

OVAN, ST., of Autun. [EVANTIUS (1).]

OWAIN ap Macsen Wledig, surnamet Vinddu, numbered among the Welsh saints, but of uncertain character and history; the Triads present him as a warrior chief, and elected to the throne of the Britons in the 4th or 5th century. (Rees, *W. SS.* 108, 115; Williams, *Em. Welsh.* 365.) [J. G.]

OWEN, ST. [AUDOENUS.]

OYAN, ST. [EUGENDUS (2).]

OZEAS, a presbyter, commended by Theodoret as a champion of godliness, by whom he sent a letter to Ibas, bishop of Edessa. (Theod. *Ep.* 132.) [E. V.]

P

PABO, surnamed POST PRYDAIN, Welsh warrior and saint about the beginning of the 6th century, buried at Llanbabo in Anglesey. (*Myvyr. Arch. of Wales.* ii. 49; Williams, *Tolo MSS.* 503, 527, 558; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 103, 167.) For the Llanbabo inscribed stone see Westwood, *Lap. Wall.* 192. [J. G.]

PACATULA. [GAUDENTIUS (10).]

PACATUS (1), LATINUS DREPANIUS (otherwise LATINUS PACATUS DREPANIUS), a Gallic rhetorician of the 4th century, author of a panegyric pronounced before the senate on Theodosius the Great, Sept. 1st, 391, which contains much information upon the facts of that emperor's life. [DREPANIUS, in *Dict. G. & R. Biog.*] [G. T. S.]

PACATUS (2) (PARATUS), Gallic poet, probably near Bordeaux, c. A.D. 431. He obtained from URANIUS an account of the death of Paulinus of Nola (see it in Boll. *AA. SS.* Jun. v. 172), but the poetical life of St. Paulinus intended to have been written by Pacatus, and based on this, does not appear to have been composed. (*Hist. Lit. Franc.* ii. 202, 204; Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat.* v. 170, 195, ed. Mansi; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 54.) [J. G.]

PACATUS (3), an ecclesiastical writer against Porphyrius, cited by John the Roman deacon, afterwards (as some think) pope John III. in his *Exposition of the Heptateuch*, printed in Pitra's *Spicilegium Solesmense* (vol. i. pp. 280, 281). Nothing further is known of this Pacatus (Ceill. xi. 334). [C. H.]

PACHO (Παχών, PACHOMIUS in Cassiod.), a solitary in Scetis, from youth to extreme old age, in the latter part of the 4th century, famed for his strength in the monastic virtues, having never been seduced, writes Sozomen, by the appetites of the flesh, the passions of the soul, or the wiles of the evil one, to desire the things from which it behoves a philosopher to abstain, (Soz. vi. 29; Cassiod. *Trip. Hist.* viii. 1; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* xi. 36; *Laus. Hist.* c. 29 and note in

Pat. Gr. xxxiv. 1084). The account of him in the *Lausiac History* has been wrongly attributed to St. Nilus. (Fabric. *Bibl. Gr.* t. x. p. 16, ed. Harles; Ceill. viii. 211.) [C. H.]

PACHOMIUS (1), ST., a monk of the Thebaid of Lower Egypt, in the 4th century A.D., the founder of the famous monasteries of Tabenna; one of the first to collect solitary ascetics together under a rule. Beyond a brief mention of him in Sozomen, who praises his gentleness and suavity (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 14), the materials for his biography are of questionable authenticity. His memory is specially revered in the Greek Church (*AA. SS.* Mai. 14; *Menol. Gr.* Mai. 15). Athanasius, during his visit to Rome, made the name Pachomius familiar to the church there through Marcella and others, to whom he held up Pachomius and his Tabennian monks as a bright example (Hieron. *Ep.* 127, *ad Principium*). Rosweyd gives a narrative of his life in Latin, being a translation by Dionysius Exiguus, in the 6th century, of a biography said to be written by a contemporary monk of Tabenna (*Vit. Patr.* in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 227).

If we may trust this writer, Pachomius was born of wealthy pagan parents in Lower Egypt, before the council of Nicea. He served in his youth under Constantine in the campaign against Maxentius, which placed Constantine alone on the undisputed throne. It was, as often in the early days of Christianity, the kindness shewn by Christians to himself and to his comrades in distress, which led him to become a Christian. Like many enthusiastic converts of that day, he attached himself to a hermit, celebrated for his sanctity and austerities. The narrative tells how he and Palaemon supported themselves by weaving the shaggy tunics ("cilicia"), the favourite dress of Egyptian monks, not unlike the hair-shirt of later ascetics. He became a monk, and many prodigies are related of his power over demons, and in resisting the natural craving for sleep and food. (*Vit. cc.* 40, 44, 45, 47, 48, etc., ap. Rosw. *V. P.*)

His reputation for holiness soon attracted to him many who desired to embrace the monastic life, and without, apparently, collecting them into one monastery, he provided for them the organisation, without which disorder must have ensued. The bishop of a neighbouring diocese sent for him to regulate the monks there. Pachomius seems also to have done some missionary work in his own neighbourhood. Athanasius, visiting Tabenna, was eagerly welcomed by Pachomius, who, in that zeal for orthodoxy, which was a characteristic of monks generally, is said to have flung one of Origen's writings into the water, exclaiming, that he would have cast it into the fire, but that it contained the name of God. He lived to a good old age (Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* ix. 14). The Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 287) give the *Acta* of Pachomius by a nearly contemporary author, in a Latin translation from the original Greek MSS., with notes and commentary by Papebroch. Here (*Acta*, § 77) Pachomius died about the time when Athanasius returned to his see under Constantius, i.e. A.D. 349 as computed by Papebroch [ATHANASIUS, p. 191 b

note r], and as the same author reckons, aged 57. Miraeus (*Schol. to Gennad. Scr. Eocl. c. 7*) makes him flourish in 340; Trithemian in 390, under Valentinian and Theodosius. Sigebert (*Chron. ann. 405*) puts his death in 405 at the age of 110. Portus Veneris, now Porto Venere, a small town on the north-west coast of Italy, near Spezia, claims, that his body rests there.

What is called the Rule of Pachomius was published at Rome 1575 A.D., and, again, at Rome 1588 A.D. in a revised form by Petr. Ciacconius as part of his edition of Cassian's works. (Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, Notae ad *Vit. Pachom.*) It is said to have been translated by Jerome from the original Greek or Coptic, 404 A.D. But Cave objects that Pachomius is omitted in Jerome's list of ecclesiastical writers (Cave, *Hist. Liter. i.* 208).

The same learned and accurate writer regards the Rule given by Palladius of Helenopolis in his *Historia Lausiaca* (c. 38, ap. Rosweyd, *Vit. Patr. pp. 737*), as an abridgment of a longer rule, and thinks, that the simple rule of Pachomius was amplified by his successors. The rule in Palladius agrees with the rule in the Life of Pachomius. Sozomen styles Pachomius the founder and ruler (*ἀρχηγός*) of Tabenna, and speaks of his system (*πολιτεία*) as aiming, like other monastic codes, at virtue and heavenly things (*Hist. Eocl. iii.* 14). Palladius (*ib.*) relates, how an angel traced the Rule on a brazen tablet. Three monks were to share one cell; they were all to take their meals together, but were to wear their hoods at meals, so as not to see one another. They were to wear their white goatskins (cf. Hebrews xi. 37), day and night. Twelve times at least in the day, twelve in the evening, twelve in the night were to pray. Pachomius himself set them an example of working hard, both indoors and out. The probation for a novice was to last three years; the lay monks were to reverence those, who had been ordained; all were to be under the control of priors ("praepositi," cc. 22, 25, etc.), chosen not by seniority but by merit (c. 45).

The sister of Pachomius is said (like St. Scholastica) to have copied her brother's example by founding a convent near his monks, and prescribing a Rule for the female devotees there. A monk, with leave from those in authority, might visit a relative there, if accompanied himself by one of the older brethren. According to Gennadius (*De Viris Illustr. c. 7*, ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccles.*), Pachomius wrote also several epistles, mostly lost (Rosweyd, *Not. ad Vit. Pach.*), and ordered the monks of the monasteries under his supervision to meet yearly at Easter and on another great festival.

The *Monita Spiritualia*, ascribed to Pachomius by Voss (*Opp. Gregor. Thaum. App. Mogunt. 1606*) Cave pronounces spurious, but praises them highly as terse, and worthy to be written in letters of gold (*Hist. Liter. s.v.*). (In addition to the authorities cited above, see Honorius Augustodunensis, *De Scriptor. Eocl.*, ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccles.*, Hamburgi, 1718; and Heraclides, *Paradisus*, ap. Rosweyd. *Vitae Patrum. Antverpiae*, 1628.) Rosweyd (*Vit. Patr. lib. i. in Pat. Lat. lxxiii.* 429) gives a *Vita* bearing some resemblance to the Life of Pachomius, but conjectures that it is the Life of some monk

who, he thinks, should be named Posthumius. Papebroch (p. 359) reprints it as a *Vita Apocrypha* of Pachomius. [I. G. S.]

PACHOMIUS (2), a disciple of the saint of that name. (*Vit. S. Pachonii*, c. 24 ap. Rosweyd. *Vit. Patr. in Pat. Lat. lxxiii.* 244.) [I. G. S.]

PACHOMIUS, of Scetis. [PACHO.]

PACHOMIUS (3), Greek monk, author of three works given in Migne, *Pat. Graec. t. xcvi.* 1333-63, entitled *περὶ τῆς ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ὠφελείας*, *Περὶ Καρτανίων Αἰρετικῶν*, and *Προθεωρία εἰς τὴν γραμματικὴν*. He probably belongs to the 8th century (Ceillier, xii. 152). [J. G.]

PACHYMIUS (Παχύμιος), Egyptian bishop and martyr in the Diocletian persecution. [PHILEAS.] (Eus. *H. E.* viii. 13.) [G. T. S.]

PACIANUS, ST., Mar. 9, bishop of Barcelona. All that is known of him is derived from St. Jerome (*de Viris Ill.* 106, 132), who states that he was renowned both for the purity of his life and for his eloquence, and that he wrote various short works, of which some were against the Novatians, and one was called *Cervus*. He died at an advanced age in the reign of Theodosius and before A.D. 392, the date of St. Jerome's work, and therefore probably succeeded Praetextatus, bishop in A.D. 343. He was the father of Dexter, the pretorian prefect, to whom St. Jerome's book was dedicated. Three letters of his are extant, addressed to Sympronianus, a Novatian, in which the chief positions he defends are the use of the name Catholic, and the possibility of repentance and the right of the church to give absolution for post-baptismal sin. There are also extant an exhortation to repentance, and a sermon on baptism. In the former he alludes to the work now lost, mentioned by St. Jerome, which he calls *Cervulus*. It is supposed to have been directed against the New Year festivities, at which people dressed themselves up in the skins of various animals. Gams gives a list of the editions of St. Pacian, the princeps being that of Tillet, Paris, 1538. Migne's (*Patr. Lat. xiii.* 1051) is a reprint of Galland's. (Tillem. viii. 537; Gams, *Kirch. von Spanien*, ii. (1), 318; *Esp. Sag.* xxix. 91, 390.) An English translation of his works accompanies that of Cyprian's Letters in the Oxford Ang. Cath. Lib. [F. D.]

PADARN (PATERNUS, PATERO, PETERONE), founder and patron of Llanbadarn-Fawr, near Aberystwith, co. Cardigan, bishop of that see and one of the three chief saints of Wales.

The chief authority is *Vita Sancti Paterni*, belonging to the 11th or 12th century; it is published by Rees (*Cambr. Brit. SS.* 189-97, 502-14, with English translation), and John of Tinmouth's shortened form of it is given by Capgrave (*Nov. Leg. Angl.* f. 258-9), from whom it is printed, with important preface by Henschenius, in Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 April ii. 375-78. (For the bibliography see Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. i. 129-30, pt. ii. 858; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc. i.* 145-6, App. c, 159 App. E, carefully distinguishing the Lives of the bishops of Wales and Avranches.) Padarn was a Breton, son of

Pedwrn; in the company of his relative CAD-FAN (1), he came to Britain A.D. 516 (Ussher), was perhaps a pupil in the school of St. Iltyd at Llantwit Major, and finally built a church and monastery at Mauritana, now Llanbadarn-Fawr. He is then said to have visited Ireland, to which his father had retired for religion, and on his return built monasteries and churches throughout Cardiganshire. He was the first bishop of Llanbadarn, and by the legend is carried with SS. David and Teilo for episcopal consecration to Jerusalem. After a rule of twenty-one years, he removed to Brittany at the call of Caradog Vraichvras (a celebrated warrior and prince of Cornwall about the close of the 5th century, but whom we can hardly regard as a ruler in Brittany), and became bishop of Vannes, one of the seven dioceses into which Armorica or Brittany was divided. While he was there, Samson was bishop at Dol, and a synod took place at Vannes for the settling of some differences between Padarn and the neighbouring bishops, but the result was only partial, and Padarn soon after went among the Franks and died there, but the year is unknown. The Bollandists place his birth about the year 490, his arrival in Britain 516, his return to Armorica 540, and his death 560, but beyond his reputed connexion with certain contemporaries there is no evidence for dates, and the Paternus who, with Samson, signed the canons of the council of Paris, A.D. 557, was unquestionably the bishop of Avranches, in Lower Normandy. The Welsh portion of the legend taken by itself, and his burial at Bardsey, can be received without much question, but the remainder can with difficulty be accepted. The feast of the bishop of Llanbadarn is April 15, and that of the bishop of Avranches, April 16 (Usuard. *Mart. Auct.* Apr. 16; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. c. 14 and *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 516 sq.; Rees, *W. SS.* 215-7; Pryce, *An. Br. Ch.* c. 4; *Myr. Arch.* ii. 10, 24, 50, 472; Cressy, *C. H. Brit.* xi. c. 9; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 144). Padarn is patron and has given his name to Llanbadarn-Fawr, and many other places in Wales. The extent and duration of the see of Llanbadarn are uncertain. It probably occupied the counties of Cardigan and Radnor, the north of Brecknockshire, which had just belonged to the short-lived see of Llanafan-Fawr, and the southern parishes of Montgomeryshire. It is said to have been filled by Cynog after Padarn [CYNOG], but the succession is lost, and only Cynog, Curig, and Idnerth are even mentioned. It may have existed till 720, when its churches appear to have been devastated by the Saxons (*Brut. y Tywysog.* in *Myr. Arch.* ii. 472, but not in *M. H. B.* 842), but it ultimately became merged in the see of St. David's. [J. G.]

An early biographer quoted by Usher, says that three days were held sacred to his memory; April 15, being the anniversary of his death; June 20 in remembrance of his consecration as bishop, and Nov. 1, on account of his reconciliation with the prelates of Armorica. William of Malmesbury (*Gesta Pontificum*, v. § 249), gives a letter of Radbod, prior of the monastery of St. Sampson at Dol, to King Athelstan in 923, in which he says that he has sent the king the bones of St. Senator, St. Paternus, and St. Scubilo, who was Paternus's master, and that they lay in the same tomb with St. Paternus on his right

and left hand, and that their festival is kept on September 23. This was the bishop of Avranches. The invasions of the Northmen threw the Breton and South Welsh churches upon Anglo-Saxon protection (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 96). The name Paternus also occurs as that of a Cornish king, the father of St. Constantine (Vol. I. p. 660), and some suppose that he gave name to the parish of Madron in Cornwall. The *Acta Sanctorum* give the Bishop of Vannes (who died about 560) under April 15, ii. 379-382, the bishop of Avranches (who died about 565), under April 16, ii. 427-430.

There are parishes in Cornwall and Devon called Petherwin, probably in honour of the bishop of Vannes. [C. W. B.]

PADDA, a priest who assisted Wilfrid in the conversion of the South Saxons (*Bed. H. E.* iv. 13). [PUCH, s. f.] [C. H.]

PAEANIUS, a lay friend and correspondent of Chrysostom, filling some high official position at Constantinople. Chrysostom gives him a very exalted character for zeal in defence of the truth, and courage united with respect, in resisting the bishops and others in authority by whom it was being betrayed. In the height of the storm, while some were being driven into exile, others were flying or hiding themselves for fear of persecution, and others were yielding to the menaces of the party in power, he stood firm, and by his almost unaided strength supported the falling church, encouraged the fearful, put the cowardly to shame, and proved himself a harbour to all the tempest-tossed. His interest and his exertions extended beyond Constantinople to Palestine, Phoenicia, Cilicia, and every part of the church that was affected by the recent calamities (Chrys. *Ep.* 205, 220). His fidelity to Chrysostom cost him the temporary loss of his official position, and his banishment from Constantinople. But after a short interval he was recalled and reinstated in his former rank (*Ep.* 220). We have four letters of Chrysostom to Paeanius (*Epp.* 95, 193, 204, 220). [E. V.]

PAEGA, an abbat in the diocese of Worcester, who attested the act of the council of Clovesho, Oct. 12, 803. (Kemble, *C. D.* 1024; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546.) [C. H.]

PAEONIUS, a prefect of Gaul, who, according to the somewhat malicious account of Sidonius Apollinaris, by whom he is nicknamed Chremes, had usurped the office in the first instance. According to the same authority he was a man of humble birth, who had advanced himself by stirring up sedition and posing as a sort of tribune of the people, and by contracting a fortunate marriage. The cause of the poet's ill-humour was an unfounded accusation which Paeonius had made against him of writing some satirical verses in which he and others were held up to ridicule (A.D. 461). The story of the charge and the reconciliation by the good offices of the Emperor Majorian, who asked them both to dinner, is amusingly told in one of Sidonius's letters (i. 11). [S. A. B.]

PAESIS (1) (Πάσις, Παΐσις. PAUSIS), March 24, Egyptian martyr with others in the second

year of the Diocletian persecution. They suffered under Urbanus, ruler of Palestine, at Caesarea. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. 3.) [G. T. S.]

PAESIS (2), June 21, an Egyptian martyr in the Diocletian persecution, with his sister Thecla. They were natives of the Thebaid. Their names are not found in any martyrology save the Ethiopic as given in Ludolphi *Hist. Aeth. Comment.* p. 401, under the date of Dec. viii., but their original Acts will be found in Aug. Ant. Georgii *de Miraculis S. Coluthi*, Rom. 1793, p. cxxx., with which should be compared Georgii *Fragm. Evang. Johann. Graeco-Copto-Thebaic.* Rom. 1789, p. xcvi. According to the fuller version of their Acts in this latter reference, they suffered under Armenius the prefect of Egypt [MARMENIA]. These Acts show the efforts made by the governor to gain them over, as they were of noble birth. The Acts are clearly genuine records of that great persecution, and may be compared with those of Theodotus of Ancyra as regards the efforts made to win the martyrs by rewards. [G. T. S.]

PAIR, ST. [PATERNUS (9).]

PALAEMON, solitary in the Thebaid, who directed Pachomius abbat of Tabenna, in the spiritual life. (*Vit. Pachomii* in Boll. A.A. SS. Mai. iii. 297-8, ed. 1866; Tillemont, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 167 sq., 674 sq.) [J. G.]

PALATINUS, a Christian, perhaps of Hippo, who appears to have embraced a monastic life at an early age, and sent to St. Augustine some hair-shirts, probably as indicative of his own mode of life. (Aug. *Ep.* 218; Tillemont, *Mém.* xiii. 150.) [H. W. P.]

PALCHONIUS (BALCONIUS), bishop of Braga (Bracara) in Lusitania from before 415 till after 447 (Florez, *Esp. Sag.* xv. 102), recipient of a consolatory letter brought from Avitus the priest by Orosius the historian in 415. The letter occurs in the App. to St. Augustine's *Opp.* t. vii. (*Pat. Lat.* xli. 805; see also Baronius, *Eccl. Ann.* A.D. 415; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 3.) [J. G.]

PALLADIA (1), a lady of Cappadocia, a relative of Basil, whom for the excellence of her character he regarded as his mother. (Basil, *Ep.* 137 [366].) [E. V.]

PALLADIA (2), sister to PAULUS (107).

PALLADIA (3), wife of St. Salvianus, priest of Marseilles (circ. A.D. 390-485), is known from a letter written by her and her husband to her parents Hypatius and Queta (*Ep.* iv. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liii. 160; Ceillier, x. 360), earnestly deprecating their anger against Salvianus who had separated from her on religious grounds. [S. A. B.]

PALLADIA (4), lady of rank, condemned in the council held at Lyons A.D. 517 for incest with one named Stephen; six canons were passed against them. (Hefele, *Conc.* ii. 667; Mansi, viii. 568.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (1), priest, correspondent of St. Athanasius about A.D. 371. He wrote to

inform Athanasius that a number of the monks of Caesarea in Cappadocia were turned against Basil, and begged Athanasius to counsel the unruly brethren to cease from opposing the doctrine of their bishop. (Athanasius, *Ep. ad Pallad.*, in *Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 1167; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 147.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (2), one of the principal officers of the court at Constantinople, where one of that name was "Intendens largitionum" in 381, and "magister officiorum" in that and the following years (*Cod. Theod.* tom. vi. p. 376), a highly prized friend and frequent correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen, who wrote to him during the Lent of 382 in behalf of a relation of his named Euphemius, who was going on business to Constantinople (Greg. Naz. *Epp.* 228, 231), and also on behalf of a presbyter named Sacerdos (*Ep.* 229.) [E. V.]

PALLADIUS (3), a person who during Gregory Nazianzen's absence had inflicted violent injury on his house, of which Gregory in 380 makes complaint to Alypius, governor of Cappadocia, and begs him to prevent its complete ruin. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 148 al. 82.) [E. V.]

PALLADIUS (4), Arian bishop, apparently of Dacia, who wrote a letter, not now extant, to St. Ambrose, and who is classed by that prelate (*De fide* l. 1, c. 6) among the leading Arians, was tried with Secundianus in the provincial council of Aquileia A.D. 381, and condemned for Arianism. (Mansi, iii. 599 sq. See Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xvi. 916 for St. Ambrose's account of the trial.) Vigilius of Thapsus uses him in his treatise in defence of the Nicene faith as disputing with Ambrose, against whom he had written [AMBROSIUS]. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxii. 433 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 483.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (5), magistrate of Suedra in Pamphylia, who united with the clergy of Suedra in the request to Epiphanius of Salamis for instruction upon the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; the *Ancoratus* is Epiphanius's reply. (Epiphanius, *Opp.* iii. 3.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (6), bishop of London (unhistorical) is given as the sixth by Godwin. (*De Praesul. Angliae*, 170, ed. Richardson; Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr.* 152.) [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (7), bishop of Helenopolis, the author of the *Lausiaca History*, containing biographies of the leading ascetics with whom he was contemporary, the trusted friend of Chrysostom, in whose misfortunes he fully shared, was born c. 367, perhaps, though this is uncertain, in Galatia. He embraced an ascetic life in his 20th year, c. 386. His ascetic career can only be conjecturally traced from scattered notices in his *Lausiaca History*. He never remained very long in one place, his object being to make the acquaintance of the leading solitaries and ascetics of his day, and to learn all that could be gathered of their manner of life and the miraculous deeds of which they were the reputed authors. Tillemont thinks that his earliest place of sojourn was with the abbat Elpidius of Cappadocia in the cavernous recesses of the mountains in the vicinity of Jericho (*Hist. Laus.* c. 106), and that he, about 387,

visited Bethlehem, where he received a very unfavourable impression of Jerome from the solitary Posidonius (*ibid.* c. 78), and passing thence to Jerusalem formed the acquaintance of Melania the elder, and Rufinus, the latter of whom he highly commends (*ibid.* c. 5, c. 118). In 388 Palladius paid his first visit to Alexandria (*ibid.* c. 1). Here he placed himself under the instructions of the presbyter Isidore, the Hospitaller of the Alexandrine church. Isidore, wisely judging that Palladius's ardent temperament needed manual labour more than spiritual counsels for its subjugation, sent him to pass three years with a solitary named Dorotheus, who was notorious for the austerity of his asceticism (*ibid.* c. 2). The discipline proved too severe for the young aspirant for ascetic honours, and a severe illness compelled him to curtail the period of his stay (*ibid.* p. 7). After having visited several of the monasteries near Alexandria and their inmates, including the famous Didymus, Palladius retired (c. 390) to the Nitrian desert, whence, after a year, he plunged still deeper into the district known as the Cells, τὰ κελλῖα, where he remained more or less for the space of nine years (*ibid.*). Here, for three years, he enjoyed the intercourse of Macarius the younger [MACARIUS, (17)] and subsequently of Evagrius of Pontus [EVAGRIUS (12) PONTICUS]. Palladius's eager desire to obtain information regarding the heroes of the ascetic life, and a naturally roving disposition, forbade his remaining absolutely settled long in any one place, and he appears during this period to have traversed the whole of Upper Egypt as far as Tabenna and Syene, and to have visited all the leading solitaries of that country. Outraged nature again asserted itself. Palladius once more fell ill (399 A.D.), and the dropsical symptoms with which he was afflicted caused the solitaries with whom he was sojourning to send him down to Alexandria to consult the physicians of that city, after he had assisted at the death-bed of Evagrius (*ibid.* c. 86). By their advice he returned to the purer air of Palestine, whence he soon passed to Bithynia, where, as he somewhat singularly remarks, either by human judgment or the Divine will, he knows not which, he was called to the dignity of the episcopate (*ibid.* c. 43). Palladius tells us neither when he was consecrated nor the name of his see. This (if we are right in identifying the author of the *Lausiac History* with the adherent of Chrysostom) we learn from other sources was Helenopolis, formerly called Drepanum, in Bithynia. He was ordained by Chrysostom, and the Origenistic opinions Palladius was charged with having imbibed from Evagrius, subsequently became a handle of accusation against his consecrator (Phot. *Cod.* 59, p. 57). The accusation of Origenism is also brought against Palladius by Epiphanius (*Epistola ad Joann. Jerus.* Hieron., *Opera*, i. col. 252, ed. Vallars.), and Jerome himself (*Proem. in Dial. adv. Pelagianos*), though Tillemont endeavours to shew that these passages refer to another Palladius. Palladius was present at the Synod held at Constantinople, May 400, at which Antoninus of Ephesus was accused by Eusebius, and he was one of the three bishops deputed by Chrysostom to visit Asia and make a personal investigation into the charges (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 131-133).

On the fruitless termination of this embassy, Chrysostom, at the opening of the year 401, resolving to go to Ephesus himself and apply a healing hand to the diseases of the Ephesine church, Palladius was one of the bishops selected to accompany him (*ibid.* p. 134).

Palladius's alleged Origenistic views having been one of the grounds of accusation against Chrysostom, he was one of the first to suffer from the persecution which, after his exile in 404, fell upon all the friends and adherents of the banished prelate. Palladius appears from a letter addressed to him by Chrysostom from Cucusus to have lain for some time in concealment in the hope of escaping persecution, in an enforced leisure which the saint reminds him allowed more time for intercessory prayer for the distracted church. It is to this that he may be referring when he speaks of having had to pass eleven months in a small dark room (*Hist. Laus.* c. 43). Concealment being no longer easy, and the magistrates having decreed that the house of any one who harboured bishop, priest, or even layman who communicated with Chrysostom, should be confiscated, Palladius, with many other ecclesiastics, took refuge in Rome, where he arrived about the middle of 405, bringing with him no letters, but a copy of the infamous decree which had driven him from Constantinople (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 26, 27). Palladius and the other refugees were hospitably entertained by one Pinianus and his wife and by some noble ladies of Rome, a kindness of which he makes grateful mention in his history (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 121), and for which Chrysostom wrote letters of thanks from Cucusus. (PINIANUS.) He was honourably received, together with the other bishops Cyrianus, Demetrius, and Eusebius, who had come on the same business by pope Innocent, and his testimony enabled the pope to obtain a clear knowledge of the details of the transaction (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 26). Chrysostom wrote a grateful letter to the four bishops for all the labour and trouble they had encountered in his behalf (Chrys. *Ep.* 148). On the departure of the Italian deputation sent by Honorius to his brother Arcadius, requesting that the whole matter should be subjected to the decision of a general council, Palladius and the other refugees accompanied them (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 31). On their arrival the whole party received brutal and insulting treatment, and were forbidden to land at Constantinople. Palladius and his companions were shut up in separate chambers in the fortress of Athyre on the coast; and loaded with the utmost contumely, in the hope of breaking their spirit and compelling them to renounce communion with Chrysostom, and recognise Atticus (*ibid.* p. 32). All threats and violence proving vain, the bishops were relegated to distant and opposite quarters of the empire. Palladius's place of banishment was Syene, on the extreme border of Egypt (*ibid.* p. 154). On his journey thither, he suffered from the brutal treatment and foul language of his guards, who deprived him of the services of his attendant, and forcibly robbed him of his writing case and memoranda (*ibid.* p. 199). Tillemont considers that the death of Theophilus, in 412, brought some relaxation of Palladius's sentence, and that he was permitted to leave his place of exile, but not to return to his see.

During the interval between 412 and 420, when he wrote his *Lausiac History*, Tillemont places his residence of four years in the neighbourhood of Antinoopolis in the Thebaid, of which district and its numerous ascetics he gives copious details (*Hist. Laus.* c. 96-100; c. 137, 138), as well as the three years which he states he spent on the Mount of Olives with Innocent, the presbyter of the church built there. During the interval he may also have visited Mesopotamia, and Syria, and the other portions of the eastern world which he speaks of having traversed. The peace of the church being re-established in 417, it is possible that Palladius was restored to his see of Helenopolis. If so he did not remain there long, for Socrates informs us that he was translated from that see to Aspuna in Galatia Prima (*Socr. H. E.* vii. 36). He had, however, ceased to be bishop of Aspuna, either by death or by resignation, in the year 431, when Eusebius attended the council of Ephesus as bishop of that see (*Labbe, Concil.* iii. 450). Palladius composed his *Historia Lausiaca* in the twentieth year of his episcopate, c. 420. The work takes its name from the person at whose request it was written, and to whom it is dedicated. This was one Lausus or Lauson, the chief chamberlain in the imperial household, probably that of Theodosius II. Cedrenus says that he was an eunuch, a class of persons to which such officials usually belonged (*Cedren.* p. 335). Palladius describes Lausus as a very excellent person, who was not elated by his high place, employing his power for the glory of God and the good of the church and his riches for the relief of the poor and needy, devoting his leisure time to self-improvement and study. The *Lausiac History* is a collection of short biographical notices and characteristic anecdotes of the chief ascetics of the writer's time, both men and women. Though Palladius was credulous, especially with regard to supposed miraculous actions, his work deserves to be accepted as an honest and, with the exception named, trustworthy account of the mode of life of the solitaries of that age, and has a very real value as a faithful picture of the tone of religious thought then prevalent. It preserves to us many historical and biographical details which would otherwise have been lost, to which later writers have been indebted. Sozomen borrows many anecdotes from the *Lausiac History* without acknowledgement. Socrates makes special reference to Palladius as a leading authority on the lives of the solitaries, but is in error as to his profession and date, calling him a monk, and stating that he lived soon after the death of Valens (*Socr. H. E.* iv. 23). The *Historia Lausiaca* was repeatedly printed in various Latin versions, from very early times, the first edition appearing soon after the invention of printing. The first edition of the Greek text, with many lacunae, was that of Meursius (*Lugdun. Bat.* 1616). A more complete text was given in the *Auctarium* of Fronto Ducaeus (tom. ii. Rom. 1624), which was reprinted in the successive editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, in 1644 and 1654. Combefis supplies some additional material in his *Ecclesiae Graecae Monumenta*, vol. iii. The complete work is contained in the *Patrologia of Migne*.

Another work has been, without sufficient authority, ascribed to Palladius of Helenopolis in several MSS., in one of which it is annexed to the *Historia Lausiaca*. This is a treatise on "the nations of India, and the Brachmans," *περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἰνδίας ἐθνῶν καὶ τῶν Βραχμῶνων*. The work supplies nothing by which the writer can be identified, beyond the facts that he was a Christian who commenced his journey in company with one Moses, bishop of Adule, on the confines of Egypt and Ethiopia, and that at the time of his writing the Roman empire was still flourishing. Cave expresses grave doubts as to Palladius being its author, which Oudin directly denies.

The question whether the *Dialogue with Theodore the Deacon* is correctly assigned to Palladius of Helenopolis requires fuller discussion. This "Dialogue," which is our chief authority for the later history of Chrysostom and the events connected with his deposition and banishment and the persecution of his adherents, has been commonly ascribed to Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, the author of the *Historia Lausiaca*. Whether the authorship may be correctly assigned to him is a question which has been much debated, and on which the opinions of scholars have been greatly divided. Photius, our earliest authority on the subject, mentions this Dialogue as the work of Palladius, whom he designates as a bishop, without naming his see (*Phot. Cod.* 96, p. 252). The title of the MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence of the 7th century, from which the Greek text was first printed, describes the author as "Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis," and the same description is repeated at the end of the work. The title is as follows: *Διάλογος Ἱστορικῶς Παλλαδίου Ἐπισκόπου Ἐλενοπόλεως γερόμενος πρὸς Θεόδωρον διάκονον Ῥώμης περὶ βίου καὶ πολιτείας τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου*. In other MS. copies of the dialogue the author is designated bishop of Aspuna, to which see we know on the authority of Socrates that Palladius was translated from Helenopolis (*Socr. H. E.* vii. 36). Theodore, bishop of Trimithus in Cyprus, in the 7th century, also agrees in ascribing the work to Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis. There was no question as to the authorship till the first publication of the Greek text by Emeric Bigot, Paris, 1680. In a learned Latin preface Bigot expresses his opinion, that the work was originally published anonymously to escape the enmity of the persecutors of Chrysostom, and that the identification of its author with Palladius the adherent of Chrysostom is erroneous. To escape the force of the testimony for its being the work of the bishop of Helenopolis, Bigot invents a second Palladius who succeeded his namesake on his translation to Aspuna (*Bigot, Praef.* pp. 9, 10). Such an assumption is entirely gratuitous, and completely devoid of foundation. That the dialogue was written by Theodore of Helenopolis is strongly maintained by Dupin (*Auteurs Ecclés.* tom. iii. p. 296, ed. Paris, 1686), who finds an additional argument in favour of his view, in the similarity of its style with that of the *Historia Lausiaca*, both being written in a curiously debased Greek. This view of the authorship is also held by Cotelier (*Eccl. Graec. Monum.* tom. iii. p. 563), and

s regarded as probable by Cave who, however, shrank from deciding the question, saying "de dialogi hujus auctore multos inter eruditos lis est . . . verum omnia doctiorum judicio lubens submitto" (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 377).

Wastel, the learned Carmelite, invented another theory of the authorship, viz. that it was composed by the younger of the two interlocutors, Theodore the deacon: a shadowy personage of whose real existence we have no proof (Wastel, *Vindic. Joann. Ierosol.* tom. ii. p. 496). Tillemont strongly maintains that the name of the author of the Dialogue was Palladius, and that he was a bishop, but led astray by the false assumption that the narrator is speaking in his own character, and seeing that the bishop of Helenopolis is repeatedly referred to by him as a distinct person, calls into existence another Palladius, unknown to history, of whom he draws up an entirely imaginary history from the dialogue itself (*Mém. Ecclés.* tom. xi. pp. 520-533; 642-646). It is rather remarkable that so many learned men should have failed to perceive that this dialogue is essentially a literary composition, of the same character as the dialogues of Plato and Cicero and other ancient writers, and that the characters and framework are alike fictitious, invented by the author for the purpose of adding vividness and a dramatic air to his narrative. The bishop and the deacon are evidently imaginary personages brought upon the stage to tell what each knows of the transactions in reply to questions put to them by the other. One thing only is certain as to the authorship. It was undoubtedly written by one who was not only an eyewitness of the events he describes, but took an active part in them. There is no one who corresponds so closely to the ideal presented by the narration in all respects as Palladius of Helenopolis, nor is there any really weighty objection to regarding him as the real author. The supposed objection, based on Palladius of Helenopolis being spoken of in the third person, would be of equal weight against Caesar being the author of the "Commentaries" or Xenophon of the "Anabasis." With regard to the character of the work, interesting and valuable as it is, it owes its merit entirely to the subject, and not to the style or arrangement. It is impossible to echo Photius's commendation of it as a work "excellently and carefully composed," *καλῶς τε καὶ ἐσπουδασμένως*. It has all the characteristics of a heated polemical pamphlet, written under very excited feelings. The language is debased, the style involved, and the arrangement confused. The narrative is entirely deficient in orderly sequence. To follow the course of events one has to turn backwards and forwards, and it is difficult to conceive of a biographical treatise which more fully exercises our patience. But for the closing days of Chrysostom's episcopate and the events of that stirring time, with all its faults, this dialogue is simply priceless. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* tom. xi. pp. 500-530, pp. 638-646; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 376; Du Pin, *Auteurs Eccl.* tom. iii. p. 296; Cotelerius, *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* tom. iii. p. 563; Wastelius, *Vindiciae Joannis Ierosolymitani*, tom. ii. p. 499; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* i. 727; viii. 456; x. 98 sq.; Oudin, *De Script. Eccl.* i. 908.)

[E. V.]

PALLADIUS (8), a solitary, commemorated by Theodoret in his *Religiosa Historia*, c. vii.

[E. V.]

PALLADIUS (9), prefect of the east, A.D. 450-455. He held the office at the council of Chalcedon. (Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* i. 639; Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 78.)

[J. G.]

PALLADIUS (10), thirteenth bishop of Bourges, was contemporary with pope Leo I., and joined with other Gallican bishops in sending to the pope the synodical letter from Ravenna A.D. 451 (Leo, *Epist.* 66. 99. 102; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* liv. 883. 969. 985, for the letter and reply). His feast is May 10 (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 8; *Boll. A. SS. Mai.* ii. 567). [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (11), July 6, the first bishop sent to Ireland, and the immediate predecessor of St. Patrick. The facts known about him are very few, though his memory has been surrounded with abundant legends. His birthplace has been disputed, some placing it in England, others in Gaul, others in Italy; some even making him a Greek. The fact is that we have no information at all on the subject; and as the name Palladius was common enough in those times, every author has a sufficiently wide field on which to exercise his power of identification or imagination. Ussher has pretty well exhausted this field in his *Ecclés. Britann. Antiq.* t. vi. cap. xvi. of Elrington's edit. The ecclesiastical position of Palladius has also been disputed. Some have made him archdeacon of Rome, a cardinal, and apostolic nuncio; others believe that he was deacon of Germanus of Auxerre. He seems to have been an influential man in the earlier part of the fifth century, as Prosper of Aquitaine, who was a contemporary, mentions him twice, affording the only real record of his life which we possess. Under date A.D. 429, the consulship of Florentius and Dionysius at Rome, Prosper writes thus in his *Chronicle*:—"Agricola, a Pelagian, son of Severianus, a Pelagian bishop, corrupted the churches of Britannia by the insinuation of his doctrine, but by the instrumentality of the deacon Palladius, pope Celestinus sends Germanus, bishop of Auxerre, in his own stead, to displace the heretics and direct the Britons to the catholic faith." The probability seems great that Palladius was from Gaul or Britain, as two years afterwards, in 431, the pope consecrated him a missionary bishop for Ireland; and it is not likely he would have sent any person on such a mission except one who knew the language and customs of a Celtic people. Prosper's words under 431, the year of the consulship of Bassus and Antiochus, are, "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur a Papa Celestino Palladius et primus Episcopus mittitur." There is also a reference to this mission of Palladius in Prosper's work, *Contra Collatorem*, cap. xxi., where he says of Celestine, "whilst the pope laboured to keep the Roman island Catholic, he made also the barbarous island Christian, by ordaining a bishop for the Scots" (cf. opp. Prosperi, in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. li.). This mission of Palladius is referred to in the Book of Armagh, where Tirechan (*Analect. Bolland.* t. ii. p. 67), or more probably some writer towards the year 900, speaking first of

St. Patrick's mission and its date, then adds something to Prosper's statement. "Palladius is first sent as bishop, who was called Patricius by another name. He suffered martyrdom among the Scots, as the ancient saints declare; then the second Patrick is sent by the angel of God, Victor by name, and by pope Celestine, in whom the whole of Ireland believed." This notice has introduced great confusion into the history of Palladius. Tirechan calls him Patricius as his second name, and has thus introduced another Patrick into the numerous Patricks who were already claiming the honour of being the apostle of Ireland. The controversy is too long and involved to be here discussed. The reader will find ample details in Ussher, *l. c.*; Todd's St. Patrick, p. 270, and Petrie on the *History and Antiquities of Tura Hill*, p. 90. The Bollandists, *AA. SS. Jul. ii. p. 286*, give the Scottish traditions, and the Rev. J. F. Shearman in his *Loca Patriciana*, p. 25, Dub. 1879, has discussed with vast resources of legendary lore the different localities in Wicklow and Kildare where Palladius is said to have preached and built churches. His authorities are not however of much historical value on such a question, being specially the *Four Masters* and Jocelyn. His work contains, however, much interesting matter for the students of Irish ecclesiastical history and antiquities, the accuracy of which is guaranteed by the writer's extensive personal knowledge of the localities. [G. T. S.]

PALLADIUS (12), patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 488-498 (Clinton, *F. R.*). He had been a presbyter of St. Thecla in the Isaurian Seleucia. He succeeded Peter the Fuller in A.D. 488. He favoured the cause of Peter Mongus. He died in A.D. 498, and was followed by Flavian (Theophan. pp. 116, 117; Eutychn. ii. 111; Le Quien, *Or. Christ. ii. 729*). [E. V.]

PALLADIUS (13) (PELADIUS), eighth bishop of Embrun, succeeded Gallicanus c. A.D. 555, but his position, and hence his date, are doubtful, as in his *Acta* (given by the Boll. *AA. SS. Jun. v. 84*) he is said to have preceded Gallicanus, and ruled five years, A.D. 513-8 [GALLICANUS (2)] (*Gall. Christ. iii. 1060*). [J. G.]

PALLADIUS (14), ST., Oct. 7, bishop of Saintes in the latter half of the 6th century, was one of the intriguing self-seeking prelates so common in France at that epoch. Descended from an ancestor of the same name famed for his wealth (Greg. Tur. *de Glor. Conf. lx.*), he seems to have taken orders with no views beyond temporal advancement.

The city of Saintes was included in the territory of king Guntram, and against him, though a zealous patron of the Church and friend of the clergy, Palladius constantly plotted. In particular he joined the faction of the pretender Gundovald, at whose command he consecrated Faustianus as bishop of Dax in 584 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc. vii. 31, viii. 2*). This action was a subject of discussion at the 2nd Council of Mâcon in 585, at which the bishops deposed Faustianus and sentenced Palladius, with two other prelates to pay a large annual sum for his future maintenance [*ibid. viii. 20*, FAUSTIANUS]. Undeterred by this punishment, Palladius appears

to have intrigued two years later with emissaries of the notorious Fredegund, though the charge was not brought home to him (*ibid. viii. 43*).

Though lawless and immoral in his life (see Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc. viii. 2, 7, 22*), he was not insensible to the external interests of his diocese, and exerted himself zealously in the building of churches and obtaining of relics. (See Greg. Tur. *de Glor. Mart. lvi.*; *de Glor. Conf. lvii.*; *de Mirac. S. Martini, iv. 8*, and Greg. Magn. *Epist. xlix.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 834*, and *Gall. Christ. x. 259*; Boll. *Acta SS. Oct. iii. 924-35*).

His signature is found to the canons of the 4th Council of Paris held in 573, while in 579 a council was held in his own see (Mansi, ix. 868, 921). How long he lived after 595, the date of Gregory the Great's letter cited above, is unknown. [S. A. B.]

PALLADIUS (15), ST., 20th bishop of Auxerre, between St. Desiderius and St. Vigilius, in the first half of the 7th century, was abbat of St. Germanus of Auxerre at the time of his election. He was present at two councils, that of Rheims held in 625 or 630 and that of Clichy about 628 (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem. ii. 5*, Migne, *Patr. Lat. cxxxv. 102*; Mansi, x. 591, 594, 612). He was an active builder and restorer of ecclesiastical edifices in his diocese, and his signature is found to the *diploma* of Clovis II. for the monastery of St. Denys of Paris in 653 (Migne, *Patr. Lat. lxxxvii. 684*). He was buried in a church he had built in honour of St. Eusebius, and is commemorated on the 10th April. In 943 bishop Guido removed his bones from their stone tomb to a silver coffin (Boll. *Acta SS. Apr. i. 864*; *Gall. Christ. xii. 269*). [S. A. B.]

PALMAS, bishop of Amastris, in Pontus, towards the end of the second century. In the last decade of that century, he presided over a council of the bishops of Pontus, assembled in order to report to Victor of Rome the practice of their churches with regard to Easter celebration; and their decision was in conformity with the Roman usage and opposed to that of the Quartodecimans (Euseb. *H. E. v. 23*). Palmas must then have been old, for it was as senior bishop he presided, no see in Pontus, apparently, at that time having metropolitan pre-eminence over the others. We find mention made of the episcopate of Palmas some years earlier, in the letter of DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH (see that article) to the church of Amastris (Euseb. *H. E. iv. 23*). [G. S.]

PAMBO (Πάμβω, Παμβός, PAMBUS, PAMBAS), a monk of Nitria, a friend of Macarius and Isidore; mentioned by Jerome (*Ep. xxii. 33*, ed. Vall.), by Rufinus (*Hist. Eccl. ii. 8*; *Apol. ii. 12*), and by Palladius (*Hist. Laus. 10*). Jerome attributes to him the judgment upon a monk, in whose cell after death the sum of 100 solidi was found. It was to be buried with him, with the words, Thy money perish with thee. He received Melania on her visit to Nitria (*Hist. Laus. 117*). He was one of those who stood out among the solitaries as defender of the Nicene doctrine, and died in 393 (Soc. iv. 23; Soz. iii. 14; Niceph. Call. ix. 14; Boll. *Acta SS. 1 Jul. i. 36*).

[W. H. F.]

N

PAMMACHIUS, a Roman senator of the Furian family (Jerome, *Ep.* lxvi. 6, ed. Vall.) prominent in the church of Rome in the 4th and 5th centuries. He was cousin to Marcella (Jer. *Ep.* xlix. 4), and is said by Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* c. 122) to have been related to Melania. He was also allied by friendship to Jerome, Paulinus, and afterwards to Augustine. He was a fellow student of Jerome at Rome (*Ep.* xlvi. 1), but appears to have not been specially connected with church affairs in early life. No mention is made of any intercourse between him and Jerome during Jerome's stay in Rome in 382-5; but they probably met, since it was in 385 that Pammachius married Paulina, the daughter of Paula, who the same year went with Jerome to Palestine. Pammachius was a man of learning, ability and eloquence (*Ep.* lxxvii. 1, xlix. 3). After his marriage, he seems to have occupied himself much with scriptural studies and church life. The controversy relating to Jovinian interested him, and he is thought to have been one of those who procured the condemnation of Jovinian from Pope Siricius (Tillemont, x. 568). But when Jerome published his books against Jovinian (in 392), they appeared to Pammachius to be too violent. He bought up the copies, and wrote a remonstrance to Jerome asking him to moderate his language. This Jerome refused to do; but he thanked Pammachius for the interest he had shewn, and hailed him as a well-wisher and defender, and promised him to keep him informed of his future writings (*Ep.* xlvi. xlix.). From this time their intercourse was constant.

Pammachius is said by Jerome (xlix. 4) to have been designated for the sacerdotium at this time by the whole city of Rome and the Pontiff. From this some have assumed that he was afterwards ordained. The words appear rather to imply, that he might on a vacancy be elected to the bishoprick itself. But he was never ordained. His growing convictions and those of his wife, the fact that all his children died at their birth, and that his wife died in childbirth (A.D. 397, see Jerome, *Ep.* 66, addressed to him two years later), led him to take monastic vows. He did not, however, forego his position as a senator, but appeared among the senators in their purple in the dark dress of a monk (Jerome, *Ep.* lxvi. 6). He showed his change of life by munificent gifts to the poor, and a great entertainment which he made for them (Paulinus, *Ep.* xiii. 11; see also Pall. *Hist. Laus.*, 122). He also, with Fabiola, erected a hospital at Portus, which became famous throughout the world (Jerom. *Ep.* lxvi. 11).

At the commencement of the Origenistic controversy, Jerome wrote to Pammachius his letter *De Opt. Genere Interpretandi* (*Ep.* lvii. ed. Vall.). This was in the year 395. On Rufinus coming to Rome Pammachius, with Oceanus and Marcella, watched his actions in Jerome's interest, and, on his publication of a translation of Origen's *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, wrote to Jerome to request him to give a full translation of the work (*Ep.* 83 and 84). These friends also procured the condemnation of Origenism by the Pope Anastasius in 401, and to them Jerome's apology against Rufinus was addressed, and the book *Cont. Joannem Hierosol.* During the Donatist schism in Africa, Pammachius, who had property in

that province, wrote a letter to the people of Numidia, where the schism had begun, exhorting them to return to the unity of the church. This letter brought him into relations with Augustine, who wrote to him (*Ep.* lviii.) congratulating him on an action which he considered likely to conduce to the healing of the schism, and desiring that he would read the letter to his brother-senators, that they might do as he had done. This was in the year 401. After this we hear of Pammachius only in connexion with the Bible-work of Jerome. Jerome dedicated to him his commentaries on the Minor Prophets (406) and on Daniel (407), and it was at his request that Jerome undertook the commentaries on Isaiah and Ezekiel (prefaces to Comm. on Am. Dan. Is. and Ezek.). But before the latter was finished, Pammachius had died in the siege of Rome by Alaric, A.D. 409. He is reckoned as a saint by the Roman church, his day being Aug. 31st (*Acta Sanctorum Aug.*, vol. vi. p. 555).

[W. H. F.]

PAMMO (Πάμμων), anchorite, one of the solitaries around Antinoë, is said by St. Athanasius (*Narratio ad Ammonium*, Migne, *Pat. Græc.* t. xxvi. 980) to have concurred with Theodorus, abbat of Tabenna, in announcing to Athanasius by revelation the emperor Julian's death, A.D. 363. [ATHANASIUS, p. 199.] [J. G.]

PAMPHILUS (1), the celebrated presbyter of Caesarea, the founder of the famous library in that city, the intimate friend, ἀγαθαίσι φίλος (Hieron. de *Script. Eccl.* 75), and literary guide of Eusebius the church historian, who, after his martyrdom, manifested the depth of his devotion by adopting his friend's name as a surname, Εὐσέβιος Παμφίλου, "Pamphilus's Eusebius." Eusebius composed his friend's biography in three books. The work is entirely lost, and our only knowledge of this chief among the biblical scholars of his age is derived from a few scattered notices in the existing writings of Eusebius, and in those of Jerome and Photius. The statement of the late writer Nicephorus Callistus, that Pamphilus was Eusebius's uncle, his mother being the martyr's sister, wants all confirmation. Pamphilus was a native of Phœnicia, and, if we accept the somewhat doubtful authority of Metaphrastes, was born at Berytus, of a wealthy and honourable family. His worldly expectations were good, and his intellectual gifts might have ensured him a high position in public affairs. But an early devotion of himself with all his powers to the service of God led to the renunciation of all his worldly prospects, together with the voluntary surrender of his property for the aid of the needy, and the acceptance of a life of strict self-denial and unremitting study. Having received his earlier education in his native city, he passed to Alexandria, where he devoted himself to theological studies under Pierius, the head of the Catechetical school there (Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* iii. 430; Phot. *Cod.* 118). Returning to Phœnicia Pamphilus settled at Caesarea, of which church he became a presbyter, probably during the episcopate of Agapius. Here he commenced that which became the work of his life, the gathering together a collection of books, especially MSS. of the Sacred Scriptures, and commentaries upon them. Jerome speaks of Pamphilus as emulating the

zeal of Demetrius Phalereus and Pisistratus in the domain of profane literature, in hunting for and obtaining possession of books illustrative of Holy Scripture from all parts of the world. The library thus formed was subsequently repaired and made good after the injuries it received during the persecution of Diocletian by Acacius and Euzoius, the successors of Eusebius in the see of Caesarea. (Hieron. *Ep.* 34, vol. i. p. 155.) Eusebius himself made a catalogue of it. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 32.) This library was especially rich in codices of the Scriptures, not a few of which Pamphilus had transcribed or corrected with his own hand. In this work he had Eusebius as his zealous coadjutor. (Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* c. 81.) Jerome speaks of Palestinian manuscripts of the LXX. current in the Syrian church, which, having been carefully prepared by Origen, were published by the two friends. "Ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt" (Hieron. *Praef. in Paralip.*; *adv. Rufin.* ii. 27, tom. ii. p. 522). (See the colophons of a Vatican MS. given from Migne, Euseb. tom. iv. p. 875, after Mai, *Bibl. Nov. Patr.* iv, in the article EUSEBIUS in this Dictionary, Vol. II. p. 310 a). Among other priceless literary treasures, the loss of which we vainly deplore, was a copy of the so-called Hebrew text of the Gospel of St. Matthew (Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* c. 3) and the *Tetrapla* and *Hexapla* of Origen in the original copy (Hieron. *in Tit.* iii. 9, tom. vii. p. 734). In the Catechetical school of Alexandria Pamphilus had conceived the most ardent admiration for its most distinguished son, the myriad-minded Origen, with whose works he made it his special object to enrich his library, copying the greater part of them with his own hand (Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* c. 75). Jerome gloried in the possession of Origen's commentaries on the Minor Prophets in five-and-twenty volumes, in Pamphilus's autograph; which "as the footsteps of the martyr's sufferings," he valued as much as the riches of Croesus (*l.c.*). A very early MS. of part of the Epistles of St. Paul of the 5th or 6th century (Codex cœi. *Bibl. Coislin.*) is stated in the colophon to have been collated with an autograph of Pamphilus in the library at Caesarea (Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin.* pp. 251-262). He gave a proof of his zealous affection for the memory and good fame of his great teacher by devoting the last two years of his life, which were spent in prison during the persecution of Diocletian and crowned with martyrdom A.D. 309, to composing, with the assistance of his devoted friend Eusebius, an *Apology*, or *Defence* of Origen. Of this work, addressed to the "Confessors condemned to the mines in Palestine," five books were completed at the time of his death, the sixth being added subsequently by Eusebius (Photius, *Cod.* 118). Photius gives a brief summary of the work, of which we have the first book alone in the inaccurate Latin version of Rufinus. (Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* iv. pp. 339, 392.) An unfounded doubt has been thrown by Jerome in more than one place on the authenticity of this apology, which he hardly scruples to accuse Rufinus with having forged. He bases this charge on the statement of Eusebius, "Pamphilus 'amator et praeco contubernalis,'" that Pamphilus wrote nothing but familiar letters, de-

voting himself exclusively to the study of and meditation on the Scriptures. (Hieron. *Ep.* 84, *ad Pammach. et Ocean.*; *adv. Rufin.* lib. i. c. 2, p. 199, lib. ii. c. 6. p. 223.) Against this we may place, not only the express statement of Photius referred to above, but also Jerome's own words (*de Script. Eccl.* c. 75), and what is said by Eusebius as to their common share in the *Apologia* (*H. E.* vi. 33, 23), as well as the testimonies of Socrates (*H. E.* iv. 27), and of the author of "Prædestinatus," c. 43. (Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* iii. 487-512.) It is not the only occasion on which Jerome's ardent partisanship and overfervid temperament led him to make accusations which it is difficult either to defend or to excuse. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* tom. v. p. 750, note 2, *Saint Pamphile.*) Montfaucon, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, pp. 78-82, printed from a codex (No. 25) a brief summary of the contents of the Acts of the Apostles, divided into thirty-nine sections, bearing the name of Pamphilus, which he does not hesitate to ascribe to the presbyter of Caesarea, though by others it is ascribed to Euthalius. Pamphilus was as far as possible from that selfishness which has sometimes been the opprobrium of scholars. What he knew and had acquired he regarded as the common property of those who desired to share it. Eusebius describes him as ever ready to help all who were in need, either in the matters of the body, the mind, or the soul. The copies of the Scriptures which he caused to be made by the body of students of which he was the centre, he distributed gratuitously, while he liberally supplied the temporal wants of those who were in distress (Euseb. *de Martyr. Palaest.* c. 11; Hieron. *adv. Rufin.* i. 9, tom. ii. p. 465).

For the history of the persecution in which Pamphilus suffered, and of the companions, eleven in number, whom he animated by his example and encouraged by his words to meet their death, another article may be consulted [EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, Vol. II. pp. 310, 311]. The persecution began A.D. 307, when Pamphilus was committed to prison by Urbanus, the governor of the city. He continued two years in close confinement, cheered by the companionship of his second self, Eusebius, of whom St. Jerome wrote, "tantam inter se habuere concordiam Eusebius et Pamphilus ut unus animae homines putes, et ab uno alter nomen acceperit" (Hieron. *ad Pammach. et Ocean. Ep.* 84). With the assistance of his friend he devoted this period to the composition of his *Defence of Origen*, of which mention has already been made. At the end of the two years, while his "Defence" was still incomplete, Pamphilus sealed his life-long confession of his Master with his blood. "The centre of a brave company, among whom he shone out as the sun among the stars." This happened A.D. 309, when Firmilianus had succeeded Urbanus as governor. The library collected by Pamphilus was destroyed when Caesarea was taken by the Arabs in the seventh century. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32, viii. 13, *de Mart. Palaest.* c. 11; Hieron. *de Script. Eccl.* c. 3, 75; Photius, *Cod.* 118; Metaphrastes apud Euseb. Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* tom. xx. col. 1497-1500; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. vi. pp. 418-427; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 150; Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* tom. x. p. 712; Routh, *Reliq. Sacr.* tom. iii. 417-512; iv. 339-392.)

[E. V.]

PAMPHILUS (2), bishop of Amida, the modern Diarbekir, succeeded Asterius in the early part of the fifth century. A fragment of a letter written by him to John of Antioch at the time of the council of Ephesus is quoted by Le Quien, asserting that Christ was passible, not in what He was before His Incarnation, but in what He then became: *οὐ τούτῳ παθόντα δὲ ἦν, ἀλλ' ὃ γέγονεν, τούτέστι τῇ σαρκί.* (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 991.) [E. V.]

PAMPHILUS (3), bishop of Abydos, in the latter half of the 5th century. A letter written by him to Peter the Fuller, vehemently denouncing his heretical tenets, was read in the council of Constantinople A.D. 483 (Labbe, iv. 1117). [E. V.]

PAN or **PANTA**. In one form of the Valentinian system Jesus is the perfect fruit of all the Aeons, each of whom contributes to him his own choicest excellency. Consequently, besides the names Soter, Christus and Logos, Jesus has the name Πάντα because ἀπὸ πάντων (Iren. I. ii. 6, II. xxi. 1). And Irenaeus reports that the Valentinian expositors found their doctrine on this subject in several texts of Scripture which with some looseness of quotation, they presented in the forms, πᾶν ἄρρεν διανοίγον μήτραν (Exod. xiii. 2), αὐτός ἐστι τὰ πάντα (Col. iii. 11), πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα (Rom. xi. 36), ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος (Col. ii. 9), ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Eph. i. 10). Irenaeus suggests that their doctrine was derived less from Scripture than from the Pandora of Hesiod. (II. xiv. 5, xxi. 2, xxx. 4; IV. ii. 2.) [G. S.]

PANCARIUS (1), deacon of Side, addressed by St. Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium. (St. Amphil. *Excerpt.* in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* vol. xxxix. col. 113.) [G. W. D.]

PANCARIUS (2), a Christian, who after some legal proceedings had come into possession of a property at Germanicia, or Germanicana, a place in the province of Byzacene, and diocese of Hippo, 22 miles S.E. of Aquae Regiae (Ant. *Itin.* lv. 3). Before his arrival the priest of the place, Secundinus, had been on good terms with his parishioners, but after this, as Pancarius informs him, they had found fault with him, and threatened to destroy not only his house, but also the church. Augustine wrote entreating him to state his case fairly, so that he might not seem to be going beyond his right, and that the people might suffer no damage, and above all, to prevent violent measures (Aug. *Ep.* 251). [H. W. P.]

PANCHARIUS, an officer to whom Theodoret wrote in 449, exhorting him to contend earnestly for the maintenance of the apostolical faith (Theod. *Ep.* 98). [E. V.]

PANCRATIANUS, bishop of Braga (Bracara) said to have presided over the council of Braga, 411, when ten bishops met to consult for the defence of the church against the inroads of the Goths, &c., but the acts are doubtful (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 1507; Hardouin, *Conc.* i. 1189.) [J. G.]

PANCRATIUS (1), (ST. PANCRAS), May 12 martyr at Rome on the Via Aurelia, A.D. 304. He was a Phrygian by birth, but was baptized at Rome by the pope himself. He suffered when only fourteen years of age with his uncle Dionysius. His martyrdom was very celebrated in the earlier ages. His church still gives a title to a cardinal, and the saint himself is even yet held in veneration at Rome. A well-known parish church in London is called after the English form of his name, St. Pancras. Gregory of Tours (*de Glor. Martt.* i. 39) tells us that his tomb was outside the walls of Rome, and that it was gifted with such powers that perjurers were at once seized by the devil if they swore falsely before it. Gregory the Great mentions the martyr in his epistles (iv. 18 and vi. 49), and in Homily (xxvii.) on S. John (Ceill. iii. 29; Tillmont, *Mém.* v. 260; *AA. SS. Boll.* Mai. ii. 17; Ruinart. *AA. Sinc.* p. 407; *Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuard.). [G. T. S.]

PANCRATIUS (2), a presbyter who accompanied Lucifer, bishop of Calaris, when the latter was sent by Liberius, bishop of Rome, with a letter to Constantius, asking him to summon a council [LUCIFERUS, i. p. 750 a; HILARIUS (31) p. 75 a]. He is mentioned in the letter of Liberius which was sent at the same time to Eusebius of Vercellae. Athanasius (*Ep. ad Solitar.*) mentions that Pancratius, for his loyalty to the orthodox faith at the council held at Milan, A.D. 354, was driven into exile. [J. L. D.]

PANCRATIUS (3), a friend of Gregory Nazianzen, who commended him to Nectarius, on his going to Constantinople (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 31). [E. V.]

PANCRATIUS (4), a vir illustris, to whom and to another named Viator pope Pelagius I., between 555 and 560, addressed a letter, urging upon them the duty of abstaining from the sacrifices of schismatics even more than from sacrilege. (Mansi, ix. 731.) [G. W. D.]

PANCRATIUS (5) deacon of the church of Vienne, had retired to a monastery. Gregory the Great at his request, when he went to Rome on a pilgrimage, wrote, in A.D. 601, to his bishop DESIDERIUS (9) forbidding him to recall Pancratius to the service of his church (*Epp.* xii. 35). [F. D.]

PANESNIU, sometimes called Macarius, an ascetic deacon and martyr in Egypt in the year A.D. 306. He was born in the same village as St. Paeis and his sister Thecla, which went by the name of Parva Civitas Apollinis. [PAESIS; THECLA.] (Cf. Aug. Ant. Georg. *Fragm. Evang. Johann.* p. xcix.) He suffered under the prefect Culcianus. His acts, which are genuine, contain many fragments of the Coptic version of the Scriptures, including the Lord's Prayer, with the doxology omitting the word kingdom, as in the version embodied in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, cap. viii. cf. Harnack's *Edit. Twelve Apostles*, cap. viii. cf. Harnack's *Edit. Twelve Apostles*, cap. viii. They have been printed with an elaborate commentary and an account of his miracles in Aug. Ant. Georg. *S. Couthi Miracula*, p. 163-

889. They are very important for the history of the Diocletian persecution. In the *Fragm. Evang. Johann.* by Georgius, p. 415, are learned notes on the version of the Lord's Prayer.

[G. T. S.]

PANODORUS, an Egyptian chronologer, who wrote at the beginning of the 5th century. He is almost exclusively known to us through the use made of his work by Georgius Syncellus [GEORGIUS (68)], who states (p. 617, 18, Bonn edition) that Panodorus was an Egyptian monk who flourished in the reign of Arcadius (A.D. 395-408), and in the episcopate of Theophilus, the 22nd bishop of Alexandria, who died A.D. 412. Syncellus usually names Panodorus in company with another Egyptian monk and chronologer, Anianus; and states (pp. 61, 3; 62, 2) that the two were contemporary. He describes (62, 18) the work of Anianus as the more concise, and as agreeing with the tradition of the apostles and holy fathers. It contained Easter tables in 11 cycles of 532 years each, and probably contained little more than historical notes accompanying these tables. It placed the Incarnation on the 25th March at the end of the year of the world 5500, the same day being set down for the date of the Creation and of the Resurrection. The work of Panodorus on the other hand was fuller and more various, and exhibited greater knowledge of profane writers. He counted the years before the Incarnation as 5493 years instead of 5500. Unger has given reasons for concluding that the date of the death of the bishop Theophilus, which Syncellus quotes anonymously (p. 59, 5), was really taken from the work of Anianus. This work therefore must have been later than 612; and therefore the work of Panodorus, written in the reign of Arcadius, must have been the earlier of the two. The sources whence Panodorus chiefly derived his profane history were the works of Africanus, of Eusebius, and of Dexippus. Panodorus frequently criticizes Eusebius with great severity. A list of the principal points on which he founds censure will be found in the work from which most information about Panodorus can be obtained, viz. Gelzer's *Sextus Julius Africanus und die Byzantinische Chronographie*. Panodorus shows great interest both in Egyptian and in Chaldee learning, which he endeavours to harmonize with the scriptures, reconciling the long Chaldee chronology with the shorter chronology of the Hebrews, by the hypothesis that the Chaldee years were only days. Gelzer imagines that Panodorus was one of the Neo-Platonists who, by the end of the 4th century, had made their peace with the church, and who strove to incorporate with Christianity some of the ancient learning, on which they set the highest value.

[G. S.]

PANOLBIUS, bishop of Hierapolis (Mabug) and metropolitan, succeeded Alexander the champion of Nestorius, on his deposition in 435. Athanasius bishop of Perrha, a suffragan see of Hierapolis, having been accused by his clergy of various offences before Domnus patriarch of Antioch, Panolbius was commissioned to inquire into the matter. Athanasius however, instead of meeting his accusers, resigned his

bishopric. Panolbius, who was very friendly to Athanasius, delayed the election of a successor, on which Athanasius resumed his see, and by the influence of Cyril of Alexandria and Proclus of Constantinople a synod was summoned at Antioch, A.D. 445, to examine into the matter, and Athanasius was deposed. Previous to this, Panolbius had been succeeded as metropolitan by John, and was probably dead. The whole matter came before the council of Chalcedon at its fourteenth session (Labbe, iv. 728 ff.; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 927). [ATHANASIUS OF PERRHA.] [E. V.]

PANSOPHIUS (1), the subject of an alleged miracle wrought by St. Ambrose. He was the infant child of Decens and Pansophia, Christians living at Florence; and Paulinus relates that he was raised to life by St. Ambrose. *Life of Ambrose*, §§ 28, 50. [AMBROSIUS, p. 97 a. note.] [J. LL. D.]

PANSOPHIUS (2), preceptor of the empress Eudoxia, ordained bishop of Nicomedia by Chrysostom in place of the adventurer Geron-tius. His appointment was received with hostility by the people of Nicomedia, who were much attached to their former bishop, and it was necessary to have recourse to force to secure his admission. (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 6.) [E. V.]

PANSOPHIUS (3), a bishop of Pisidia, see unnamed, who was deputed by Chrysostom to celebrate the Eucharist in his place, his spirit having been too much ruffled by the violent denunciations of Eusebius bishop of Valentinianopolis against Antonius bishop of Ephesus, to officiate himself (Pallad. p. 128). Pansophius was also one of the four bishops deputed to convey to pope Innocent in 404, the appeal of Chrysostom and that of the bishops of his communion (*ibid.* p. 10). [E. V.]

PANSOPHIUS (4), a count, carried a letter of Leo the Great to Flavian of Constantinople. (Leonis *Ep.* xxvi.) [C. G.]

PANTAENUS, chief of the Catechetical School of Alexandria, in the latter part of the second century, and perhaps the early years of the third. Of his previous life little is known with certainty. We are not informed whether he was originally a Christian or became one by conversion. Our authorities agree, however, that he was trained in the Greek philosophy, and owed to this training much of his eminence as a teacher. Origen, in a passage preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 19), names him as an example—the earliest, apparently, that he is able to adduce—of a Christian doctor who availed himself of his heathen learning. Eusebius tells us (*ib.* v. 10) that in his zeal for the faith he undertook the work of an evangelist in the East, and penetrated as far as India; where he found that St. Bartholomew had already preached the Word, and had left there a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew characters, which was still treasured by the Christians of that country. Jerome (*De Viris Ill.* xxxvi.) adds (but probably without authority) that Pantaenus brought back this copy with him to Alexandria. He also represents this mission as having been undertaken at the request of the people of India,

who had heard his fame as a teacher and sent a deputation to solicit his coming. This is by no means incredible, considering the celebrity of Alexandria as a seat of learning.^a But Jerome raises a difficulty when he names Demetrius as the bishop by whom he was sent. For Eusebius places the accession of Demetrius to the patriarchate in the tenth year of Commodus (*H. E.* v. 22; cp. *Chron.*), A.D. 189; while he represents Pantaenus as head of the Alexandrian School in the first year of that reign (*H. E.* v. 9, 10), and distinctly conveys that his appointment to that position took place after his return from his Indian mission.

There is a like conflict of authority concerning the relation in which Pantaenus stood towards Clement of Alexandria. Eusebius (v. 11) unhesitatingly assumes that Pantaenus is the unnamed master whom Clement in his *Stromateis* (i. p. 322, Potter), places above all the great men by whose teaching he has profited, "last met, but first in power," in whom he "found rest." Eusebius also tells us (vi. 13) that Clement in his *Hypotyposes* (now lost) "made mention of Pantaenus as teacher" (*διδασκάλου*), and inserted into that work "many of his interpretations (*ἐκδοχὰς*) and traditions." In the *Eclogae e Prophetiis* appended to the works of Clement, we find reference made to "our Pantaenus" (*ὁ Πανταίνος ἡμῶν*): but this expression does not necessarily convey that the writer (even if he were Clement, which is uncertain) spoke of Pantaenus as his *teacher*. It is clear, however, that Eusebius, with full access to the works of Clement, regarded him as the avowed disciple of Pantaenus. To this authority we may add that of his friend Pamphilus, who was principal author of their joint *Apology for Origen*; for Photius (*Biblioth.* cxviii.) states on the authority of that work (now lost) that Clement "was the hearer of Pantaenus and his successor in the School." This information Pamphilus no doubt had from his master Pierius, himself Head of the same school, a follower of Origen and probably less than fifty years his junior. To the same effect Maximus the Confessor (*Scholias in S. Greg. Naz.*)^b styles Pantaenus "the Master" (*καθηγητήν*) of Clement. Against these authorities we have to set Philip of Side (circ. A.D. 427) who in his *Historia Christiana*, as we learn from a fragment first published by Dodwell,^c made "Clement the disciple of Athenagoras, and Pantaenus of Clement."

If we must choose between these opposing accounts, we cannot hesitate to prefer that of Eusebius. Dodwell's attempts to discredit it are ineffectual;^d and we may well suppose that

^a Halloix (*Vitae PP. Or.* II. p. 852) appositely quotes Dion Chrysostom, who writes (circ. A.D. 100) of "Ethiopians, Arabians, Bactrians, Scythians, Persians and Indians, flocking to Alexandria." This passage also shows that the India where Pantaenus preached is probably to be taken to be India proper. So Jerome (*Ep.* lxxiv. *Ad Magnum*), "Pantaenus... missus est in Indiam, ut Christum apud Brachmanos praedicaret."

^b Gale's ed. p. 19 (quoted by Routh, *Rel. S. I.* p. 379); also Oehler ap. Migne, *Patrologia Gr.* t. xci. col. 1085.

^c *Diss. in Iren.*, Appx. p. 488. From a MS. in the Bodleian Library, Cod. Barocc. 142.

^d He argues that when Clement writes of Pantaenus as "teacher" in the *Hypotyposes*, it is in relation, not to the writer, but to the School which Pantaenus taught. But

Philip's statement is an instance of the "confusing of dates" for which Socrates blames him (*τοὺς χρόνους τῆς ἱστορίας συγχέει*, *H. E.* vii. 27).

This contradiction, however, and with it the difficulty concerning the dates of the life of Pantaenus above pointed out, may be in great measure solved or at least accounted for, if we suppose Pantaenus to have been head of the school both before and after his sojourn in India, and Clement to have filled his place in his absence. We know that Origen afterwards quitted and resumed the same office in this manner. Thus, when Eusebius in the place above cited (v. 10) introduces Pantaenus as presiding over the school at Alexandria, then proceeds to relate his Indian mission, and finally reverts to the description of him as head of the school, we are to understand him as expressing accurately (though awkwardly) the facts of the case. In the opening of the chapter he speaks of Pantaenus's first tenure of the office (dating in or before the year 180); at its close, of his second tenure of the same (beginning perhaps some fifteen years later): and there is room between for his mission by Demetrius in 189 or 190. And in this way Clement may be regarded as the predecessor as well as the successor of Pantaenus. Then, having been his deputy he may have continued in the school as his colleague. They were probably not far from being of an age. If Pantaenus was the senior, Clement was the more brilliant; and in the eyes of the Church of Alexandria at the close of the second century, it may well have seemed a question which was the master and which the disciple. This hypothesis agrees with the probable date of Clement's headship [CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA]; and likewise with the note in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, under year of Pertinax, or second of Severus (circ. 193), where we read that at that time Clement was in Alexandria, "a most excellent teacher (*διδάσκαλος*) and shining light (*διέλαμπε*) of Christian philosophy," and Pantaenus "was distinguished as an expositor of the Word of God" (*ἐν τῷ θείῳ λόγῳ διέπραττεν*, Syncell.). Thus also Alexander Bishop of Jerusalem (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14), in a letter to Origen, couples the names of Pantaenus and Clement (placing, however, Pantaenus first), as "fathers," and speaks of them both as recently deceased (*τοὺς μακαρίους ἐκείνους τοὺς προοδόντας*). This letter shows, further, that whatever question may be raised as to Clement, we may safely reckon not only this Alexander, but the illustrious Origen himself, among the scholars of Pantaenus.

We have no information as to the date of his death, but the passage above cited from the *Chronicon* confirms Jerome in prolonging his

even if this were so; it remains that Clement derived "traditions" from him, and therefore was his junior. He argues further that Origen's mention of Pantaenus (*Eus. H. E.* vi. 19) as *τὸν πρὸ ἡμῶν* conveys that he was Origen's immediate predecessor; and that the combination of his name with that of Heraclas, implies that they were contemporaries. But it rather seems that Origen is here citing Pantaenus as his earliest and Heraclas as his latest instance. The order of succession in the School seems to have been (according to Dodwell's fragment) Athenagoras, Pantaenus, Clement, Origen, Heraclas, Dionysius, Pierius.

activity into the reign of Severus (193-211). And it is in no way improbable that he may, as Jerome states, have lived on into the following reign—a statement repeated in the (later) Roman Martyrology. His commemoration is on the 7th of July.

From the facts above stated it follows that Photius is wrong in believing Pantaenus to have been a hearer not only "of those who had seen the apostles" (which he may well have been), but also "of some of the apostles themselves." A man who was living after the year 193, and who was not the senior of Clement by more than a generation, could not possibly have been born so early as to have been a hearer even of the last survivor of the twelve. Photius was probably misled by a too literal construction of what Clement (*Strom.*, ut supr.) says of his teachers,—that they "had received the true tradition of the blessed doctrine straight from the holy Apostles Peter, James, John and Paul."

His philosophic training, according to Eusebius (followed by Jerome) was in the Stoic school. Philip of Side, on the other hand, describes him as "an Athenian, a Pythagorean philosopher." There is no incompatibility between these statements; for, as Mosheim well suggests (*Dissert. ad H. E. pertt.* p. 94), a Christian divine could not implicitly follow any one heathen school, but must necessarily become such an Eclectic as Clement claims to be (*Strom.* I. vii. p. 338), adopting from each sect "such of its tenets as teach righteousness together with godly knowledge." Thus from the Stoic he would gather views of human duty; from the Pythagorean and Platonist, conceptions of God and things spiritual. Whether Philip means to convey that he was "Athenian" by birth or merely by education, does not appear. Assuming that Pantaenus is the "teacher" described in the *Stromateis* (p. 322), it may be inferred from the title of "Sicilian bee" there given to him, that Clement believed him to have come from Sicily. The notion that he was of Jewish origin (Halloix, *Vitas Socr. sacr.* ii. p. 840) is baseless, and arose from a misreading of the above passage of the *Stromateis*, through which the last of Clement's teachers was confounded with a former one whom he calls "the Hebrew by origin."^e

Of his literary works, Eusebius tells us that in them he "interpreted (ὀπομνηματίζόμενος) the treasures of the divine dogmas;" Jerome, that he left "many commentaries on the Scriptures." Both however give us to understand that the church owed more to his spoken utterances than to his writings. And to all appearance the two fragments which alone have reached us as from him (see Routh, *Reliquiae*, i. p. 378) are relics of his oral rather than of his written teaching. One bears the character of a verbal reply to a question proposed to him; it is preserved by Maximus the Confessor^f (*Scholium*

in *S. Greg. Naz.*, as above referred to), who, in illustration of the teaching of Dionysius the Areopagite concerning the Divine will, tells us that Pantaenus when asked by certain philosophers, "in what manner Christians suppose God to know things that are?" replied, "Neither by sense things sensible, nor by intellect things intelligible. For it is not possible that He who is above the things that are, should apprehend the things that are according to the things that are. But we say that He knows the things that are, as acts of His own will (ὡς ἴδια θελήματα); and we give good reason for so saying; for if by act of His will He hath made all things (which reason will not gainsay), and if it is ever both pious and right to say that God knows His own will, and He of His will hath made each thing that hath come to be; therefore God knows the things that are as acts of His own will, inasmuch as He of His will hath made the things that are." The other, contained in the *Eclogae* (as above) is introduced by "Our Pantaenus used to say" (ἔλεγε), and lays down as a principle in interpreting prophecy, that it "for the most part utters its sayings indefinitely [as to time], using the present sometimes for the future and sometimes for the past." This maxim is adduced by the writer in support of his interpretation of the words "In the sun He hath set His tabernacle" (Ps. cxviii. 4, LXX.) as meaning the Church taken into God; the passage being one of a continuous series of excerpts taken apparently from a Commentary on that Psalm. And it is noteworthy that Anastasius of Sinai [ANASTASIUS SINAITA (3)], in the 7th century, in his *Contemplations on the Hexaëmeron* (quoted by Routh, t. I. p. 15), twice cites Pantaenus as one of his authorities for a kindred interpretation, according to which Christ and his Church are foreshown in the history of the Creation of Paradise (I. p. 860; VII. cont. p. 893 in *Bibl. Max. PP.* tom. ix. ed. Lyons, 1677). But the true inference from these references seems to be, not that Pantaenus wrote commentaries on Genesis, or on the Psalms,^g but that he led the way in the method of spiritual or mystical interpretations of the Old Testament, which is usually associated with the names of his more famous followers, Clement and Origen.

In the former of the passages above referred to, Anastasius describes him as "Priest of the church of the Alexandrians (τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἑκείνης);" which is noteworthy, in the absence of all direct information concerning the time and place, or even the fact, of his ordination. That he was a priest may be inferred—not indeed from his headship of a school, as we learn from the case of Origen, but—from the fact that he was sent by his bishop to evangelize India.^h

^e We know from Photius (*Bibl.* cix.) that Clement in the *Hypotyposes* dealt largely "in the interpretation of Genesis, Exodus, and the Psalms."

^h The Greek of this passage is given by Halloix, p. 851. The complete work is extant in Latin only.

ⁱ Routh quotes from the *India Orientalis Christiana* of Paulinus a S. Bartholemaeo, a description of one of the groups engraved on the bronze doors of the Basilica di S. Paolo fuori le mure (built by the Emperor Theodosius, A.D. 383), representing St. Thomas the Apostle and Pantaenus; the latter holding in his hand the Gospel of St. Matthew. But the engraving of this group as given by Ciampini (*Vetera Monumenta*, t. I.

^e Ἀνάκαθεν. Halloix is wrong also in rendering this word "ex alta stirpe oriundus." Cf. for it Eus. *H. E.* i. 2, and *passim*.

Maximus however must have known of writings of Pantaenus; for in accounting for the fact that Eusebius makes no mention of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, he remarks that he is equally silent concerning those of Pantaenus (οὐδὲ μὲν Πανταίου τοῦ πόνου ἀνεγράφατο. *Prolog. in Opp. S. Dion. Ar.* p. xxxvi. ed. Plantin., 1634).

Besides the authors already quoted, see Nicephorus Callistus (14th century) IV. xxxii., who however adds little to the information given by earlier writers; Baronius, *Annales*, s. a. 183; Cave, *Primitive Fathers*, p. 185 (1677); *Hist. Litt.* t. I. p. 51 (1688); Du Pin, *Auteurs Ecclés.*, t. I. pt. i. p. 184; Lardner, *Credibility*, ch. xxi.; Le Quien, *Oriens Chr.* t. II. coll. 382, 391; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. III. p. 170. [J. Gw.]

PANTALEON (1), July 17, a physician and martyr at Nicomedia, in the Diocletian persecution. His relics were carried to Africa, and thence were translated with those of St. Cyprian to the Church of St. John Bap. in Lyons (*Ado. Mart.*). [G. T. S.]

PANTALEON (2), notary, mentioned in several letters of Gregory the Great. The first, in A.D. 593, directs him to inquire into the case of EVANGELUS (4). In A.D. 598 Gregory sent him to Sicily to recover communion plate which had been sold there by certain clerics from Italy. The next year Gregory charged the defensor, Sergius, to see that Pantaleon's mother-in-law's claims to the property of her uncle, who had died childless and intestate, were not prejudiced by the absence of her son-in-law on the business of the church. In A.D. 600 Gregory sent him to Genoa about the consecration of the new bishop of Milan. In A.D. 602 Gregory wrote to him about the church estates in Sicily under his management, and directed him to restore to the *coloni* on them any sums which had been unjustly exacted from them. (*Epp.* iii. 41; viii. 26; ix. 46; xi. 3; xii. 41; xiii. 34.) [F. D.]

PANTALEON (3), rebuked, in a letter addressed to him by pope Martin I., for sending untrue information of a disparaging character about Stephen, bishop of Dorus. (*Migne, Pat. Lat.* lxxxvii. 169.) [G. W. D.]

PANULVIUS, an Egyptian bishop, who assisted in the consecration of Timotheus Salophaciolus. (*Leonis Ep.* clxxxiii.) [C. G.]

PAPAS (PHAPAS), 8th catholicus of Seleucia on the Tigris, skilled in the Greek and Persian tongues. (*Le Quien, Or. Christ.* ii. 1105.) He is said to have been present at the council of Nice, A.D. 325, or more probably only represented by his suffragans Simeon and Sadost, and to have died A.D. 326 (*Greg. Barhebr. Chron. Eccl.* iii. 27 sq. in *Assem. Bibl. Or.* i. 186, ii. 397, iii. 346, 612). [J. G.]

PAPGEN, catholicus of Armenia A.D. 487-492. (*Saint-Martin, Mem. sur l'Arménie*, I. 437.) [G. T. S.]

PAPHNUTIUS (1), deacon of the church of Boou, a military station in Egypt, and martyr

(*iv. pl. 38, qu. 27*), to which Paulinus refers, by no means bears out this description; for the figure holding the volume (?) is evidently Thomas, and the other figures seem disciples. Ciampini himself takes it to represent the Apostle's martyrdom. Moreover, the doors bore an inscription dated 1070, stating that they were made for Alexander IV. (II.) in Constantinople. Their evidence therefore could not have weight. They were partly destroyed in the fire which ruined this venerable church in 1824.

under Culcianus the prefect in the persecution of Diocletian. He and a soldier named Silbon, welcomed the martyr Panesniu when he was cast into prison, as recorded in *Aug. Ant. Georgii de Miraculis S. Coluthi et S. Panesniu*, pp. 183, 322. [G. T. S.]

PAPHNUTIUS (2), Sep. 11, bishop in Upper Thebais, who suffered mutilation and banishment for the faith (*Socrates, H. E.* i. c. 11; *Theodoret, H. E.* i. c. 7). At the council of Nicaea A.D. 325, he was much honoured as a confessor, and specially by Constantine (*Socrates, ib.*). When at that council it was proposed to enforce the law of clerical celibacy [*D. C. A., CELIBACY*, p. 325] Paphnutius rose up and earnestly opposed it, on the ground of both principle and expediency, and prevailed (*Socrates, ib.*). He closely adhered to the cause of St. Athanasius, and attended him at the council of Tyre, A.D. 335. As to his appearance there Rufinus (*H. E.* i. c. 17), followed by Sozomen (*H. E.* ii. c. 25), tells a dramatic story of his going up to Maximus of Jerusalem, reproaching him for being in Arian company, and explaining to him the exact position of affairs [*MAXIMUS (13)*]. (*Fleury, H. E.* xv. c. 26; *Ceillier, Aut. Sacr.* iii. 420, 450; *Boll. Acta SS.* 11 Sept. iii. 778.) [J. G.]

PAPHNUTIUS (3), an anchorite of the Meletian schism, called by Epiphanius μέγας ἀνήρ, whose mother had been a confessor. After the death of Meletius, he and others of the party [*JOANNES (239)*, *CALLINICUS (4)*] being hard pressed by Alexander patriarch of Alexandria, sought permission from the emperor Constantine, but in vain, to continue their separate assemblies. (*Epiph. Haer.* lxxviii. 5, 6; *Tillem. vi.* 234.) [C. H.]

PAPHNUTIUS (4), (*Παφνούτιος Σάως*), bishop of Sais in Lower Egypt, present at the council of Alexandria in 362 (*Athanas. Tomus ad Antioch.* in *Pat. Gr.* xxvi. 795, 807; *Tillem. vi.* 588). [C. H.]

PAPHNUTIUS (5) (*ΠΑΦΝΟΥΤΙΟΣ ΠΥΝΟΥΠΗΙΟΥ*, surnamed BUBALUS, and CEPHALA), an anchorite and priest in the Scetic desert in Egypt. Cassian's words (*Coll.* iv. c. 1) regarding his promotion of abbat Daniel [*DANIEL (2)*] to the diaconate and priesthood have been held to prove that a presbyter had the power of ordaining, but Bingham (*Ant. Bk.* ii. 3, 7) will not admit that Cassian is to be understood in that sense. When Cassian visited him in A.D. 395, he was ninety years of age, but hale and active, never leaving his cell but on Saturday and Sunday for attendance at church five miles distant, and for carrying home his week's supply of water; his chief graces, often alluded to by Cassian, were patience and humility (*Coll.* iii. c. 1). He seems to have fled twice from the Scetic into Syria for greater solitude and perfection (*Cass. De Coen. Inst.* iv. cc. 30, 31), and with some others, A.D. 373, he had already found refuge at Diocæsarea in Palestine. [*MELANIA (1)*] *Tillem. vi.* 250-1, ed. 1732.) When the anthropomorphic controversy arose between Theophilus bishop of Alexandria and the monks

in the Egyptian desert, Paphnutius took the side of the bishop and orthodoxy (Cass. *Coll. x. c. 2*); his attempt to convert the aged Serapion and his failure, till Photinus came, is very curious (Cass. *Coll. x. c. 3*). To him there is attributed (*Vit. Patrum*, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 211 sq.) a *Life of St. Onuphrius*. Cassian also represents Paphnutius as giving instruction on the duty of self-abnegation to a new disciple whom he had admitted into his monastery (Cass., *De Coen. Inst.* iv. cc. 32 sq.), and again the whole of his third *Conference* at Scetis is on the same subject *De tribus abrenuntiationibus* (*Coll.* iii. cc. 1-22). He treats first of the several forms of God's call, and then of the spiritual, personal, and material renunciations, confirming his arguments by texts of Scripture, and meeting objections (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vi. 291, viii. 164, 176; Fleury, *H. E.* xx. c. 7, xxi. cc. 1 sq.).

[J. G.]

PAPHNUTIUS (6), an anchorite of the Thebaid in the 4th century, commemorated by Palladius and Rufinus, who describe especially the esteem in which he held men who were living an upright secular life. (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* 62-5; Ruf. *Hist. Mon.* 16; Sozom. iii. 14; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ix. 14.)

[W. H. F.]

PAPHNUTIUS (7), an Egyptian bishop who assisted in the consecration of Timotheus Salociaciolus. (Leonis *Ep.* clxxiii.)

[C. G.]

PAPIANILLA, wife of Sidonius Apollinaris, and daughter of the Emperor Avitus. She brought her husband as dowry a house and lands at Avitacum in the Auvergne, which with the country life of the time are charmingly described in one of Sidonius's letters (*Epist.* ii. 2; Roscia (v. 16). She bore him three or four children before they separated, as is said, on his becoming bishop of Clermont, in obedience to the canons. She seems to have been still living in the year 474 (Grégoire et Collombet, *Œuvres de Sidoine traduites*, *pref.* xx. xxvi; Ceillier, x. 379).

[S. A. B.]

PAPIAS (1), bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 36) in the first half of the second century. With regard to the name, Lightfoot says (*Coloss.* p. 48), "Papias, or (as it is very frequently written in inscriptions) Pappias, is a common Phrygian name. It is found several times at Hierapolis, not only in inscriptions (Boeckh, 3930, 3912 a, add.), but even on coins (Mionnet, iv. p. 301). This is explained by the fact, that it was an epithet of the Hierapolitan Zeus (Boeckh, 3912 a, Πάπια Διὸς ὁμώνυμῳ)." As applied to the god the name would express his fatherly character; as applied to a mortal it would be equivalent to the Greek Diogenes. There is, in fact, one inscription (Boeckh, 3817) in which we find a Papias also called Diogenes. The date of Papias used to be regarded as determined by a notice in the *Paschal Chronicle*, which records his martyrdom at Pergamus under the year 163. Accordingly, the later Greek writers give Papias the title of martyr (Photius, *Cod.* 232). Lightfoot, however, (*u. s.*) has convincingly shewn that this notice in the *Paschal Chronicle* is derived from a passage in Eusebius (iv. 15), where mention is made of

the martyrdom at Pergamus of one Papyllus, together with Carpus and Agathonice; and it appears from still extant Acts of these martyrs that it was considerably later (viz. in the Decian persecution) that they suffered. The identification, therefore, of Papyllus with Papias is found to be a mere blunder. We have therefore no ground for asserting that Papias lived so late as A.D. 163, and we shall presently see reason for at least placing his literary activity considerably earlier in the century.

What has given celebrity to the name of Papias is his authorship of a treatise in five books called "Expositions" of Oracles of the Lord" Δογματων Κυριακων ἐξηγήσεις, on which title we shall make further remark presently. The object of the book seems to have been to throw light on the Gospel history, and in particular to do so by the help of oral traditions which Papias had been able to collect from those who had come in contact with surviving members of the Apostolic circle. The fact that Papias lived at a time when it was still possible to meet such persons, has given such importance to his testimony, that though only some very few fragments of his work remain, they have given occasion to whole treatises; every word of these fragments being rigidly scrutinised, and, what is less reasonable in the case of a book of which so little is known, arguments being built on the silence of Papias about sundry matters which it is supposed he ought to have mentioned and assumed that he did not. It is necessary to give at length the first and most important of the fragments, a portion of the preface preserved by Eusebius (iii. 39); from which we can infer the object of the work and the resources which Papias claimed to have available. "And I will not scruple also to give for thee a place along with my interpretations to whatsoever at any time I well learned from the elders and well stored up in memory, guaranteeing its truth. For I did not, like the generality, take pleasure in those who have much to say, but in those who teach the truth; nor in those who relate their strange commandments, but in those who record such as were given from the Lord to the Faith and come from the Truth itself. And if ever any one came who had been a follower of the elders, I would enquire as to the discourses of the elders, what was said by Andrew, or what by Peter, or what by Philip, or what by Thomas or James, or what by John or Matthew or any other of the disciples of the Lord; and the things which Aristion and the elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say. For I did not think that I could get so much profit from the contents of books as from the utterances of a living and abiding voice."

From the use of the singular 'for thee' in the opening words, we infer that the work of Papias, like those of St. Luke, was inscribed to some individual. The first sentence of the extract had evidently followed one in which the writer had spoken of the "interpretations" which appear to have been the main subject of his treatise, and for joining his traditions with which he conceives it to be necessary to make an apology. Thus we see that Papias is not making

* The authorities leave it uncertain whether this first word in the title is singular or plural.

a first attempt to write the life of our Lord or a history of the apostles, but that he assumes the previous existence of a written record on which he comments, and which he tries to illustrate. Those whom Papias enumerates as the ultimate sources of his traditions are divided by him into two classes: Andrew, Peter, and others, of whom he speaks in the past tense; and Aristion and John the Elder, of whom he speaks in the present. As the passage is generally understood, Papias does not claim to have more than a second-hand knowledge of what any of these had related, but had made it his business to enquire from any one who had conferred with elders, what Andrew, Peter, &c., had said, and what John and Aristion were saying; the difference being that the two last were the only two surviving at the time of his enquiries. But considering that there is a change of pronouns, the *τι* of the first clause being replaced by *ἐ* in the second, we are disposed to think that there is an anacoluthon, and that Papias did not intend this *ἐ* to depend on the adjacent verb *ἀνέκρωον*. We believe his meaning, however ill expressed, to be that he learned, by enquiry from others, things that Andrew, Peter, and others had said, and also stored up in his memory things which Aristion and John said in his own hearing. Certain it is that Eusebius here understands Papias to claim to have been a hearer of this John and of Aristion, and intimates that he does so because several of the traditions given in the course of the work are stated to have been derived from one or other of these two authorities.

The question arises, in what sense does Papias use the word "elders" in this passage? It is quite an ordinary use of the word to apply it to the men of a former generation; and so it would be most natural to understand it here as used of the men of the first generation of Christians, if it were not that in the second clause the title seems to be refused to Aristion, who is nevertheless described as a disciple (by which we must understand a personal disciple) of our Lord. And as those mentioned in the first group are all apostles, there is room for doubt whether the word "elder," as Papias used it, did not include, besides antiquity, the idea of official dignity. On the question whether the John mentioned along with Aristion is different from John the apostle previously mentioned, see JOANNES PRESBYTER, Vol. III., p. 398.

The fragment quoted enables us to fix within certain limits the date of Papias. He is evidently separated by a whole generation from the apostolic age; he describes himself as living at a time when it was no exceptional occurrence to meet a person who had been a hearer of the apostles, and (if we understand him rightly) he had met two who professed to have actually seen our Lord Himself. Eusebius tells that Philip the apostle (some suppose that he ought to have said Philip the deacon) came to reside at Hierapolis with his daughters; and that Papias, on the authority of these daughters, tells a story of a miracle performed by Philip of raising a man from the dead. Eusebius certainly understood Papias to describe himself as contemporary with these daughters, and as having heard the story from themselves. If these were the same whom St. Luke describes as prophesying at Caesarea in

the year 58, and if we suppose them to have been young women then, they might have been still alive at Hierapolis between 100 and 110. This is quite as late as persons were likely to be met with in Asia who had been hearers of Peter and others who, according to all tradition, died before the destruction of Jerusalem; and even the year 100 is later than we should expect to find a person alive who could be called a personal disciple of our Lord. On the other hand, Papias speaks of his enquiries in the past tense; and therefore we may easily believe that a considerable time elapsed before he published in his treatise the results of these enquiries. On the whole, we think that we shall not be far wrong in dating the work of Papias about A.D. 130.

There is every appearance that Papias lived after the rise of Gnosticism, and was not unaffected by the controversies to which it gave occasion. Strong asceticism was a feature which characterised some of the earliest of the Gnostic sects; and their commandments, Touch not, taste not, handle not, may well have been "the strange commandments" to which Papias refers. And Lightfoot is probably right in thinking that the sarcasm in the phrase "those who have so very much to say" may have been aimed at the work on the gospel by Basilides in twenty-four books, and some similar productions of the Gnostic schools of which the later book "Pistis Sophia" remains as a sample.

Of the traditions recorded by Papias, what has given rise to most discussion and has been made the foundation of most theories is, what he relates concerning the gospels of Matthew and Mark, which he is the first to mention by name. We quote the passages at length. Concerning Mark he says, "This also the elder [John] said: Mark having become the interpreter of Peter wrote accurately everything that he remembered of the things that were either said or done by Christ; but however not in order. For he neither heard the Lord nor had been a follower of His; but afterwards, as I said, was a follower of Peter, who framed his teaching according to the needs [of his hearers], but not with the design of giving a connected account of the Lord's discourses [or oracles]. Thus Mark committed no error in thus writing down some things as he remembered them. For he took heed to one thing: not to omit any of the things he had heard, or to set down anything falsely therein." Concerning Matthew, all that remains of what Papias says is, "So then Matthew composed the oracles in Hebrew, and every one interpreted them as he could." Until quite recent times no doubt was entertained that Papias here speaks of what we now know as the Gospels of Matthew and Mark; and mainly on the authority of these passages was founded the general belief of the Fathers, that Matthew's gospel had been originally written in Hebrew, and that Mark's gospel is founded on the teaching of Peter. But some modern critics have contended that our present first two gospels do not answer the descriptions given by Papias of the works of which he speaks. There is a striking resemblance between these two as we have them at present; but Papias's description, it is said, would lead us to think of them as very different. Matthew's gospel, according to

Papias, was a Hebrew book, containing an account only of our Lord's discourses; for so Schleiermacher would have us translate τὰ λόγια, the word which we have rendered "oracles." Mark, on the other hand, wrote in Greek, and recorded what was done as well as what was said by Christ. Again, Mark's gospel, which in its present state has the same claims to orderly arrangement as Matthew's, was, according to Papias, not written in order. The conclusion then which has been drawn from these arguments is, that Papias's testimony does not relate to our present gospels of Matthew and Mark, but to certain unknown originals out of which these gospels sprang; and accordingly there are several who constantly speak of "the original Matthew" the "Ur-Marcus," though there is no particle of evidence beyond what may be extracted from this passage of Papias that there ever was any gospel by Matthew or Mark different from those we have got. Renan even undertakes to give an account of the process by which the two very distinct works known to Papias, Matthew's collection of discourses, and Mark's collection of anecdotes, came into their present mutually resembling forms. In the early times, every possessor of anything that purported to be a record of our Lord, desired to have the story complete; and would write into the margin of the little book which was his own property, anything he met elsewhere that touched his heart; and so the book of Mark's anecdotes was enriched by a number of traits from Matthew's "discourses" and vice versa.

If this theory were true, we should expect to find in early times a multitude of gospels differing in their order and in their selection of facts, according as different possessors of MSS. had differently inserted the discourses or events which touched their hearts. Why we should have now exactly four versions of the story is hard to explain on this hypothesis. We should expect that, by the process of mutual assimilation which has been described, all would in the end have reduced themselves to a single gospel. The solitary fact to which Renan appeals in support of his theory in reality refutes it; the fact, namely, that the pericope of the adulteress (John vii. 53—viii. 11) is absent from some MSS. and differently placed in others. Such a state of things is so unusual that critics have generally inferred that this pericope cannot be a genuine part of St. John's gospel; but if Renan's theory were true, the phenomena which present themselves in a small degree in the case of this story ought to shew themselves in a multitude of cases. There ought to be a multitude of parables and miracles with respect to which we should be uncertain whether they were common to all the evangelists or special to one; and what place in that one they ought to occupy. Further, according to the hypothesis stated, Mark's design was more comprehensive than Matthew's. Matthew only related our Lord's discourses; Mark, the "things said or done by Christ;" that is to say, both discourses and anecdotes. If this were so, Mark's gospel would differ from Matthew's by excess, and Matthew's gospel would read like an abridgement of St. Mark's. Exactly the opposite is the case.

To deal first with the last point, we count it

a mere blunder to translate λόγια discourses as if it were the same as λόγους. In the New Testament (Acts vii. 38, Rom. iii. 2, Heb. v. 12, 1 Pet. iv. 11) the word has its classical meaning "oracles," and is applied to the inspired utterances of God in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Nor is there any reason to think that when St. Paul for example says that to the Jews were committed the oracles of God, he confined this epithet to those parts of the Old Testament which contained Divine sayings and refused it to those narrative parts from which he so often drew lessons (Rom. iv. 3, 1 Cor. x. 1, xi. 8, Gal. iv. 21). So likewise Philo quotes as a λόγιον the narrative in Gen. iv. 15, 'The Lord set a mark upon Cain,' &c., and as another oracle the words (Deut. x.), 'The Lord God is his inheritance.' The word is used in the same way by the Apostolic Fathers. Thus in Clement (1 Cor. 53) τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ is used as equivalent to τὰς ἱερὰς γραφὰς. (See also c. 19, Polyc. ad Phil. 7.) Knowing as we do from Papias's younger contemporary Justin Martyr that the reading of the gospels had in his time become part of the Christian public worship, we may safely pronounce the silent substitution of one gospel for another to be a thing inconceivable; and we conclude that, as we learn from Justin that the gospels had been set on a level with the Old Testament in the public reading of the Church, so we know from Papias that the ordinary name τὰ λόγια for the Old Testament books had in Christian use been extended to the gospels which were called τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια, the "oracles of our Lord." There is no reason to imagine that the work of Papias himself was limited to an exposition of our Lord's discourses; we translate therefore its title Κυριακῶν λογίων ἐξηγήσεις Expositions of the Gospels.

The manner in which Papias speaks of St. Mark's gospel quite agrees with the inspired authority, which the title, as we understand it, implies. Three times in this short fragment he attests Mark's perfect accuracy. "Mark wrote down accurately everything that he remembered." "Mark committed no error." "He made it his rule not to omit anything he had heard or to set down any false statement therein." And yet for some reason Papias was dissatisfied with Mark's arrangement and thought it necessary to apologise for it. No account of the passage is satisfactory which does not explain why, if Papias revered Mark so much, he was dissatisfied with his order. Here the hypothesis breaks down at once, that Papias was only in possession of two documents unlike in kind, the one a collection of discourses, the other of anecdotes. Respecting Mark's accuracy as he did, Papias would certainly have accepted his order if he had not been in possession of some other document, to which, in this respect, he attached more value, going over the same ground as St. Mark's, but giving the facts in a different order. The question then remains to be answered, If Papias held that Mark's gospel was not written in the right order, what, in his opinion, was the right order? Strauss considers and rejects three answers to this question, as being all irreconcilable at least with the supposition that the gospel known to Papias as St. Mark's was that which we receive under the name: (1) that the right order was St.

John's; (2) that it was St. Matthew's; (3) that Papias meant to deny to Mark the merit, not only of the right order, but of any orderly arrangement whatever. The first of these three solutions is defended with great ability by Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.* Oct. 1875, p. 848). Besides these three there remains another, which we believe to be the true one, namely that what Papias regarded as the right order was St. Luke's. The reason why this solution has been generally set aside is that no mention of St. Luke's gospel is made in any of the fragments of Papias which have reached us, from which it has been assumed to be certain that he was unacquainted with Luke's writings. If we had the whole work of Papias and found he had said nothing about St. Luke it might be reasonable to build arguments on his silence; but we have no right to assume that he was silent merely because Eusebius found in Papias no statement about St. Luke which he thought worth including in the few brief extracts which he gives. Lightfoot has shewn (*Coloss.* p. 52) that it is not the habit of Eusebius without some special reason to copy references made by his predecessors to undisputed books of the Canon. Hilgenfeld finds in the preface of Papias echoes of the preface to St. Luke's gospel which induce him to believe that Papias knew that gospel. To us this argument does not carry conviction, but there is every appearance that Papias was acquainted with the Acts. In one fragment he mentions Justus Barsabas: in another he gives an account of the death of Judas Iscariot, which seems plainly intended to reconcile the story in St. Matthew's gospel with that told in the Acts. One of the extant fragments has every appearance of having been part of a comment on our Lord's words preserved by St. Luke, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." At all events, if in explaining the language used by Papias we have to choose between the hypothesis that he was unacquainted with Luke's gospel, and the hypothesis that the Matthew and Mark which he knew perished without leaving any trace of their existence, and were in the next generation silently replaced by another Matthew and Mark, the former hypothesis is plainly to be preferred if it will give an equally good account of the phenomena.

But if we assume that Papias recognised St. Luke's gospel, his language with respect to Mark's is at once accounted for. Luke's preface declares it to be the Evangelist's intention to write in order, *γραψάτω καθεξῆς*; but even a careless reader must perceive that his order is neither the same as Mark's nor as Matthew's. On this difference we conceive Papias undertook to throw light by his traditional anecdotes. And his account of the matter in the case of St. Mark's gospel is that Mark was but the interpreter of Peter, whose teaching he accurately reported: that Peter had not undertaken at any time to give an orderly account of our Lord's words and deeds, but had merely related some of them from time to time as the immediate needs of his hearers happened to suggest; that Mark therefore was guilty of no falsification in faithfully reporting what he had heard; and that if his order was not always accurate it was because it had been no part of the Evangelist's plan to aim at accuracy in this respect. With

regard to Matthew's gospel his solution seems to be that the church was not then in possession of the gospel as Matthew had written it; that the Greek Matthew was but an unauthorised translation from a Hebrew original which individuals had translated, each for himself as he could. Thus, in place of its being true that Papias did not use our present gospels, we believe the fact to be that he was the first to harmonise them, and to proclaim the principle, that no apparent disagreement between them can affect their substantial truth. Taking in connection the solicitude which Papias here displays to clear the gospels from all suspicion of error, and the recognition of inspired authority implied in the title *λόγια*, we find it impossible to admit the inference which has been drawn from the last sentence of the fragment, that Papias attached little value to the gospels as compared with the *viva voce* traditions which he was able to attest himself; and we willingly accept Lightfoot's explanation, that it was the Gnostic apocryphal writings which Papias found to be useless to him in his attempts to illustrate the gospel narrative accepted by the church.

It has been already stated that the extant fragments of Papias mention the gospels of Matthew and Mark by name, but not those of Luke or John. Eusebius tells us, however, that Papias uses testimonies from St. John's first epistle. There is therefore very strong presumption that Papias was acquainted with the gospel, a presumption, as we have already said, not in the least weakened by the fact that Eusebius did not think it worth while to mention that this, in his time, undisputed book, had been used by Papias. This presumption is strengthened by the fact, that the list of the apostles in the fragment of the preface already quoted, contains names in the order in which they occur in St. John's gospel, placing Andrew before Peter, and includes some, such as Thomas and Philip, who outside of that gospel have little prominence in the gospel record, and that it gives to our Lord the Johannine title, the Truth. Irenaeus (v. 36) has preserved a fragment containing an express recognition of St. John's gospel; and though Irenaeus only gives it as a saying of the elders, Lightfoot (*Contemp. Rev.* Oct. 1875) has given convincing reasons for thinking that Papias is his authority, a conclusion to which Harneck assents as highly probable. An argument prefixed to a Vatican (9th century) MS. of St. John's gospel quotes a saying of Papias about that gospel, and goes on to speak of Papias as having been John's amanuensis. On the latter statement, see Lightfoot, *u. s.*, p. 854; but the evidence seems good enough to induce us to believe, that the work of Papias contained some notices of St. John's gospel, which Eusebius has not thought it worth while to mention. It must be remembered that Papias belonged to Asia Minor, where the fourth gospel according to all tradition was written, and where its authority was earliest recognised; and is described by Irenaeus as a companion of Polycarp, of whose use of St. John's gospel we cannot doubt.

Eusebius does not mention that Papias used the Apocalypse; but we learn that he did from other trustworthy authorities, and it is certain that on the subject of Chiliasm, Papias held

views most distasteful to Eusebius. We learn from Irenaeus (v. 33) that Papias, in his fourth book, told, on the authority of "the Elder" [John], how our Lord had said that "the days will come when there shall be vines having 10,000 stems, and on each stem 10,000 branches, and on each branch 10,000 shoots, and on each shoot 10,000 clusters, and in each cluster 10,000 grapes, and each grape when pressed shall give 25 measures of wine. And when any of the saints shall take hold of a cluster, another shall cry out, I am a better cluster, take me, and bless the Lord through me." The story goes on to tell of similar predictions concerning the other productions of the earth; and relates how the traitor Judas expressed his unbelief and was rebuked by our Lord. It has recently come to light that the ultimate original of this story of Papias was a Jewish apocryphal book made known by Ceriani, *Monumenta sac. et profan.*, in 1866. See the Apocalypse of Baruch, c. 29, in Fritzsche, *Libri Apoc. Vet. Test.* p. 666. To this, and possibly to other stories of similar character, Eusebius no doubt refers when he says that Papias had related certain strange parables and teachings of the Saviour, and other things of a fabulous character. Amongst these Eusebius quotes the doctrine, that after the resurrection the kingdom of Christ would be exhibited for a thousand years in a sensible form on this earth. And he expresses his opinion, that things spoken mystically by the apostles had wrongly been understood literally by Papias, who "was a man of very poor understanding as his writings shew." The common text of Eusebius balances this unfavourable judgment on Papias by elsewhere (iii. 26) calling him a very learned man and deeply versed in the Holy Scriptures; but the weight of evidence is against the genuineness of the clause containing this encomium, which probably expresses the later current church opinion concerning one who was regarded as a venerable father.

Concerning the use by Papias of the Acts of the Apostles we have spoken already. Eusebius tells nothing as to his use of St. Paul's epistles, and though, as has been already remarked, the silence of Eusebius goes a very short way towards proving that Papias does not quote these epistles, yet it seems more likely than not that he found no occasion to mention them in a work on the gospel history. The later and longer residence of the apostle John in Asia Minor is likely to have obliterated the recollections of the Pauline visit; and in looking for traditions of our Lord's life, Papias would naturally enquire after the testimony of those who had seen Him in the flesh. The very gratuitous inference from the assumed fact that Papias does not quote St. Paul, that he must have been Ebionite and anti-Pauline, is negatived by the fact that, as Eusebius testifies, he used the epistle of Peter, a work the teaching of which, as all critics allow, is completely Pauline.

With regard to the silence of Eusebius as to the use by Papias of John's gospel and Paul's epistles, it may be added that if it affords any presumption, it is that Papias gave no indication that his opinion about the undisputed books differed from that which, in the time of Eusebius, was received as unquestioned truth. For Eusebius thought meanly of Papias, and if he had known him to

hold wrong opinions about the canon, would be likely to have mentioned it in disparagement of his authority in support of Chiliasm.

Eusebius relates that Papias tells a story of a woman accused before our Lord of many sins, a story also to be found in the gospel according to the Hebrews. There is a reasonable probability that the story here referred to may be that of the woman taken in adultery, now found in the common text of St. John's gospel. It must be remarked that Eusebius does not say that Papias took this story from the gospel according to the Hebrews. And the presumption is that Papias gave the story as known to him by oral tradition, and not as delivered from a written source. If this be so, it would follow that Papias had no direct knowledge of the gospel according to the Hebrews. We have incidentally mentioned that Papias has a story about Justus Barsabas having taken a cup of poison without injury. If Papias's copy of St. Mark contained the disputed verses at the end, this story might appropriately have been told in illustration of the verse, "If they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them," a promise instances of the fulfilment of which are very rare, whether in history or legend. A story of the kind is told of the apostle John, but is likely to have been later than Papias, else we should have been apt to hear of it here.

Georgius Hamartolus quotes Papias as saying, in his second book, that the apostle John had been killed by the Jews. That there is some blunder is clear; but Lightfoot has made it very probable from comparison with a passage in Origen, that a real saying of Papias is quoted, but with the omission of a line or two. Papias, in commenting on Matt. xx. 22, may very well have said, as does Origen, that John had been condemned by the Roman emperor to exile at Patmos, and that James had been killed by the Jews.

In the article JOANNES PRESBYTER (iii. 399) we have quoted several authorities (including Irenaeus) who speak of Papias as a disciple of John the Evangelist. He is called by Anastasius of Sinai *ὁ πᾶν* and *ὁ πολὺς*, and passed in the church as an authority of the highest rank. Jerome (*Ep. ad Lucinium*, 71 Vallars.) contradicts a report that he had translated the writings of Papias and Polycarp, declaring that he had neither leisure nor ability for such a task. He does not, in his writings, shew any signs that he knew more of the work of Papias than he could have learned from Eusebius. The latest trace of the existence of the work of Papias is that an inventory, A.D. 1218, of the possessions of the cathedral of Nismes (Menard. *Hist. civil. ecclés. et littér. de la ville de Nismes*) contains the entry "Item inveni in clastro—librum Papię librum de verbis Domini." No trace of this MS. has been recovered. The fragments of Papias have been assembled in various collections, by Grabe in his *Spic. legum*, by Galland, by Routh (*Rel. Sac.*), but at present they can best be read in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Apostolic Fathers*, p. xii. Dissertations on Papias are so numerous that we can only select a few for mention: important articles in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* by Schleiermacher, 1832, Zahn, 1867, Steitz, 1868; an essay by Weiffenbach, Giessen, 1876, a reply by Leimbach, Gotha, 1878, and a rejoinder by Weiffenbach,

Jahrbuch f. prot. Theol. 1877; Hilgenfeld in his *Journal*, 1875, 1877, 1879; Lightfoot, *Contemporary Review*, 1867, 1875.

Others of the name of Papias are—a martyr with Victorinus (Assemani, *Act. Mart. Or. et Occ.* ii. 60); a martyr with Onesimus at Rome, Feb. 16; a physician at Laodicea (Fabric. *Bib. Gr.* vii. 154); and it is necessary to add that there was a grammarian Papias in the 11th century, because a note of his on the Maries of the gospel had been published by Grabe among the fragments of Papias of Hierapolis, and had been accepted as such until Lightfoot established the true authorship. [G. S.]

PAPIAS (2), Jan. 31 (Bas. *Men.*), Feb. 25 (*Mart. Rom.*; Usuard.), a companion of the martyr Quadratus in the Decian persecution under the proconsul Tertius. The Latin martyrologies make him suffer in Egypt under the Duke Sabinus, in the persecution of Numerian. Sabinus was ruler in Egypt under Decius, and persecuted Dionysius Alexandrinus (Eus. vi. 40). [G. T. S.]

PAPIAS (3), Feb. 26, martyr in the Decian persecution at Attalia. He suffered with Deodorus, Claudianus, and Conon (Aubé in *Rev. Arch.* 1884, pt. i. p. 219; *AA. SS. Boll.* Feb. iii. 627; *D.C.A.*). [G. T. S.]

PAPINIANUS, Nov. 28, bishop of Vita and martyr in Africa by fire in the Vandal persecution, cent. v., with many other bishops. *Mart. Vet. Rom.* Adon.; *Vict. Vit. Hist.* [GENSERIC]. [G. T. S.]

PAPISCUS. [JASON (2)].

PAPPOLUS (1), 19th bishop of Chartres, between St. Chaletricus and St. Bertharius, towards the close of the 6th century. The 4th council of Paris was principally occupied with a plaint of his against Egidius, archbishop of Rheims, who had invaded his jurisdiction by consecrating Promotus as bishop of Châteaudun, in the diocese of Chartres, by order of king Sigebert. On Sept. 11, 573, the council decided in favour of Pappolus, ordered Egidius to withdraw his countenance from the usurper, against whom they threatened excommunication, and wrote to Sigebert begging him not to encourage the lawless proceeding (Mansi, ix. 865 seqq.; *Greg. Tur. Appx.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1168 seqq.; Ceillier, xi. 892). Promotus afterwards applied to Guntram to reinstate him, but on Pappolus resisting and exhibiting the sentence passed by the bishops, the king refused his aid (*Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc.* vii. 17).

In 585 his signature is found to the canons of the Council of Paris (Mansi, ix. 957).

In the miracles of St. Caranus, Pappolus is eulogized as the founder of a monastery at Chartres, while a little later in the same narrative he appears in an odious light as a persecutor (*Boll. Mai.* vi. 753). This production, however, is quite untrustworthy. [S. A. B.]

PAPPOLUS (2) (PAPOLUS), bishop of Metz, c. A.D. 614. He built a monastery in honour of St. Innocent (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 691; *Boll. A. SS.* Sept. vi. 185). [J. G.]

PAPPUS (1), a Syrian bishop of an unnamed see, one of the four bishops deputed in 404 to convey to pope Innocent the appeal of Chrysostom, and that of the 40 bishops of his communion (Pallad. p. 10). On the persecution against Chrysostom's adherents in 406, Pappus took refuge with Elpidius of Laodicea, and when Palladius wrote the two holy men were reported not to have descended the staircase of their house for three years, spending their time in prayer (*ibid.*). [E. V.]

PAPPUS (2), bishop of Cythra, or Cythros, in Cyprus, only known to us from the religious romance, which passes as the life of St. Epiphanius, ascribed to Polybius, bishop of Rhinocurara. We there find it stated that Pappus and his brother bishop, Gelasius of Salamis, had been confessors in a former persecution, and that he was revered as a father by the other bishops of the island, on this account and also from his great age, having held his see of Cythra—"a miserable city," *πόλις οὐκ ἐρπύδα*—fifty-eight years. The writer goes on to say that it was miraculously revealed to Pappus that Epiphanius was to be bishop of Salamis, and that he had to ordain him by force. This part of the story may be safely rejected; how much of it is true is doubtful. (*Vit. S. Epiphani.* cc. 34, 35, pp. 347-9; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.*; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* x. 497, notes.) [E. V.]

PAPULA (PAPPULA, PAPPOLA), left her father's house, and betook herself to a monastery, where for thirty years she lived as a monk, about A.D. 500 (Gregorius Tur. *De Glor. Conf.* c. xvi). [J. G.]

PAPYLUS (PAPIRIUS or POPYRIUS, as Rufinus, and Ado after him, write), April 13. Under CARPUS (2) will be found the Acts of this martyr so far as they were known till the year 1881, when Aubé brought some new facts to light as the result of his explorations among the Greek MSS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*. Papyrus is mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 15) at the end of his account of Polycarp's martyrdom. Ruinart (p. 27) in his preface to the Acts of Polycarp, says that according to Eusebius Papyrus and his companions Carpus and Agathonice suffered about the same time as Polycarp. This is a mistake made by the Bollandist Henschenius, arising out of the Latin version of Eusebius, which inserts the words "sub id tempus," which have no equivalent in the Greek original. Eusebius does not say that Carpus and Papyrus suffered at the same time as Polycarp, but that Pionius and Metrodorus did, and that their martyrdoms were recorded in the copy of Polycarp's Acts which he consulted. [PIONIUS.] Of Papyrus his notice is simply thus: "There are also records extant of others that suffered martyrdom in Pergamus, a city of Asia, Carpus and Papyrus, and a woman Agathonice, who were gloriously perfected after numerous and illustrious testimonies." However, though Eusebius does not expressly affirm that they suffered with Polycarp, he seems by introducing them at the conclusion of his narrative about Polycarp, to imply that they suffered about that period, while Ado, who seems to have had the lost work of Eusebius on the martyrs before him, says that

They suffered at the time when Justin Martyr was slain. (Adon. *Mart.* April 13; LYONNESE MART.; and Le Blant, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 5.) The Acts of Papyrus contained in Metaphrastes assign his martyrdom to the Decian persecution. These Acts are, however, in Aubé's view, utterly worthless. In the *Revue Archéologique*, Dec. 1881, p. 350, he published a Greek manuscript containing Acts which he thinks may be those seen by Eusebius. He first points out the numerous historical mistakes in the existing Acts, and then the evident marks of truth borne by the newly found document. The express mention of the Acts by Eusebius suggested to Aubé the idea of searching the Greek manuscripts at Paris for a purer text than that of Metaphrastes. He found ten MSS. containing the corrupt and legendary text, and one giving a shorter and more rational one. It came into the library in 1669 from the East, and is numbered MSS. vol. 1468, fol. 134. This MS. gives no names of emperor, proconsul, or pope, under whom Papyrus suffered. It says nothing of Papyrus being a deacon or Carpus a bishop. It is devoid of the legendary miracles which figure in Metaphrastes. It represents Papyrus simply as a citizen of Thyatira. Aubé notes several other points in which these Acts seem to him more authentic than those of Metaphrastes, and gives a Latin translation of the Greek text which he discovered. Aubé seems to concur in the verdict which places the martyrdom of Papyrus in the Decian persecution. But Lightfoot points out (*Ignatius*, i. 625) that in the Acts mention is made of emperors in the plural number, thence he infers that this rather points to the reign of M. Aurelius or of Severus. If the martyrdom were as early as M. Aurelius, the possibility suggests itself of an identification of Papyrus with the PAPIRIUS mentioned by Polycrates, who however is not called by him a martyr. Lightfoot also notes the answer of Papyrus to the question, 'Hast thou children?' 'Yes, many, by God's grace;' as making it probable that Papyrus was a bishop. According to Euseb. iv. 15, Papyrus suffered at Pergamus, though a citizen of Thyatira. He may have been forwarded to the regular proconsular court from Thyatira. Le Blant (*l. c.* p. 50) has an interesting passage on the assizes held by the proconsuls at various important centres. [G. T. S.]

PARACODES, ST., 7th bishop of Vienne, between St. Dionysius and St. Florentius I., about the commencement of the 3rd century, is said to have been, like his predecessor, a Greek. According to Ado he lived on till the times of the emperor Maximin, i. e. 235 (*Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxiii. 85), but if the Chronicle of the Viennese bishops (see *Gall. Christ.* xvi. 9) is to be trusted, he suffered martyrdom in the reign of Severus (A. D. 193-211). There is a letter purporting to be addressed to him by Pope Victor on the subject of the Paschal feast (*Boll. Acta SS.* Jan. I. 20), but it is undoubtedly spurious. His day of commemoration is Jan. 1, and in the Appendix to Ado's Martyrology are the words "Eodem die sanctissimi Paragodae septimi Viennense episcopi" (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 419). [S. A. B.]

PARACONDACES, an abbat, Paulician persecutor and inquisitor in Asia Minor and

Armenia, by imperial commission in the reign of Leo the Armenian. The cruel severity with which the sect was treated led to the usual reprisals in such cases. He was assassinated by some of the Astatici, Sergiote fanatics, at Cynschora in Armenia. (*Pet. Sic. Hist. Man.* i. 41; *Phot. c. Man.* i. 24; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 353.) [M. B. C.]

PARALIUS, bishop of Andrappa (Claudiopolis) A. D. 431-451 (*Le Quien, Or. Chr.* i. 539), subscribes Nestorius's condemnation at the council of Ephesus A. D. 431 (*Labbe, Conc.* iv. 1364). [J. G.]

PARCENTIUS, a Manichean leader discovered at Merida, in Spain, by Antoninus its bishop, in the Manichean persecution of A. D. 447, inaugurated at Rome by pope Leo, A. D. 444, (*Idat. Chron.* p. 26; *Ceill.* x. 667.) [G. T. S.]

PARCHOR. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 6) states that Isidore, the son of Basilides, wrote a book called *Expositions of the Prophet Parchor*. On this name see BARCABBAS. [G. S.]

PARDUS, bishop of Arpi, in Apulia, present at the Council of Arles A. D. 314. (*Routh, Rel. Sacr.* iv. 94.) [H. W. P.]

PAREDRI, a name by which those who professed the art of magic designated the familiar spirits through whose aid they claimed to do their wonders. The name seems to have been introduced into Christian literature by Justin Martyr (*οἱ λεγόμενοι παρὰ τοῖς μάγοις ὄνειροπομοὶ καὶ πάρεδροι*, *Apol.* i. 18). From this passage, apparently, are derived the *πάρεδροι καὶ ὄνειροπομοὶ* of Irenaeus (*l. xxiii.* 4, *xxv.* 3) and of Euseb. (*H. E.* iv. 7), and also the *paredri* of Tertullian (*De Anim.* 28). And Tertullian, probably, had the same two words in his mind (*Apol.* 23): "Si et somnia immittunt, habentes simul invitorum angelorum et daemonum adistentem sibi potestatem." The explanation of *πάρεδρος*, as an assisting power, is adopted by Rufinus, *Hist.* ii. 13: "Utens adminiculo adistentis sibi et adherentis daemoniacae virtutis, quam *πάρεδρον* vocant. But in non-ecclesiastical writers, *πάρεδρος* is interpreted *σύνθροπος* or assessor, and *θεοὶ πάρεδροι* are new gods admitted to share the dignity of the old ones. [G. S.]

PAREGORIUS (1), Feb. 18, mart. with Leo about the time of the emperors Gallienus and Valerian, A. D. 260. He suffered at Patara, a city of Lycia, under Lollianus, governor of the province, for refusal to worship Serapis. Spartianus often mentions Avitus Lollianus as one of the thirty tyrants who lived at that time. Trebellius Pollio also mentions him in his account of them. (*Ruinart, AA. Sinc.* 535.) [G. T. S.]

PAREGORIUS (2), an aged presbyter of Basil's diocese, who had a woman living with him as housekeeper. Basil on being informed by the chorepiscopus of the district, of this violation of the Nicene canons commanded Paregorius at once to make her leave his house, and interdicted him from all ecclesiastical functions until he obeyed. Paregorius in vain pleaded his ad-

vanced age, the innocence of the connection, and his need of the woman's services, and charged Basil with being too ready to listen to ill-natured stories. Basil reiterated his mandate; ordered that the female should be sent to a nunnery, and threatened that if Paregorius presumed to exercise his sacerdotal office he would be anathema, and all who availed themselves of his ministry would be excommunicated (Basil, *Ep.* 55 [198]). [E. V.]

PARERMENEUTAE, heretics who perverted Scripture in a contentious spirit, putting aside the plainest and most unobjectionable interpretations (Joan. Damasc. *Haer.* 97). [C. H.]

PARMENIANUS, successor to Donatus the Great, who followed Majorinus as Donatist bishop of Carthage. Optatus calls him "peregrinus," i.e. probably not a native of Africa. Having adopted Donatist opinions, he succeeded Donatus about 350, and having been banished A.D. 358, he returned under the decree of Julian A.D. 362 (Aug. *Retract.* ii. 17; Euseb. *Chron.* ap. Hieron. *Opp.* vol. iii. p. 687). About this time, if not earlier, he published a work, not now extant, in five parts, in defence of Donatism, to which the treatise of Optatus is a reply. [Optatus, DONATISM, Vol. I. p. 885.] About 372 Tichonius, a Donatist, but well versed in Scripture, becoming sensible of the narrow and exclusive views of the sect, wrote a book to condemn them, but without abandoning his party. To this Parmenian replied, condemning the doctrine of Tichonius, as tending to connect the true church, that of the Donatists, with the corrupt one, the Catholic, especially its African branch. A council of 270 Donatist bishops was convened at Carthage, which sat for seventy-five days, and at last resolved that "traitors," if they refused to be re-baptized, should nevertheless be admitted to communion (Aug. *Ep.* 93, 43).

The time of this council is not known. Parmenian died, and was succeeded by Primian about 392; but his book against Tichonius fell into the hands of St. Augustine, who, at the request of his friends, discussed it in a treatise divided into three books, about 402-405 (Tillemont, xiii. 128, and note 32).

I. In the first book he considers chiefly the ecclesiastical side of the question, including also its civil aspect, i.e. that of church and state. In Parmenian's view, Gallic, Italian and Spanish Christians, in a word, all church members who were not Donatists, were no better than the African traitors; but of this he brought no Scripture proofs, only assertions of some of his own sect. Are such witnesses as these to be preferred to the Scriptural testimony as to the universality of the church, brought forward by Tichonius, or did the seed of Abraham die out before it reached distant parts? Parmenian thought the world was polluted by traitors, because no separation took place in Africa, but this was impracticable, unless in Africa the traitors had outnumbered the honest men. Let those who wish to know the facts read the treatise of Optatus, especially what he says about Lucilla, the mock condemnation of Caecilianus, and the ordination of Majorinus, performed in order to frustrate God's grace and condemn

people who had never even heard of Caecilianus. Augustine then cites the case of Hosius, condemned (for signing the creed of Sirmium) by Spanish, but upheld by Gallic bishops (Hosius, vol. iii. p. 172). How can this be explained, unless we suppose that the former condemned him in error, and afterwards yielded to their colleagues in order to avoid such a schism as that which the Donatists have created? In blaming these Spanish bishops for changing their minds, the Donatists show their own inconsistency, for the Maximianists, of whom one hundred bishops condemned Primian (at Cabarsusis), refused afterwards to yield to three hundred and ten of their own party, who acquitted him at Bagaia. Parmenian, if he were now alive, could not condemn the Spanish bishops, for he would thus offend those of his own party who returned to Primian after the judgment of the three hundred and ten, and acquit Praetextatus and Felicianus, who did so, and were received by their own party unconditionally. If his views were carried out, he would have created a new sect of Parmenianists, and divided still further the already divided body in Africa. Further, in accusing Hosius of helping Caecilianus at the trial in order to "drive many saints into Catholic communion," he virtually admitted that his own party appealed to Constantine, but after the adverse decision they accused the president (Melchides) of "tradition;" and virtually the various Catholic nations who knew nothing of the whole matter, and preferred to communicate with Christians whom the Donatists called traitors, but whom, after that decision, Augustine preferred to consider innocent. They also accused the emperor of partiality, but how much less to be blamed are they who refuse to believe these rash accusations! Parmenian complained that, at the suggestion of Hosius, Constantine ordered the Donatists to be punished; but the truth was that Hosius recommended a punishment milder than the one previously proposed. If Donatists are martyrs, then all law-breakers are so; but has the emperor no concern with religion? If he put Catholic Christians to death for disobedience to the law, would they be martyrs, or were the people martyrs to whom the idol temples belonged which he ordered to be destroyed, and whose worship he forbade under pain of death? It was not without reason that, in pronouncing a blessing on the persecuted, our Lord added the words "for righteousness' sake." Are the outrages of the Circumcellions, or ought rebels and poisoners to be disregarded? Donatists themselves persecuted Maximianists, nor can the cruelties practised by Firmus on the Rogatists be forgotten. Donatists affect to disbelieve the charges against the Circumcellions, but refuse to accept the judgment of the whole world, when it disclaims knowledge of African matters. The council of Bagaia condemned the Maximianists, and when they refused to give up their churches, the Donatists appealed to the law, which compelled them to do so, and punished some who were obstinate. Their only supporter was Julian, but other emperors enacted laws against conventicles, and imposed heavy fines on those who ordained in them, with confiscation of the buildings, and incapacity either to make or to receive bequests

for their benefit, of which Augustine mentions a case in point (c. *Parm.* i. 12. 9.) Yet Christians do not object to their retaining their churches, for the separation of wheat from chaff ought not to take place until the final judgment.

II. In the second book Augustine discusses at length the Scriptural argument, which may be divided into three parts. Donatists argue:—

(a) That no benefit can be conferred on others by unholy teachers; their sacrifice is unholy and unacceptable to God.

(b) That a man cannot impart what he has not received; if the giver be unholy he can impart no benefit.

(c) That corruption of a portion infects the whole mass, for which there is no remedy but separation.

In reply, Augustine argues that in their zeal for purity Donatists forget what Scripture says about the unity of the Church, e.g. Ps. cxxxii., cxxxiii. 1; Eccles. ii. 16 (14). Such a passage as Is. lxvi. 3 tells against those who set up altars of their own. Sacrifices offered by bad men (Prov. xxi. 27) injure not those who partake in, but those who offer them, and the One sacrifice is profitable or not according to the condition of heart of those who receive it (1 Cor. xi. 29). Let Donatists judge whether they eat and drink worthily who separate themselves from many heirs of the kingdom of heaven. The purity of priests under the law (Ex. xix. 22; xxx. 20; Lev. xxii. 21) typified the perfect purity of the great High Priest. Christian people pray for each other, but not as mediators, and the One Mediator prays for all. Sacraments are not invalid by reason of the unworthiness of ministers, but they injure those who receive them unworthily, as our Lord implied Matt. xxiii. 3; and in this sense must Jer. ii. 13 be understood, not as if baptism were void, but that they who received have abused it, and made themselves "broken cisterns." Donatists quoted Eccles. xxxiv. 25 (30) to shew that a "dead" minister cannot confer true baptism, to which argument Augustine replies by saying that "dead" means heathen, and defers his judgment on the question of baptism administered by one who is not a Christian. But we may remark that in this case both the Donatists and St. Augustine argued on the meaning of the Vulgate reading of the passage—*qui baptizatur à mortuo, et iterum tangit, quid proficit lavatio illius?* whereas in the Greek version, which is nearest to the lost original, the passage stands *ὁ βαπτίζομενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ κ.τ.λ.* i.e. "he who washes himself after touching a dead body," &c. (Lev. xxii. 4, 6; Numb. v. 2). Donatists maintained that baptism was valid only when the minister was holy, but that if he were not so, God himself or an angel supplied the deficiency. If so, argues Augustine, it were better always to be baptized by a bad man, for then what is wanting would always be made up. It is Christ alone who baptizes with the Holy Ghost, and He alone gave his commission to the apostles (Matt. x. 20; John xx. 21–23). In the case of ministrations by unholy men, the Holy Ghost will desert not the receiver of the sacrament but the minister (1 Cor. ix. 17; Phil. i. 15, 18). As to God hearing sinners (John ix. 31; Psa. xlix. (l.) 16, 20) we know that He does sometimes hear them, as appears in the cases of Balaam and Caiaphas, as also of Daniel and the

publican, confessing themselves to be sinners. And would it not be well for the Donatists to apply to themselves this term, for what malefactors could be worse than Optatus of Thamugada and the Circumcellions? It was said in the council of Bagaia that the Maximianists were like the Egyptian corpses of Ex. xiv. 31. If so, Felicianus must be one of such corpses, for he, being "dead," baptized. Again, what do men mean when, in the Lord's prayer, they ask that their sins may be forgiven, a petition which refers not to baptism but to sins committed after baptism? If Donatists think that they have no sins, their prayer must be hypocritical; if they are not free from sin, how can they baptize?

But, say the Donatists, how can a man give what he has not received? 1 Cor. iv. 7. Can a man be said to receive properly from them: if he can, does he lose this by leaving them? If he does and he returns to them, he ought to be re-baptized, but if he need not be re-baptized, he cannot be said to have lost anything. And how can any one be deprived of the benefit of God's promise to Abraham by the fault of any "trahitor"? Some perceive this difficulty, and say that they who depart from the Donatist church lose not their own baptism, but only the right of conferring it. But both baptism and ordination are sacraments which cannot properly be repeated: even men who return to the church from a schismatical body are not re-ordained, or if this be done in ignorance, the fault may easily be pardoned. 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

If even a layman administers baptism in case of extreme necessity, his act, though irregular, must not be judged invalid. The case of baptism by one who is not a Christian was mentioned before, but as to baptism by Separatists there can be no doubt of its validity, though they are to blame for administering it; and how came it to pass that after his condemnation by 310 bishops, Felicianus lost nothing? After all, Tichonius described well the rule of Donatists in this matter, *quod volumus sanctum est*. Even Judas went forth to teach, and our Lord desired people to listen to the teaching of the Scribes and Pharisees. In quoting 1 Cor. iv. 7, the Donatists, to be consistent, ought to add the words "from a righteous man," by which means Parmenian would have proclaimed himself to be righteous; but there must be many bad men among the party, and from whom does even a righteous man receive ultimately except from one who is not man? If none but righteous men can confer baptism, how could any receive it from such men as Optatus (of Thamugada) or Felicianus, while he was cast out! Parmenian extended the exclusion even to holders of speculative opinions, but what would he say of them if they changed their minds? Our Lord, he says, went for baptism, not to the Pharisees but to the Baptist; yet, says Augustine, he frequented the Temple, which he once called "a den of thieves"; and from whom did such men as John and Cornelius receive their holiness?

As to infection of the whole body by the fault of some members (Eccles. i. 15, x. 1; 1 Cor. v. 6; 2 Cor. vi. 14–18; Eph. v. 11, 12; 1 Tim. v. 22), Augustine is never weary of reminding his opponents of the crimes of Optatus, and that to live among bad people does not imply participation in their sins, for if it did so, how could they be

pure who returned to Primian? The true separation will take place at the last day.

III. In the 3rd book Augustine pursues farther the point urged by Parmenian, of the duty of separation founded on such a passage as 1 Cor. v. 12, 13, which Augustine said ought not to be strained too far, and in quoting which Parmenian left out v. 12. Relying on the Vulgate, Augustine, who was only moderately acquainted with Greek, endeavours to shew that its ambiguous *malum* may be understood of subjective evil, not only of an objective offender. But this notion he was led afterwards by a better understanding of the Greek original, *τὸν πορνῆδον*, to abandon. *Retract.* ii. 17. Awaiting the final separation, Christians ought to endeavour to correct and reconcile offenders, as St. Paul himself recommended (2 Cor. ii. 6-11). Donatists were fond of quoting Ps. cxl. (cxli) 5, but it was not in any meek spirit that they persecuted Caecilian and supported Gildo. When St. Paul blamed the Corinthians for boasting, he added presently after "a little leaven," &c., and in this seems to condemn the infectious example of those who by exulting over the faults of others sought to clear themselves (1 Cor. v. 6, 7). But are there no bad men among the Donatists? If there are why do they communicate with them, and how will they defend Optatus (of Thamugada); or do they think their church is purer than the church of Africa in the time of Cyprian, who denounced strongly its covetous members, yet continued to communicate with them? *Cypr. de Laps.* c. 6. The same principle is shewn in the conduct of the man mentioned by Ezekiel (Ezek. ix. 4). Separation ought to take place only in extreme cases, after every opening for repentance and restoration has been made, and even then to be rather personal than official, in the spirit of our Lord's declaration (Matth. v. 9). Parmenian quotes Jer. xxiii. 28 against Tichonius, but were he himself, Donatus, and Majorinus, handles of the fan for winnowing the world; if so, where were the Circumcisions? and even this winnowed mass was sifted again by Primian, in order to separate the Maximianists. But the winnowing ought not to take place before the last day, and why did our Lord compare the church to a net? Such passages as Ps. xxv. 26, iv. 10, and Is. lii. 11, ought to be explained of personal participation: if Jeremiah desired a separation in this life, of chaff from wheat, Jer. xxiii. 28, how came St. Paul to hold a different doctrine, for were not those impure of whom he speaks in Phil. i. 15, 17? They ought to beware of pride (Phil. iii. 20; Col. iii. 1-3). The true safeguard of unity is the church set on a hill. But Donatists think penalties suffered by their zealot partisans are martyrdoms, and Parmenian exhorts Tichonius to remain with them and suffer persecution. But such language is used by all schismatics who are punished by the civil power. Even Salvius of Membresia probably would have said so; but if they speak lightly of what he suffered from men of his own party, what would they say if one of them had suffered punishment by the law? Let them ask what was done, and then judge of the punishment.

In this treatise St. Augustine had of course a great advantage in dealing with a defunct opponent, but his arguments are applicable to the living Donatist party as well as to their advocate

now deceased. His arguments derived from the conduct of the Donatists themselves are irrefragable and urged with an unsparing pressure; but those which are derived from scripture are, as we have seen, sometimes founded on erroneous readings of the text, and are often strained and fanciful, but not more so than was the practice of the day, and of which abundant instances may be found both in the writings of other writers as well as in his own. We ought not to pass by without notice the moderation of Augustine in respect of excommunication. A full account of the treatise, with a list of scripture quotations, will be found in Ribbek, *Donatus and Augustinus*, pp. 348-366. (See also vol. i, pp. 889, 890. *Aug. Retract.* ii. 17.) [H. W. P.]

PARRE, ST. [PATROCLUS (2).]

PARTENIUS, a Catholic bishop, maligned by the Donatists. (*Opt.* 2, 25.) [H. W. P.]

PARTHENIUS (1), bishop of Lampsacus on the Hellespont. His Life written by Crispin, one of his presbyters [CRISPINUS (1)] is given by the Bollandists (*AA. SS. Feb. ii.* 38-42). His first work was to purge the city from idolatrous worship, and build churches, for which he is said to have visited the Emperor Constantine and procured his hearty aid. He died about A.D. 360; his feast is Feb. 7. (Le Quien, *Or. Chr. i.*; Tillemont, *H. E. vi.* 166-7; Baron. *A.E.* ann. 337, xxxviii.) [J. G.]

PARTHENIUS (2), a priest, commissioned by Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, to inform St. Augustine about some land presented by him for his monastic establishment at Hippo. (*Aug. Ep.* 22.) [H. W. P.]

PARTHENIUS (3), abbat in Constantinople and correspondent of Alexander of Hierapolis during the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. He was a Nestorian [ALEXANDER, Vol. I. p. 84.] [G. T. S.]

PARTHENIUS (4), master of the offices and patrician, as he is called in the laudatory epistle of ARATOR, whom he led into the ways of reading, and of writing verse. He lived in Ravenna in the first half of the 6th century (*Migne, Pat. Lat. t. lxxviii.* 55 sq. 245 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 197.) [J. G.]

PASCENTIUS (1), steward or controller of imperial property in Africa, *comes domus regiae*, very severe in the execution of his office, and being an Arian, and a bitter opponent of the Catholic faith, and very fond of talk, very troublesome to the simple-minded, and perhaps not very highly educated, clergy of Carthage. (*Possidius, Vit. Aug. c.* 17; Böcking, *Not. Dign. c.* 11, vol. ii. p. 374-393.) Having requested St. Augustine to confer with him at Carthage on the subject of religion, A.D. 406, Pascentius at first agreed that written notes of the discussion should be made, but after dinner he changed his mind, refused to allow this to be done, and further asserted that Augustine was afraid to declare his opinions. Augustine therefore wrote two letters in succession both to disprove this unfounded assertion, and to give Pascentius an opportunity of reply. Again and again he com-

plains of the change in the plan and the inevitable mistakes to which it led, due no doubt, as with a courteous irony he says, to his opponent's want of memory, though if they had been made by himself he might justly have been charged with falsehood. The account which Augustine gives of the discussion, in which he was supported by his friend Alypius, is too long to be represented with any fulness, but is well worth careful study, as illustrating 1. The shuffling and slippery tactics of the Arian disputant, and as Augustine delicately insinuates, his ignorance of the true method of interpreting scripture. 2. His coarse, personal attacks on his opponent, when he was himself defeated in argument. 3. His use of the word "ingenitus" to describe the nature of God, and the defence of it by himself and some of his clamorous party who were present, on a principle precisely the same as that on which the word *ὑποούσιος* was used, viz. as expressing the sense, though not itself an actual word of scripture. 4. The manner in which Augustine, compelled by his opponent's repeated evasions to declare his own belief, exhibits this in terms which closely resemble the Athanasian Creed, its method of illustration, and sometimes its very words. (Aug. *Ep.* 238, 239.) In reply to these letters Pascentius taunts Augustine with want of confidence in his faith, asks him, when he speaks of the three Persons in the Trinity, which of them is the One God, or whether there is a threefold person called by this name; and expresses a wish that he would settle down quietly, and with his colleagues confer on him on matters tending to the glory of God, for there is no use, he says, in writing again and again to him what does not edify him. (*Ep.* 240.)

In reply to this, Augustine refuses to return railing for railing, but says, that if Pascentius has read what he has written, he could not justly accuse him of believing in a threefold God.

He repeats some of his former arguments on the Trinity of Persons in one God, and adverting to the appeal made by Pascentius on the inutilty of frequent writing, urges that if *scribo* and *scribis* does not tend to edification, still less does *dico* and *dicis*, when no record is preserved of what was said. (*Ep.* 241.) The record of the controversy exhibits in a strong light St. Augustine's power in argument, his command of temper before a coarse and overbearing opponent, his exquisite courtesy combined not unfrequently with a delicate irony, and his unflinching strictures on the dishonest evasion by Pascentius of the condition originally laid down.

These letters probably contain all that is known for certain about this controversy, and Possidius in his life of Augustine points to no further communications; but in his index to his works he mentions a letter by him "in reply to various questions." This statement has led some persons to suppose that another letter was written by Augustine besides those which we have; but, as Tillemont remarks, the letter thus described may very well be No. 238 mentioned above. Three MSS. which do not contain the letters 238-241, contain an account of a discussion, ("altercatio,") between Augustine and Pascentius, held at Hippo, under the presidency of one Laurentius. But there is no reason to believe that this is authentic, nor does Augustine himself mention any other discussion than the one

which was held at Carthage. (Aug. *Opp.* vol. ii. *App.* pp. 1153-1162, ed. Migne; Tillemont, *Mém.* vol. xiii. 164, 165 and note 41; Ceillier, vol. ix. pp. 185, 186, 194.) [H. W. P.]

PASCENTIUS (2), a Manichean leader discovered at Merida, in Spain, by Antoninus its bishop, in the Manichean persecution of A.D. 447, inaugurated at Rome by pope Leo, A.D. 444 (*Idat. Chron.* p. 26). [G. T. S.]

PASCENTIUS (3), eighteenth bishop of Poitiers, was appointed by command of Charibert, king of the Franks at the death of Pientius A.D. 564 (*Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc.* iv. c. 18; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 145). Fortunatus dedicated his life of St. Hilary of Poitiers to him (Migne, lxxxviii. 439), and Maroveus was bishop about A.D. 584. [J. G.]

PASCHALIS, anti-pope, elected, but not ordained, in opposition to Sergius, after the death of Conon in Sept. A.D. 687. Anastasius (*in Vit. Conon.*) relates as follows. The pope Conon having left, by will, thirty pounds of gold to the clergy and monasteries, his archdeacon, Paschalis, during the pope's last illness, wrote offering this sum to John (called Platys), the new exarch at Ravenna, if he should himself obtain the popedom. Seven days after Conon's death, the Roman people were divided into two parties, the one choosing as his successor the above-named Paschalis, while the other chose the archpresbyter Theodorus. The latter party having first got possession of the inner part of the Lateran palace, the other seized the remainder of it; and there the two fortified themselves, neither being disposed to yield. Thereupon the magistrates, with the army and the greater part of the clergy, and a large multitude, elected Sergius, a presbyter, in the imperial palace on the Palatine, and thence took him amid acclamations to the Lateran palace, which, though closed and guarded, they succeeded in entering. Theodore at once renounced his claim, and Paschalis was compelled, against his will, to salute Sergius as the pope elect. But he sent word of what had occurred to the exarch at Ravenna, who forthwith came to Rome in person, arriving so unexpectedly that there was no time to receive him with the accustomed honours. Finding it, however, impossible to oppose the general voice in favour of Sergius, he allowed his election, but demanded from him the thirty pounds of gold which had been promised by Paschalis. Sergius, though pleading his inability to raise the sum, and the fact that he had not himself promised it, was compelled to give it, having to use for the purpose precious crowns and vessels from the shrine of St. Peter. Not long after the ordination of Sergius, Paschalis was deposed from his archdeaconry on the charge of practising incantations and frequenting groves and oracles, and was secluded in a monastery, where, after five years, he died (says Anastasius) impenitent. [J. B.—Y.]

PASCHASINUS (1), one of the leading supporters of the anti-pope Ursicinus in his struggle against Damasus [DAMASUS] (*Ceill.* iv. 633; *Hefele's Councils*, sec. 91). [G. T. S.]

PASCHASINUS (2), bishop of Lilybaeum in Sicily, circ. A.D. 440, at the time when that

country was devastated by Vandal raids and the income of his church largely appropriated by the invaders (see Leonis Magni *Ep.* iii. cap. i. Migne's edition, note *e*). Leo the Great sent him pecuniary assistance in his trouble, for which he expresses the profoundest gratitude to his "dominus venerabilis Papa" (Leo Magn. *l.p.* l.c.). Leo, at the same time, consulted him about the Paschal cycle (A.D. 443). He replies in favour of the Alexandrian computation against the Roman, but in an abject strain of deference to his patron (Leo I. Pope, p. 666). At the same time he relates in confirmation of his view a miracle which used to take place in the baptistry of an outlying church on the property of his see, on the true Paschal Eve every year the water rising miraculously in the font (Leonis *Ep.* iii. cap. 3). In 447 we find him conveying to the Sicilian bishops generally some disciplinary injunctions of the pope (LEO I. pope, p. 661; *Ep.* xvi. cap. 7). In 451 he receives another letter from Leo again desiring him to make enquiries as to the Paschal cycle (*Ep.* lxxxviii. cap. 4), and sending him the Tome to stir up his energies in the cause of orthodoxy. Immediately after this he is sent as one of Leo's legates to the council of Chalcedon (LEO, p. 659; *Ep.* lxxxix.), and presides on his behalf. (Labbe, *Concilia*, vol. iv. p. 580 E, etc. The phrase "synodo praesidens" however does not occur in the Acta of the council, but only in the signatures of the prelates representing Rome.) He acts for him with the other legates, first objecting to the presence of Dioscorus (Actio i. p. 94 D), and afterwards interposing again and again, pronouncing the sentence in Dioscorus (Actio iii. p. 424 B), reading the record of the Nicene canon beginning "Romana Ecclesia semper habuit primatum" (p. 812 A), etc. etc. For the conduct of the legates in regard to the 28th canon, see LEO, p. 663; Labbe, iv. pp. 793-794. We notice that Paschasius could not speak Greek, and used an interpreter (p. 380 B). After the council we hear no more of him. [C. G.]

PASCHASIUS (1), a deacon of Rouen, who about the year 399 was a messenger between St. Victricius, bishop of Rouen, and St. Paulinus of Nola. (Paulin. *Epist.* xviii. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 237.) [S. A. B.]

PASCHASIUS (2), Nov. 13, a Catholic confessor under Genseric. (Victor. Vit. *Opp.* ed. Ruinart, p. 433.) [G. T. S.]

PASCHASIUS (3), deacon of Rome, saint and confessor, flourished at the end of the 5th century, and the beginning of the 6th century. Gregory the Great in his *Dialogues*, bk. iv. chap. 40, speaks of him as "a man of great sanctity, much given to alms-deeds, a considerer of the poor, and a forgetter of himself." He was a firm supporter of the anti-pope Laurentius to the day of his death, and his adhesion was a great source of strength to the opponents of Symmachus (cf. Baronius, ann. 498). [LAURENTIUS (10).] Gregory in the fourth book of his *Dialogues*, gives an account of his deliverance from Purgatory, where he was expiating his sin of resisting the judgment of the church in the matter of Laurentius. This he says was effected by the intercession of Germanus, bishop of Capua, because Paschasius had erred owing to

ignorance, and not maliciously. There is also a story in the same place, which illustrates the high repute in which Paschasius was held, to the effect that when he died, in the time of Symmachus, his dalmatic was touched by a demoniac, who was healed at once. There is extant a work of his in two books, *De Sancto Spiritu* (*Pat. Lat.* lxii. 9-40), to which Gregory alludes in this same passage from his *Dialogues* as "libri rectissimi ac luculenti." Casimir Oudinus, in his work *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiae* (vide Leipsic edition, 1722, vol. i. p. 1304), argues that the treatise generally ascribed to Paschasius is really the work of Faustus of Riez, referred to by Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* c. 85; cf. *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1109), and that Paschasius's book is lost to us. His arguments hardly, however, seem convincing, and have not been generally accepted by editors. We have, besides this, a letter from Paschasius to Eugippius declaring his own inability to improve in any way a life of St. Severinus, which Eugippius had written, and sent for revision, and urging him to publish it as it stood. (*Pat. Lat.* lxii. 39, 40.) The date of Paschasius's death is fixed at about A.D. 512. [G. W. D.]

PASCHASIUS (4), bishop of Naples, succeeded Fortunatus in the autumn of A.D. 601. There are three letters to him from Gregory the Great. The first, dated February A.D. 602, desires him to consecrate an oratory erected in honour of St. Severinus; the second relates to the mode in which 400 solidi, the portion of the revenues of the church of Naples assigned to the clergy and the poor, are to be divided; in the third, written in A.D. 603 or 604, Gregory, after repeating the complaint addressed to him by the Jews of Naples that attempts had been made to prevent them from celebrating their festivals, consistently with his tolerant policy on other occasions [GREGORIUS I., Vol. II. 781], advises Paschasius to try to convert them by arguments and kindness, not by force, and orders that they should be allowed in future to keep their festivals without molestation. In a letter to his sub-deacon Anthemius, Gregory blames Paschasius for preventing the condemnation of the sub-deacon Hilarius for falsely accusing the deacon John, and orders that Paschasius should depose him from the sub-diaconate, have him publicly flogged, and banish him. Paschasius is also to be admonished to maintain watchfully the discipline of his church. He is also to appoint a major-domo to see after the entertainment of strangers and other business. (Gregorii *Epist.* lib. xi. ind. iv. 31, 34; lib. xiii. ind. vi. 12; lib. xi. ind. iv. 71, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1144, 1146, 1267, 1210.) [F. D.]

PASCHASIUS (5), *vir magnificus*, and Plancho, *vir clarissimus*, complained to Gregory the Great in 602 that JOANNES (389), bishop of Syracuse, would receive the rents of the Roman church, which he collected, only at two specified places (*Epp.* xii. 43; Jaffé, *R.P.* num. 1477). [F. D.]

PASICRATES, May 25, mart. at Dorostorum in Moesia Inferior. He suffered with one Valentio. They are mentioned in the Acts of Julius, May 27. Hesychius, soon after a martyr, sent salutation to Pasicrates, through Julius, when suffering. His expression was a remark-

able one as shewing the belief of cent. iv. in personal recognition in the Spirit World, "Plurimum etiam saluta Pasieratem et Valentionem famulos Dei, qui nos jam per bonam confessionem praecesserunt ad Dominum." It also shows their sense of the nearness of that world, for Julius replies to Hesy chius that the persons he wished to salute had already heard his greetings. Invocation of saints easily sprang up in such a soil. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 549.) [G. T. S.]

PASSALORHYNCHITAE. Epiphanius, in his article on the Montanists (*Haer.* xlviii. 14) treats of the Tascodrugitae, whom he counts as a branch, or a kindred sect; and he explains the name as meaning the same as Passalorhynchitae. The latter name he derives from *πάσσαλος* and *ῥύγχος*, and states that these people were so called because in prayer they put their finger to their nose, meaning no doubt by this ceremony of their own choosing, to express downcast humility. Epiphanius here seems to assume that the name Passalorhynchitae was likely to be better known to his readers than that which he explains by it. And in fact we hear of these people, it would seem independently, from Philaster (*Haer.* 76). This writer says that these devotees laid their finger to their nose and mouth, by way of imposing silence on themselves; desiring to imitate David (Ps. cxli. 3) and the prophets, but having really for their model the vain silence of Pythagoras. Jerome (in the preface to the second book of his *Commentary on the Galatians*) states from personal knowledge that there were in his time Passalorhynchitae at Ancyra in Galatia.

It must be borne in mind that the primitive attitude of prayer was that the suppliant stood with his hands raised up to heaven. It is intelligible therefore that those who first took notice of men who in praying covered their face with their hands should think the new practice strange, offensive, savouring of heresy, and one which deserved to be stigmatized by a nickname. Yet the nickname actually devised is by no means a natural one; and St. Augustine has reason in saying (*Haer.* 63) that if it were intended to describe men who put their finger to their nose, Dactylorhynchitae would have been a more suitable name. It seems likely therefore that the account of Epiphanius may be so far correct, that the Greek name took its origin, as meant to be a literal translation (possibly a mistaken one) of a name in another language. See ASCODRUGITAE, and Lightfoot, *Ep. Galet.* p. 32.

[G. S.]

PASSARION, chorepiscopus and archimandrite of a monastery which was probably in Jerusalem, as well as superior of all the monks in the diocese, in the time of Juvenal patriarch of Jerusalem. A few months prior to his death, which Tillemont places in 428 or 429, he was present with HESYCHIUS (25) at the dedication of Euthymius's laura near Jerusalem. In spite of his great reputation as a saint, Tillemont can find no church dedicated in his honour. (Cyril. Scyth., *Vit. S. Euphymii* ap. Coteler. *Mon.* iv. 31; *Boll. Acta SS.* 20 Jan. ii. 308; Tillem. x. 196, 197.) [EUTHYMIUS (4).] [J. G.]

PASSERIUS (POSSERIUS), priest, present at the council held at Jerusalem A.D. 415 (Labbe,

Conc. iv. 309; Orosius, *De Arb. Lib.* § 6 ap. *Pat. Lat.* xxxi. 1178.) [J. G.]

PASTOR (1). This name is connected with traditions of the Roman Church, which, though accepted as historical by Baronius and other writers, including Cardinal Wiseman (*Fabiola*, p. 189) must be rejected as mythical. These traditions relate to the origin of two of the oldest of the Roman *tituli*, those of St. Pudentiana and St. Praxedis, which still give titles to Cardinals, and the former of which claims to be the most ancient Church in the world. The story is that Peter when at Rome, dwelt in the house of the Senator Pudens in the vicus Patricius, and there held divine service, his altar being then the only one at Rome. Pudens is evidently intended as the same who is mentioned 2 Tim. iv. 21. His mother's name is said to have been Priscilla, and it is plainly intended to identify her with the lady who gave its name to an ancient cemetery at Rome. The story relates that Pudens on the death of his wife, converted his house into a church, and put it under the charge of the priest Pastor, from whom it was known as "titulus Pastoris." This *titulus* is named in more than one document, but in all the name may have been derived from the story we are citing. Thus in the acts of Nemesius, pope Stephen is said to have held a baptism there (Baronius, A.D. 257, n. 23). Our story relates that the baptistery had been placed there by Pope Pius I., who often exercised the episcopal functions in this church. Here the two daughters of Pudens, Pudentiana and Praxedis, having given all their goods to the poor, dedicated themselves to the service of God. This church under the name of Ecclesia Pudentiana is mentioned in an inscription of the year 384, and there are epitaphs of priests *tituli Pudentis* of the year 489 and 528 (De Rossi, *Bull.* 1867, n. 60; 1883, p. 107). The original authority for the story appears to be a letter purporting to be written by Pastor to Timothy (see *Boll. AA. SS.* May 19, iv. 299). He informs Timothy of the death of his brother Novatus, who, during his illness, had been visited by Praxedis, then the only survivor of the two sisters. He obtains Timothy's consent to the application of the property of Novatus to religious uses according to the direction of Praxedis: and baths possessed by Novatus in the vicus Lateritius, are converted into a second *titulus*, which is that now known as of St. Praxedis. This *titulus* is mentioned in an epitaph of the year 491 (De Rossi, *Bull.* 1882, p. 65); and priests of both *tituli* sign in the Roman Council of 499. On this letter are founded false letters of Pope Pius I. to Justus of Vienna, given in Baronius (*Ann.* 166, i.), a forgery later than the Isidorian Decretals. Those who maintain the genuineness of the letter of Pastor, have in various ways tried to get over the chronological difficulty of connecting Pudens with St. Paul on the one hand, and with Pius I. on the other. It has been tried to show that such longevity is not impossible; and it has been suggested that Praxedis and Pudentiana were not daughters but grand-daughters of Pudens. But the spuriousness of the whole story has been abundantly shown by Tillemont (ii. 286, 615). Later writers who repeat the story make Novatus and Timothy brothers of Pudentiana, but there

is no authority for this in the original story. In the Acts of Justin, the martyr states that the only meetings of Christians he knew of were held in Rome, in what, according to one reading, is the *balnei Timothini*. It is possibly hence that the name Timothy comes. The connection of the name of Pius I. with that of Pastor, is derived from the *Liber Pontificalis*, which describes Pius as brother of Pastor; but this is a mere blunder, originating in the statement made in earlier lists of Roman bishops, that the book called the *Shepherd* had been written by Hermas, brother of the Roman bishop Pius. A confusion arose between the name of Hermas and of his book, which was known as "*Liber Pastoris*." The statement just referred to appears in the poem of Pseudo-Tertullian against Marcion in the form

"Post hunc deinde Pius Hermas cui germine frater
Angelicus Pastor quia tradita verba locutus."

And a Vatican MS. of the Latin Hermas ends "explicit liber Pastoris discipuli beati Pauli apostoli." If there were better evidence of the existence of a Roman presbyter called Pastor, the name, which is common enough, would present no difficulty. A Junius Pastor was consul in the year 165, and the name is also found in Christian Inscriptions (De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea*, i.). In addition to the references already given, may be consulted, Baronius *Martyr. Rom.* Jan. 16, May 19, June 20, July 26; Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, p. 133. [G. S.]

PASTOR (2), an African bishop in the 5th century, who wrote a confession of faith, accompanied by anathemas of the opposing heresies (Gennad. *de Vir. Illust.* cap. lxxvi.). [G. T. S.]

PATAPIUS, solitary of Constantinople, native of Thebes, the subject of three homilies written upon him by ANDREAS CRETENSIS. He lived before the 8th century; his feast is Dec. 8. (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. xcvi.) [J. G.]

PATERIUS, notary, to whom Gregory the Great dictated a letter (v. 29), the same as the Paterius Secundicerius, mentioned in the grant of testamentary power to PROBUS (St. Greg. *Epp.* app. 9, 1297, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1345) and the Paterius, who is mentioned by John the Deacon (*Vita Gregorii*, ii. 11) among Gregory's intimate friends. He collected from the various writings of Gregory all the passages of scripture quoted by him with his comments upon each, and arranged them in their proper order. He had commenced the work for his own edification, but Gregory, hearing of it, commanded him to finish and publish it. It is divided into three parts, of which the first contains the commentaries on the historical books of the Old Testament, the Psalms, Proverbs, the Song of Solomon; the second, those on Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus and the Prophets; and the third, those on the New Testament. It is usually printed as an appendix to the works of Gregory, as in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* (lxxix. 677-1136.) [F. D.]

PATERMUTHIUS, Sep. 19, mart. in the eighth year of the Diocletian persecution. He suffered in Palestine by fire under the governor Firmilianus, together with the Egyptian bishops

Peleus and Nilus and an anonymous presbyter. They appear to have been the leaders of the Christians consigned to the copper mines of Palestine. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. xiii.)

[G. T. S.]

PATERNIANI, heretics who, according to Augustine (*Haer.* 85; *Cont. Julian.* v. 26), taught that the lower half of man's body had been made, not by God, but by the devil, and who in consequence of this doctrine, freely practised impurity of life; holding that all that was required of man, was to keep the upper parts of his body pure, and that what was done by the lower did not regard him. But quite the opposite practical conclusion was certainly intended by the first inventors of this notion, who were Encratites (Eph. *Haer.* xv. 2). Augustine states that the Paterniani were also called VENUSTIANI, and that they were akin to the Manichaeans. "Praedestinatus" (*Haer.* 85) who copies Augustine, adds a history of the condemnation of these heretics by Pope Damasus, and of a subsequent civil law visiting them with capital punishment; but nothing stated by this writer as to the authorities by whom different heresies were condemned, can be received without independent confirmation.

[G. S.]

PATERNUS (1), ASPASIUS, pro-consul of Africa A.D. 257, at the time of the persecution under Valerian and Gallienus. When St. Cyprian was brought before him, he only pronounced upon him a sentence of banishment to Curubis, but when further he asked for information about Christians, with a view to punishment, Cyprian replied that he must decline to act as an informer. (Aug. *Serm.* 309, 2; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. p. 144; CYPRIANUS, Vol. I, p. 753.) [H. W. P.]

PATERNUS (2), first bishop of Elusa, perhaps in the third century (*Gall. Christ.* i. 967.) [J. G.]

PATERNUS (3), fourth bishop of Périgueux, between Chronopius I. and Gavidius about the middle of the 4th century, was an Arian. He was associated with Saturninus of Arles, and probably assisted him at the council of Béziers (A.D. 356) which resulted in the banishment of Hilary of Poitiers. When, after the council of Rimini, orthodoxy had finally triumphed in France, and Hilary was restored, Paternus and Saturninus alone of the French bishops persisted in their heretical opinions, which brought about their deposition from their sees (Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 45; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 1448; Mansi, iii. 251-4; Ceillier, iii. 524.) [S. A. B.]

PATERNUS (4), a correspondent of St. Ambrose. He had written to ask whether it would be right for a son of his to marry his own sister's daughter, the granddaughter of Paternus. St. Ambrose replies to him, disapproving of such a marriage. (Ambros. *Epp.* 60.) [J. L. D.]

PATERNUS (5), a presbyter of Constantinople, one of Chrysostom's bitterest enemies. He may be probably identified with one of the two presbyters specially mentioned by Palladius as leaders of the cabal under Acacius and Antiochus, and the other bishops of that party

(Pallad. p. 35). After Chrysostom's banishment he was sent with letters to pope Innocent, charging him with having set fire to his church (*ibid.* p. 25). Palladius dwells with not unnatural satisfaction on the smallness of his stature, the ugliness of his face, and the indistinctness of his utterance (*ibid.*). [E. V.]

PATERNUS (6) a Christian mentioned by Augustine in a letter to Celer. (Aug. *Ep.* 57.) [H. W. P.]

PATERNUS (7), first known bishop of Braga, was one of the Priscillianist bishops consecrated by SYMPHOSIUS of Astorga. At the first council of Toledo, A.D. 400, he recanted his errors, declaring that he had been converted by the works of St. Ambrose, and was allowed to retain his see, but was not to be admitted to communion till the opinion of the pope was known. (*Esp. Sag.* xv. 100; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 195; Gams, *Kirchen-geschichte von Spanien*, ii. (1) 393.) [F. D.]

PATERNUS, bishop of Vannes and Llanbadarn. [PADARN.]

PATERNUS (8), bishop of Tomi, accused by the monks of false teaching on the doctrine of the Incarnation. But the emperor Justin in 519 heard all the parties, acquitted Paternus, and reconciled him with Vitalian, the magister militum (Hormisdas, *Epp. et Decr.*, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxiii. 473.) [J. G.]

PATERNUS (9) (PAIR or PATIER), ST., 5th bishop of Avranches between Aegidius and St. Senerius about the middle of the 6th century, was of sufficient importance to have his life written by Venantius Fortunatus, which, with much that is incredible, preserves a few facts. It was written at the request of Marcian, abbat of Enesio (Anson, afterwards Saint-Jouin-en-Poitou), his first monastery. He was born at Poitiers, where his father held some public office, and, after being piously educated, entered the monastery of Anson, where he became cellarius. Desiring however a life freer for meditation, he withdrew with a friend named Scubilio to the uninhabited forests round Coutances, and finally established himself at Sesciacum (Scicy) where paganism was still flourishing. Here they spent three years in the conversion of the heathen, not without persecution and even danger to their lives, till sought out by Generosus, their old abbat at Anson, by whose influence Paternus was ordained deacon and priest by Leontianus, bishop of Coutances (circ. A.D. 510). During a period of more than thirty years he founded monasteries in the districts of Coutances, Bayeux, Le Mans and Avranches, and became so famous by his miracles and austerities that he was once summoned to the presence of king Childebert at Paris. At the age of seventy he was elected bishop of Avranches (circ. A.D. 552), and after an episcopate of thirteen years spent in building and restoring churches and relieving the poor, he died during the Paschal feast, and, according to the story, on the same day as his friend Scubilio (circ. A.D. 565). The two were buried at the oratory they had founded at Scicy.

The bishop Paternus who was present at

the third council of Paris held about 557, was probably identical with the subject of this article (Mansi, ix. 747, 8; Bar. *Ann.* 559. xxxii.). On the other hand, the dates are an obstacle to the Paternus addressed by Fortunatus in the 32nd Ode of the Third Book (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 149) being the same (see *ibid.* note; Pagi, an. 559. vi.)

His day is April 16, on which he is recognised by the Roman *Martyrology*. He was taken as the patron-saint of many Norman churches, and the oratory in which he was buried became afterwards a parish church, and took the name of Saint-Pair-sur-mer. For his cult, see Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. ii. 425, 6; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 469.

Fortunatus's life may be seen in Boll. *ibid.* p. 427 seqq., the end of the 2nd vol. of Mabillon's *Acta SS. Benedict.*, and in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 487-98. An abbreviation was published by Surius. [S. A. B.]

PATERNUS (10), thirty-third bishop of Ausci, c. A.D. 718, but very obscure (*Gall. Christ.* i. 976). [J. G.]

PATIENS (1), ST., Jan. 8, bishop of Metz, according to the local legend, a Greek, and a disciple of St. John the Evangelist (Boll. *Acta SS.* 8 Jan. i. 469-70). In the catalogue of Paulus Diaconus he appears as fourth bishop without comment (*De Ordine Episc. Metens.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xc. 701). The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* would place him in the 3rd century, and attribute to him the erection of a church in honour of St. John (xiii. 680-81). [S. A. B.]

PATIENS (2), ST., Sep. 11, bishop of Lyons, in the latter half of the 5th century, and a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, to whose letters we are principally indebted for our acquaintance with him. Of his pre-episcopal career we know nothing, but it is plain that he was a man of wealth and probably of high rank. Sidonius calls him "vir sanctus, strenuus, severus, misericors;" and again, addressing him in a letter, "sic semper humanum, sic abstemium ut constet indesinenter regem praesentem prandia tua reginam laudare jejunia." He was a zealous restorer and builder of churches, and successful in converting the sect called Photinians and the heretic barbarians.

About the year 470 Châlon-sur-Saône lost its bishop. The city was torn with faction by three candidates who fought for its temporalities. The firmness of Patiens and St. Euphronius of Autun, who consecrated John by a sort of *coup de main*, ended the scandal.

St. Patiens is chiefly remembered by his munificence to the poor. An incursion of the Goths had produced a famine which desolated Burgundy (A.D. 473-74). The bishop fed the people for some time at his own cost. Arles, Riez, Avignon, Orange, Viviers, Valence, Trois-Châteaux, and Clermont, are enumerated by Sidonius among the cities which shared his bounty. His fame spread through all Aquitaine, and Gregory of Tours a century later praises his humanity.

Patiens was present at the council of Arles in 475, and his signature is found with those of other prelates to the letter written by Faustus to Lucidus, in which has since been discovered the taint of Semipelagianism. He also assembled a council at Lyons on the same matter shortly

afterwards. Some orthodox writers have attempted to throw doubt on these facts, on the ground that they rest on the testimony of the heretical Faustus only. The Life of St. Germanus of Auxerre was undertaken by Constantius at his suggestion and dedicated to him. The date of his death is given variously between 480 and 491. He was buried in, or translated to, the church of St. Just. (Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* ii. 10; iv. 25; vi. 12; Constantius, *Vita S. Germ. Autiss.*, Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. vii. 200; Faustus, *Epist.* i., ii., iii., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 835 seqq.; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 24; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. iii. 791 seqq.; Mansi, vii. 1010-1012; *Gall. Christ.* iv. 25-27.) [S. A. B.]

PATIER, ST. [PATERNUS (9).]

PATRICIANI and PATRICIUS. Philaster (*Haer.* 62) enumerates a sect of heretics, taking their name from a Patricius who had taught at Rome, whose doctrine was that man's body had been made not by God but by the devil, and that consequently ill-treatment of the body was a duty. Some of them are said to have carried out their principles to the point of suicide. The sect is named by Ambrosiaster (*in 1 Tim. iv.* 1) in connection with Marcionites and Manichaeans; and also by Augustine (*Cont. advers. leg. et proph.* ii. 12, § 40); other notices of the sect seem to be all derived from Philaster. [G. S.]

PATRICIUS (1), first known bishop of Malaga, present at the council of Elvira in A.D. 306. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 31; Gams, *Kirch. von Sp.* ii. (1) 10; *Esp. Sag.* xii. 304.) [F. D.]

PATRICIUS (2), vicar of Africa, appointed by Constantine to put down those troubling the church A.D. 312. (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* x. 6.) [J. G.]

PATRICIUS (3), father of St. Augustine, a citizen of Tagaste, of very small means. While he was at school at Madaura, his son, a boy of lively disposition, more inclined to play than to work, and hating Greek, sometimes received chastisement for his idleness, at which, though he stood in great dread of the stripes, his parents, by which term his father may perhaps be chiefly understood, only laughed. For this they were probably not much to blame, but Patricius, who was not yet a Christian, appears to have shewn no anxiety for his son to become one, nor to train him in purity of morals. When he became old enough to leave school, Patricius, who in this matter was encouraged by his wife, though not for the same reason, made an effort beyond his means to send him to Carthage to receive advanced instruction in literature and education, being desirous that he should distinguish himself in the world. This was about A.D. 370, about which time, or rather sooner, Patricius became a catechumen, but in the following year he died, having received baptism a short time before his death A.D. 371. He was not unkind in disposition, but passionate, sensual, fond of display and of drink, and not always faithful to his wife, who however never talked of his infidelities, and by her discreet behaviour never provoked him to violence. See MONNICA, vol. iii. p. 932. Aug. *Conf.* i. 9, 11, 14, ii. 3, iii. 4, ix. 9 [H. W. P.]

PATRICIUS (4), a notary commissioned by Arcadius to signify his condemnation to Chrysostom, and to bid him leave his palace and church. (Pallad. p. 88.) [E. V.]

PATRICIUS (5), a person by whom Olympias sent letters to Chrysostom. (Chrys. *Ep.* 14 ad init.) [E. V.]

PATRICIUS (6), nephew of St. Augustine, a subdeacon in the church, and living at Hippo, in a clerical community of which his uncle was the head. He was the elder brother of his family, having one brother, who like himself was a subdeacon under Severus, bishop of Milevis, and also a sister or sisters. There was a family property, in which their mother had a life interest. Patricius wished to devote his share of this to the church for the common maintenance of his community, but was unable to do so until his mother died, partly because a portion of the property consisted in slaves, whom he wished to release, but could not do so until the division took place. She died A.D. 425, and Augustine informs us that he then determined to carry out his intention. Aug. *Serm.* 356, 3. [H. W. P.]

PATRICIUS (7), a count, to whom Theodoret wrote a commendatory letter on behalf of Celestiacus, a senator of Carthage, who, by the invasion of the Vandals, had lost all that he had, and was driven a beggar with his family from his native land. (Theod. *Ep.* xxxiv.) [E. V.]

PATRICIUS (8), a deacon of Constantinople, messenger to Leo the Great. (Leonis *Ep.* lxxx.) [C. G.]

PATRICIUS (9), senior (SEN-PATRICK), Aug. 24, said to have been a monk of Glastonbury and tutor of St. Patrick of Ireland. His existence, labours, and distinction from four or five, if not more, other Patricks are discussed at great length in Petrie's *History and Antiquities of Tara Hill*, p. 90. Cf. also Colgan, *AA. SS.* p. 366, and Ussher's *Antiq. Eccl. Britt.* t. vi. 445-463, Elrington's edit. *passim*, cf. t. xvii. Index, s. v. Patrick; and Moran on St. Patrick's birthplace, *Dub. Review*, April 1880, p. 332. He is commemorated in the Felire of Aengus the Culdee on Aug. 24, and distinguished from his namesake. The annals of Ulster notice his death in 457, thus "quies senis Patricii, ut alii libri dicunt." Cf. Shearman's *Loca Patriciana*, p. 395, for an elaborate essay on this topic. A glance, however, at the Index of the Roman Martyrology will show how many Patricii are commemorated, and how hard it is to distinguish between them. [G. T. S.]

PATRICIUS (10) (ST. PATRICK), March 17, the national apostle of Ireland, has been the subject of much controversy. He had four names—his baptismal name Succat, his name in captivity Cothraige, a third name Magonus or Imigonus or Maun which he exchanged at his ordination for Patricius (Ussher, *Antiq. Britt. Ecc.* opp. t. vi. cap. xvii.; *Analect. Bolland.* i. 548, ii. 35; Dr. Todd in *Proced. Roy. Ir. Acad.* vi. 292.) His existence has been doubted, his name has been ascribed to seven different persons at least, while the origin and authority

of his mission have been warmly disputed between what we may for convenience call the adherents of the Roman and Protestant views. We propose now to take our subject thus:—1. We shall give an account of the documentary evidence. 2. We shall trace the history of the saint so far as it can be recovered. 3. We shall give a brief account of the legends which have grown up round the historical facts. 4. We shall notice very briefly the controversies which have centred round St. Patrick.

I. *The Documents.*—The materials for St. Patrick's history which have a claim to be regarded as historical are, in the first place, of course the writings of the saint himself. We have two works ascribed to St. Patrick, his Confession and his Epistle to Coroticus. Both of these seem genuine.

We have a copy of the Confession more than a thousand years old preserved in the Book of Armagh, one of the great treasures of the library of Trinity College, Dublin. This copy professes to have been taken from the autograph of St. Patrick himself, as stated in the colophon appended to it. "Thus far the volume which St. Patrick wrote with his own hand." *Huc usque volumen quod Patricius manu conscripsit sua.* Dr. Todd, in his life of St. Patrick (p. 347), thus sums up the case for the Confession of St. Patrick. "It is altogether such an account of himself as a missionary of that age, circumstanced as St. Patrick was, might be expected to compose. Its Latinity* is rude and archaic, it quotes the Ante-Hieronymian Vulgate; and contains nothing inconsistent with the century in which it professes to have been written. If it be a forgery, it is not easy to imagine with what purpose it could have been forged." This is strong testimony, but it might have been made stronger, and applies as clearly to the Epistle to Coroticus as to the Confession. Not only may we say negatively that they contain nothing inconsistent with the century when they profess to have been written, but farther still, we may affirm positively that they contain statements and refer to a state of organisation and discipline, secular and ecclesiastical, which could only have found a place in the fifth century, and could not have been imagined at a later date. Le Blant, in his *Actes des Martyrs*, has taught us how to apply the rules of historical criticism to the acts and lives of the saints. His rules apply equally well to the epistle and the Confession of St. Patrick. We have noticed from Dr. Todd that the Confession uses the Ante-Hieronymian Vulgate. This is strong evidence of its early date, but it is not conclusive, as there is abundant proof that the use of the Ante-Hieronymian version continued in Ireland for several centuries after Jerome's time, a use too, strangely enough, combined at times with that of Jerome's Vulgate, as indeed seems the case in two or three places even in Patrick's Confession. Several other instances of this curious admixture of texts will be found in the learned work lately published by Professor T. K. Abbott, of Trinity

* The Latin text of Gregory of Tours has lately been reconstructed in an edition of that writer published in the *Monumenta Germaniae Hist.* by Arndt and Krusch, 1883-85. It is rude and barbarous in style, just like St. Patrick's.

College, Dublin, styled *Evangeliorum Versio Ante-Hieronymiana ex codice Usseriano*, Dub. 1884. There are, however, two other lines of evidence which seem to me conclusive as to the early date of the Confession. The one deals with the State Organisation, the other with the Ecclesiastical Organisation there alluded to and implied. They are both such as existed in the earlier years of the fifth century, and could scarcely have been imagined afterwards.

Let us take the State Organisation first. In the epistle to Coroticus he describes himself thus. "Ingenuus fui secundum carnem, decurione patre nascor." This one point alone seemed to Dr. Lanigan (*H. E.* i. 125) conclusive against St. Patrick's birth in North Britain. "I believe," he says, "it would be difficult for the sticklers for St. Patrick's birth in North Britain to find a curia or Decurion in Kilpatrick, or any place near it in the fourth century." But when Lanigan wrote, the antiquities of the Roman Empire had not been investigated, and we now know that Decurions—who were not magistrates but town councillors rather, and members of the local senates—were found all over the Roman empire to its extremest bounds by the end of the fourth century. Some discoveries in Spain about ten years ago showed that Decurions were established by the Romans in every little mining village, and were charged with the care of the games, the water supply, sanitary arrangements, education, and the local fortifications; while Hübner in the *Corp. Ins. Lat.* t. vii., num. 54 and 189, has proved that Decurions existed in Britain (cf. Marquardt and Mommsen, *Handbuch der Römischen Alterthümer*, t. iv. pp. 501-516 and *Ephem. Epigraph.* t. ii. p. 137, t. iii. p. 103). The Romans, in fact, used the order of Decurions as an instrument to establish a thorough system of local government for administrative purposes, while retaining a vigorous control in the hands of the imperial authorities. This institution was flourishing about the year 400 along the British and North Gallic coasts. It necessarily vanished amid the barbarian invasions of the following century. Now this is our first point. St. Patrick's writings imply the existence of Decurions. Again the Confession calls England *Britanniae*, using the plural *Britanniae*, not *Britannia*, which is strictly accurate and in accordance with the technical usage of the Roman empire at the close of the fourth century, which then divided Britain into five provinces, *Britannia prima* and *secunda*, *Maxima Caesariensis*, *Flavia Caesariensis* and *Valentia*, which were collectively called *Britanniae*, and so appear in St. Patrick's writings (cf. Böcking's *Notitia Dig.* t. ii. cap. iii. pp. 12-14). Then again the ecclesiastical organisation implied is such as the years about A.D. 400 alone could supply. St. Patrick tells us in the opening words of his confession that his father was Calpurnius, a deacon, his grandfather Potitus a priest. It is evident that the law of compulsory clerical celibacy was unknown to St. Patrick, though at the same time the Monastic life was popular, as we see from his epistle to Coroticus, where he speaks of the "filii Scotorum" and the "filiae regulorum" becoming "monks and virgins of Christ" (cf. the Confession, where he uses exactly the same

expressions). It has been said indeed that Patrick's father and grandfather lived separate from their wives after ordination, and that their children had all been born previously. No doubt there are numerous examples of such conduct in the ecclesiastical history of Gaul during the fifth century. But a careful review of the councils and canons will show, that in Britain or the north of Gaul there existed no prohibition of clerical marriage in the last quarter of the fourth century. One proof of this must suffice. Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, wrote a letter in the year 404 to pope Innocent I. asking how he was to deal with married priests who had begotten children since their ordination. We have Innocent's reply still. It is dated Feb. 20, 405. It shows two things, first that the prohibition of marriage was only a late innovation, as he refers not to any ancient legislation, but to the decree of pope Siricius, passed not quite twenty years before (Mansi, iii. 670; Hefele, ii. 387, Clark's ed.); and secondly that the ancient tradition had not yet quite died out in Rome, as Innocent permits the clergy of Toulouse to live with their wives if they had contracted marriage in ignorance of papal legislation. If married clergy and children born to them as such were found at Toulouse in 405, it is absolutely certain that about the year 365 Patrick's grandfather, the priest Potitus, may well have been living in lawful marriage, and yet fulfilling all his sacerdotal functions away in distant Britain.

The aspect of the political horizon, and the consequent action of the church as depicted in these writings, are such, too, as correspond with their alleged age. In the Epistle to Coroticus Patrick says, "It is the custom of the Roman Gallic Christians to send holy men fitted for the work to the Franks and other nations with many thousand solidi, to redeem baptized captives." Now the use of the word Roman here is noteworthy, for it is strictly in accordance with the *usus loquendi* of Latin and Greek writers of that age, such as Ammius Marcellinus, Socrates, Sidonius Apollinaris or Salvian of Marseilles. It has nothing to say to the Church of Rome, or obedience to its ecclesiastical ruler, as some modern writers seem to think, arguing apparently from modern to ancient usage, and knowing but little of the current literature of the time. The term Roman was then used to express a citizen of the Roman empire, no matter where Roman citizens were found, whether on the banks of the Euphrates or in Gaul and England. So that what St. Patrick here says is, "it is the custom of the Gallic Christians who are subject to Roman rule, and therefore Roman citizens, to redeem the captives made by the Franks." But the custom itself referred to is one of the strongest evidences as to the age of our writings. The writings of Zosimus, lib. vi., of Salvian, of Sidonius Apollinaris, prove the ravages of the Franks in Gaul about the middle of the fifth century. Salvian mentions the rescue of a captive taken at Cologne in *Epist.* 1. Severinus, the Apostle of Austria, a little later in the century, devoted his life to the same work in another neighbourhood, and introduced the payment of tithes for this special end and object. (See his *Life* in Pez. *Scriptores Rerum Austriacarum*, t. 1, and lately in Pertz, *Monumenta*.) [SEVERINUS.] By the end of the fifth

century, the Franks had been converted, and Clovis was the one orthodox sovereign of Christendom, the ally and champion of Catholic bishops. The redemption of captives from his hands would be then no longer necessary. This passage could only have been written about the middle of the fifth century at the latest. These instances will show how capable St. Patrick's own writings are of standing the newest tests of historical criticism.

But we have other documents relating to his life. Next in importance to Patrick's own writings stand the collection of Patrician documents contained in the Book of Armagh, derived from another document which certainly comes from the first half of the seventh century. That volume has often been described, as by Bishop Graves in the Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, by Dr. Reeves in a memoir, by Mr. Gilbert in his "National MSS. of Ireland," fasc. 1, p. 23, while an exhaustive analysis of it will be found in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, t. 1, p. 532, contributed by Father Hogan. The contents of the Book of Armagh may be divided thus: 1st Patrician documents, including the oldest copy of the Confession; 2nd, the New Testament in Latin; 3rd, the Life of St. Martin of Tours. The New Testament is remarkable as the only complete copy which has come down from the ancient Celtic church; while again the respect in which the volume was held nine centuries ago is evident from an entry which Gilbert has reproduced on plate xxv. It purports to have been written in the year 1002 in the presence of Brian Borumha, "Emperor of the Scots," and conveys on his part twenty ounces of gold to the church of Armagh. The Patrician documents are those with which we are chiefly concerned. "The collections," says Mr. Gilbert, "concerning St. Patrick in the first part of the Book of Armagh, constitute the oldest writings now extant in connexion with him, and are also the most ancient specimens known of narrative composition in Irish and Hiberno-Latin. They purport to have been originally composed, the annotations by Bishop Tirechan out of a book called *Scripta Patricii*, written by Ultan, bishop of Ardraccan, towards A.D. 650, and the *Life* by Muirchu Maccu Maetheni at the request of his preceptor, Aedh, bishop of Sletty in the same century." These documents are all now accessible in print, though a critical edition of them, and indeed of the whole Book of Armagh, is a desideratum in Celtic literature demanding, however, a width and range of scholarship seldom found in combination, for there would be necessary skill in deciphering manuscripts, in comparative philology, in Celtic and cognate tongues, and in mediaeval Latin texts of the New Testament. Sir W. Betham made the first attempt to print St. Patrick's life in *Irish Antiquarian Researches*, part ii. Dub. 1827. His version, however, is full of mistakes, though he deserves credit for having called attention to a most valuable work.

Father Hogan has printed a considerable portion of the Patrician documents in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, including the *Life* by Muirchu Maccumatheni in t. i. p. 531, where Hogan has ingeniously supplied some missing portions of the Book of Armagh from a Brussels MS. of the 11th or 12th century. In t. ii. p. 35 and 211, he

has printed Tirechan's Annotations, which are short biographical notes of St. Patrick's actions without special chronological order. These profess to have been written by Tirechan, a bishop and disciple of St. Ultan, bishop of Ardbraccan. Ultan died in 657. Tirechan says he wrote his notes "Ex ore vel libro Ultani." This would fix the date of these notes to the latter half of the 7th century, while the original authority for them, St. Ultan's book, would belong to the first half of the same century. Dr. Whitley Stokes, however, in his *Goidelica*, prints some of the Irish notes with an English translation, and maintains, p. 83, that a portion of them at least were probably written in their present shape by some 9th century author, and are, at any rate, later than A.D. 700, while Dr. Reeves in his *Antiquities of Down*, p. 224, relegates them to the 9th century, if not the 10th. They are, however, very ancient, and are manifestly one principal source of any historical elements in subsequent lives, specially in that celebrated one called the Tripartite about which we treat below. Tirechan's annotations—when combined with the life by Maccumathenius—written, as it informs us, at the dictation of Aedh, Anchorite of Sletty, who died in 698, afford ample means for ascertaining the state of the Patrician tradition within two centuries of the saint's death. We have in addition two hymns in praise of St. Patrick, those of St. Fiacc and St. Sechnall, which are ascribed to disciples of our saint. They were published, first of all by Colgan in the 17th century, and have been critically discussed by Dr. Todd in his *Book of Hymns of the Ancient Church of Ireland*. They are both evidently much later than the 5th century. St. Fiacc's hymn refers to the desolation of Tara, which took place in the 6th century, and the claim of Armagh to sovereignty over all Ireland. The traditions about Patrick, which are mentioned, are identical with those contained in the Book of Armagh, and simply confirm its statements. It is, however, a most interesting document from a philological as well as a historical point of view, and as such has been discussed by Dr. W. Stokes in *Goidelica*, p. 126; Windisch, *Irische Texte*, p. 11; Zeuss's *Grammatica Celtica*, ed. Ebel, p. 957, and by Zimmer in his *Keltische Studien*. Hft. 2, p. 160, all of whom agree in dating it between the years A.D. 700 and 900. The only remaining documents with any claim to notice as historical sources are the lives published by Colgan in his *Trias Thaumaturga*, which are seven in number. The first is the poem of St. Fiacc just described. The other lives are as follows:—The second life attributed to a Patrick junior, or some disciple of the saint who lived in the 7th century; the third life attributed to St. Benignus, a disciple of St. Patrick; the fourth to St. Aileran of Clonard, some of whose writings are still extant in Migne's *Pat. Lat.*; the fifth life was written by Probus; the sixth by Jocelyn, a Cistercian monk of the abbey of Furness, in the early part of the 12th century, while the seventh and last life is the most important of all. It is called the Tripartite life, from its three divisions, and, according to Colgan, was written by St. Evin in the 6th century. Dr. Reeves, however, points out (*Ecclesiast. Antiq. of Down and Connor*, p. 203), that it bears evidence on its face of having been written later than

the 9th century, an opinion in which the learned Roman Catholic historian, Lanigan, coincides. The 6th century was credulous enough, as the writings of Gregory of Tours proves, but still a very slight acquaintance with the acts of the saints suffices to show that the later Middle Ages alone could have produced the legends which abound in Colgan's Lives.

II. *Life and History*.—The authorities commonly used for the life of St. Patrick have been now detailed. We shall now briefly tell the story of his life as it may be derived from the primary authorities, his own writings and the Patrician documents which really belong to the 7th and 8th centuries, relegating Colgan's Lives to the department of legend which has grown up round St. Patrick's history. St. Patrick was born probably at Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton in Scotland. Bannavem Taberniae is St. Patrick's own description in the *Confession* of the residence of his parents, a name which cannot now be identified. (Cf. Archbishop Moran in *Dublin Review*, April 1880, pp. 291–326.) He was carried captive into Antrim when sixteen years of age, in one of those raids which Roman writers like Ammianus Marcellinus and Irish Annalists like the *Four Masters* show us were so prevalent during the second half of the 4th century. He became the slave of Milchu, the king of Dalaradia, the commencement of whose reign the *Four Masters* assign to the year 388, so that if St. Patrick became his slave in the very first year of his reign, he must have been born at earliest in the year 372. The locality in which he then lived is well marked. Dalaradia was the most powerful kingdom of North-Eastern Ireland. It extended from Newry, in the south of the county Down, to the hill of Slemish, the most conspicuous mountain of central Antrim. In the 7th century the traditions about his residence there were abundantly current in the locality, as indeed they are still. The exact spot where he lived is near the village of Broughshane, five or six miles east of Ballymena, where a townland Ballyligpatrick, the town of the hollow of Patrick, commemorates probably the position of the farm where St. Patrick fed Milchu's swine. (Cf. Dr. Reeves's *Antiq. of Down and Connor*, pp. 78, 83, 84, 334–348.) After seven years Patrick escaped. He then went to Gaul, and studied under Germanus of Auxerre. He remained for a very long period, some say thirty, others forty years, in Gaul, where he was ordained priest and bishop. He then returned to Ireland, visiting England on his way. He landed at the mouth of the river Vartry—the stream which now supplies Dublin with water—where it flows into the sea at the town of Wicklow, as Palladius had done before him. It was a very natural point for mariners in those days to make, though now a port diligently avoided by them. To ships sailing up the Irish coast, one of the most notable objects is Wicklow head, offering shelter along a coast singularly destitute of harbours of refuge. The Danes three centuries later soon learned its advantage, and founded a settlement there, whence the modern name of Wicklow. The nature of the harbour, too, formed a natural attraction to navigators like Palladius and Patrick. One of the striking features of Wicklow is its strand and murrrough or common, extending for some miles northward from the

Vatry, offering special opportunities for dragging up the small ships used by the travellers of those times. St. Patrick was received in a very hostile manner by the pagans of Wicklow. He landed, and quite after the fashion of modern times was received with a shower of stones, which knocked out the front teeth of one of his companions, St. Mantan, whence the Irish name of Wicklow, Killmantan, or Church of Mantan. (Joyce's *Irish Names*, p. 103; Colgan, *A.A. SS.* p. 451; Reeves's *Antiquities*, p. 378.) St. Patrick then made his way northward. He was compelled with true missionary spirit to seek first of all that locality where he had spent seven years of his youth, and had learned the language and customs of the Irish. We can even still trace his stopping-places. Dublin existed not in those days except as a small village beside a ford or bridge of hurdles over the Liffey, which served as a crossing-place for the great South-Eastern road leading from Tara to Wicklow, a bridge, by the way, not like our modern stone bridges, but such as are still found in the bogs of Ireland, composed of branches woven together, which serve to sustain very considerable weights indeed. St. Patrick sailing northward landed, according to Tirechan, at an island off the northern coast of the County Dublin, still called Inispatrick, as in the 7th century it was called the *Insula Patricii*, whence he made his way to the coast of the County Down, where he found his frail bark stopped by the formidable race which runs off the mouth of Strangford Lough. He sailed up this Lough, which extends for miles into the heart of the county Down, and landed at the mouth of the river Slaney, which flows into the upper waters of the Lough, within a few miles of the Church of Saul, a spot which has been successfully identified by Mr. J. W. Hanna in a paper on the "True Landing Place of St. Patrick in Ulster." Downpatrick, 1858. There he made his first convert Dichu, the local chief, and founded his first church. Dichu gave him his barn for this purpose, whence the name Sabhall (which is Celtic for barn) or Saul in its modern shape, which has ever since continued to be a Christian place of worship (cf. Reeves, *Antiq.* pp. 40, 220). From Dichu he soon directed his steps towards Central Antrim and King Milchu's residence, where he had spent the days of his captivity. His fame, however, had reached Milchu, and his Druids warned him that his former servant would triumph over him. So he gathered all his household goods, and setting fire to them perished in the midst just as St. Patrick appeared. St. Patrick now, A.D. 433, determined to strike a blow at the very centre of Celtic Paganism; he therefore directed his course towards Tara. He sailed to the mouth of the Boyne, where, as the Book of Armagh tells us, he laid up his boats, as to this day it is impossible for the smallest boats to sail up the Boyne between Drogheda and Navan, a canal, made in the last century, affording a waterway between these towns. Patrick proceeded along the northern bank of the river past the great Pagan territory of Brugh-na-Boine, still marked by those pyramids of Western Europe, Dowth, Knowth and New Grange, till he reached the hill of Slane, the loftiest elevation in the country, dominating the vast plain of Meath. The ancient life in the Book of Armagh is now marked by

touches of geographical exactness which guarantee its truth. They can, indeed, be fully grasped only by those acquainted with the locality. The hill of Tara is a well-marked elevation, some twelve miles in a direct line south from Slane Hill, with a plain between, so that there is no interruption of the view. Patrick determined to celebrate Easter on the Hill of Slane, and according to the custom of the early Christians lit his Paschal fire on Easter Eve, a custom which we know from other sources was universal at that time; (cf. Martene, *De Antiq. Ritib.* t. iii. lib. iv. c. 24, pp. 144, 145, and articles on EASTER, Ceremonies of, and FIRE, Kindling of, in the *DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES*, Vol. I.)

This fire was at once seen on Tara, where the king of Ireland, Laoghaire, son of Niall of the Nine Hostages (King of Ireland, A.D. 428-463, *Four Masters*, and Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 252), was then holding a convention of the chiefs of Ireland. Part of the ritual of the convention was, that no fire should be lit in his dominions on this precise night till the king's fire was lit on Tara. St. Patrick's act was a direct challenge of the king's edict, who thereupon proceeded to Slane to punish the bold aggressor. Then commenced a conflict between St. Patrick on the one side and king Laoghaire and his priests on the other, the narrative of which is marked by a series of miracles and legends, terminating, however, with the defeat of paganism and the baptism of great numbers of the Irish, including Laoghaire himself, who yielded a nominal adhesion to the truth. Before we pass from this part of our subject we may refer our readers to the great work of Mr. Petrie on the Hill of Tara, where the whole subject has been exhaustively discussed. With Mr. Petrie's aid the visitor to Tara can reconstruct the whole scene of St. Patrick's conflict, as set forth in the Book of Armagh; the vast earthworks there remaining bear witness to the rude hospitality of the kings of Tara, while the wells in which St. Patrick baptized are still flowing, or their sites at least well ascertained. The whole neighbourhood of Tara is in fact still redolent with the fame and actions of St. Patrick. Ten miles to the north-west are the remains of the great rath of Teltown, where he converted Laoghaire's brother, and where he founded the church of Donaghpatrick, on a site where ever since there has been a Christian church, the modern building though built in the Georgian epoch, reproducing the very dimensions of sixty feet which Patrick is said to have assigned to the original one (Tirechan, in Book of Armagh, see *Anal. Bolland.* t. ii. p. 40). After his triumphs at Tara and its neighbourhood, St. Patrick went first of all to Connaught, following the line of the great western road which led across the island. His visit to Connaught is amply proved. It is referred to by Patrick himself in his *Confession*, where he tells us that before he came to Ireland at all he heard the voices of the children from the wood of Fochlat, near the western sea, crying, "We intreat thee, holy youth, come and walk among us"; and then when we turn to Tirechan's *Annotations*, we find his journey described to the neighbourhood of Killala, where that wood was situated, together with circumstantial notices of the churches he founded on his way

thither, many of which can still be identified. Space will not permit us to describe St. Patrick's labours even so far as the Memoirs of the Book of Armagh would enable us, much less to enter upon those fuller details which the imaginations of the later chroniclers, collected by Colgan, have invented. He spent seven years in Connaught, passed thence into Ulster, where he founded the metropolitan church of Armagh in A.D. 445 (cf. *Annals of Ulster*; Todd, p. 470; Reeves's memoir on *The Ancient Churches of Armagh*, and his paper in the *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Acad.* t. vi. p. 447, on the System of Abbatial Succession in the Irish Monasteries). He then proceeded towards the south, where he spent seven years in Munster, paying, according to the later writers, a visit to Dublin, where wells are still shown in the gardens of Trinity College, and in St. Patrick's Cathedral, in which he is reputed to have baptized the inhabitants of that city, whose future eminence as a metropolis Patrick is said to have predicted. History, however, is obliged to confess that Dublin had then no existence as a city; it owes its origin to the military and naval instinct of the Danes, who first settled there nearly three centuries after his death. St. Patrick gets credit for a great deal of activity during the later years of his life. He is credited with legislating both for Church and State, upon which subject we must refer the student to the writings of Wasserscheleben, Petrie's *Tara*, p. 69, and the introduction to the Brehon Laws as translated by Richey and O'Mahony. The ancient Celtic laws of Ireland, their language and their nature, are far too delicate a subject for any save the most profound Celtic scholars to touch. St. Patrick died at Saul, near Strangford Lough, where he founded his first church. Ussher, in his *Index Chronologicus*, attached to his *Antiquitates Britann. Eccles.* opp. t. vi. ed. Elrington, makes 493 the year of his death, and his age 120 years, a number which is evidently based on a desire to parallel his career with that of Moses, a desire quite manifest in the structure and style of the ancient life in the Book of Armagh. The reader may, indeed, be referred to that index for a convenient synopsis of the facts and legends connected with St. Patrick, as Ussher had access to that Book of Armagh which we have so largely used. In giving this brief sketch of St. Patrick's life and labours, I have omitted all mention of the controversy touching his Roman mission, and I have done so because the controversy is interminable; those who wish to see what can be said on either side must be referred to Dr. Todd's life on the one hand, and to Cardinal Moran's *Essays on the Early Irish Church*, and his article in *Dub. Review*, April 1880, for the opposite view. I may, however, just mention that St. Patrick's own writings omit all reference to the Roman mission, the Life in the Book of Armagh also omits it, but Tirechan's *Annotations* notice it, and ascribe it to pope Celestine in the 13th year of the emperor Theodosius. This portion, however, of the *Annotations* seems clearly a 9th or 10th century addition, as the removal of St. Columba's bones to Saul, in the county Down, is mentioned in the sentence immediately preceding, an event which happened so late as the year 877 (Reeves' *Antiq.* p. 224).

III. *Legends.*—The legends which have grown up round the life of St. Patrick are innumerable. The best known will just be mentioned here. He is popularly said to have freed Ireland from demons, snakes, and toads, and even imparted such efficacy to the soil of Ireland that a portion of it carried to a land infected with poisonous animals, frees it from the plague. Mediaeval authorities, however, ascribed this action to a still earlier saint, Joseph of Arimathea, as Ussher relates in his *Antiq. Eccles. Britt.* opp. t. vi. p. 299. The legend arose thus, for it is simply a legend, as the exemption enjoyed by Ireland is mentioned by Solinus, a geographer of the 3rd century in his *Polyhistor* [Solinus in *Dict. GREEK AND ROM. BIOG.*] Reeves's *Adamnan*, p. 200, cf. p. 142). Tirechan tells us that Patrick resorted to Croagh Patrick, a mountain occupying a magnificent position over Clew Bay in Mayo. He spent the fifty days of Lent there in fasting and prayer, tormented at the same time with clouds of black-birds. This story was improved upon by Jocelyn. The black-birds became the demons and venomous reptiles of Ireland who came to assault St. Patrick. He drove them first of all into a deep hollow on the northern face of the mountain, still called Lugnademon, and thence into the sea. (Cf. Joyce's *Irish Names of Places*, p. 160, and Adamnan's *Life of Columba*, ed. Reeves, p. 206.) The story of St. Patrick's purgatory embodies another celebrated mediaeval legend. Patrick's purgatory is still, as for the past seven centuries, a famous place of pilgrimage for the Irish people. It is a cave on an island in Lough Derg, near Pettigo, in the county Donegal. According to Ussher, *Religion of Ancient Irish*, c. iii. opp. t. iv. p. 263, the earliest mention of it is in Henry of Saltrey, a monk of king Stephen's day. It was, however, then a place of celebrated resort, as Henry relates the adventures of a soldier named Owen, who went to make trial of it. Baring-Gould, *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*, 1st series, pp. 230-250, London, 1868, and T. Wright, *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, London, 1844, give a full account of this curious survival of the middle ages which even Giraldus Cambrensis recognised as only a device on St. Patrick's part to enforce upon a rude people the sense of eternal realities. (Girald. *Camb. Topogr. Hibern.* dist. ii. cap. 5.) Another legend concerns the Staff of Jesus, said to have been given to St. Patrick at Lerins, or some other island in the Mediterranean, prior to his Irish mission. Joceline and the Tripartite Life tell the story thus: St. Patrick landed on an island where he saw a withered old woman at the door of a house, bowed down with infirmities. A young man told him she was one of his descendants, while the mother of the girl, as he called the aged woman, was still more infirm. Patrick wondered exceedingly, contrasting the young man's state with the aged and infirm appearance of his alleged children, till the young man explained that Christ, when upon earth, had come to visit them, and conferred the gift of immortality upon them, but without adding the gift of youth and health to any but Himself. He further informed Patrick that he had left his staff or crozier to be given to him. Patrick refused to receive it unless from Christ's own hands, which took place a short time after.

This crozier was used by Patrick to drive the noxious animals into the Atlantic, and was preserved till the time of Giraldus Cambrensis at Armagh. It was transferred, after the Norman Conquest, to Christ Church, Dublin, where Archbishop Brown destroyed it at the Reformation, A.D. 1538, when many a relic of antiquity perished (cf. *Obit. and Martyrol. of Christ Church*, ed. Crosthwaite, and Todd, *Intro.* p. viii.). Perhaps the most celebrated legend of all, deals with the Shamrock, which has been adopted as the national emblem of Ireland, and yet there is none with less historical foundation. The popular story is that St. Patrick illustrated the mystery of the Trinity for the incredulous Laoghaire by stooping down and picking a piece of Shamrock which was growing at his feet. None of the histories down to the 12th cent. make any mention of this legend. The story formed the subject of a prolonged controversy in the third and fourth series of *Notes and Queries*, A.D. 1864 and 1869. (Cf. Moore's *Cybele Hibernica*, p. 73.) Mr. F. R. Davies, M.R.I.A., offered the best explanation of the origin of the legend, referring it to the reverence of the Druids for the trefoil. There are many other questions connected with St. Patrick which we can only glance at, but which are abundantly discussed in the works already quoted, or in those mentioned below. We cannot enter upon the controversy concerning the seven different persons with whom our St. Patrick has been confounded. The reader interested in that topic may turn to the index to Ussher's works in t. xvii. of Elrington's edition, and on p. 134. under the title St. Patrick, he will obtain abundant references on this point, which has also been discussed by Todd, Lanigan, Moran, Shearman, and every other biographer of our saint. It is necessary, however, to say a few words upon one point. The existence and work of the saint have been doubted because Bede makes no mention of him in his history. The argument from silence is notoriously an unsafe one; there are so many reasons which may lead a writer to pass over even a burning topic in his day. Thus, Josephus never mentions Christianity, though a contemporary of the apostles. There are sufficient reasons, too, which explain Bede's silence. He was an adherent of the Roman party in England, and had a horror of Celtic irregularities. He was a thorough Englishman, and hated the Britons with whom he identified the Celtic Church of Ireland. He took no interest then in the history of the Celtic church, which he looked upon as schismatical if not heretical. The silence of St. Columba and Adamnan—with one exception in his preface to Columba's life—concerning St. Patrick has also been objected. The following considerations appear to solve the difficulty. Patrick, in the first place, did not probably occupy the same place then in popular estimation which he does now. He may have been regarded as the founder of Armagh, but not as a national apostle. Distance has had its enchanting effect on St. Patrick's position. The documents in the Book of Armagh evidently prove that the position of Armagh was a disputed point in the 7th and 8th centuries. Armagh, indeed, only attained its present undisputed precedence in the Irish Church so late as the 17th century,

when three archbishops, Ussher, Macmahon and Plunkett, the two latter Roman Catholics, wrote learned treatises concerning its position. (Cf. Ussher, t. i. p. cxxix—cxlili; Plunkett's *Jus Primatiale*.) In the earliest ages St. Patrick's Trim seems to have claimed an equal, if not superior position to that of Armagh, a claim which may have somewhat to say to the position and precedence still claimed by Meath among Irish bishoprics, a point contested so lately as the past year January 1886. (Cf. Todd, pp. 149, 257.) But St. Patrick's existence is guaranteed not only by Adamnan's incidental notice, but also by the express acknowledgement of one writer of the Columban age and order, who must have been a contemporary of St. Columba himself. Cummiannus, A.D. 634, in his Epistle to Segienus, abbat of Iona, on the paschal question, expressly mentions St. Patrick, and calls him "Sanctus Patricius papa noster." (Ussher's *Sylloge*, opp. iv. 440; cf. Todd, l. c. p. 96.)

The paschal controversy again, about which Cummiannus wrote, throws an interesting light upon the date of the introduction of Christianity into Ireland. The Irish have sometimes been accused of Quartodeciman practices about Easter, which is quite a mistake. They simply adhered to the old Roman cycle, which was superseded in 463 by the Victorian cycle. [EASTER in *DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY*, Vol. I, p. 594.] The invasions of the barbarians then cut off the Celtic church from a knowledge of the more modern improvements in the calendar, which they afterwards resisted with a horror natural to simple people. The English surplice riots of Bishop Blomfield's time show how a much shorter tradition may raise a popular commotion. This determines the introduction of Christianity into Ireland to the first half of the 5th century. The alleged connection of the Irish church with Egypt and the East, as shown in art, literature, architecture, episcopal and monastic arrangements, would form an interesting article by itself on the peculiarities of the Irish Church. I can, however, only refer to Butler's *Coptic Churches of Egypt*, Oxford, 1885, where many interesting coincidences are pointed out; to Wassersleben's *Die Irische Kanonensammlung*, 2nd ed., 1885, *Intro.* p. xlii.; Warren's *Celtic Liturgy*, and the *Contemporary Review* for May, 1885, p. 742, and December, 1885, p. 906, where other references are given. The introduction of eastern practices from Gaul is conceivable, through, as Le Blant, in his *Christian Inscriptions of Gaul*, has proved, the wide spread of Syriac, Egyptian, and even Persian influences in Gaul when Patrick was studying there; the most striking instance being the existence of St. Abraham as set forth in Le Blant's 557th Dissertation. He was born on the Euphrates, was a confessor in the Persian persecution under Isdegerdes, and died an abbat in Central Gaul, Sidonius Apollinaris writing his Epitaph; cf. *Diss.* 211, 225 and 613, *Salvian. de Gab. Dei*, iv. 14, and the *Rev. Critiq.* Aug. 3, 1885, p. 100, which shows the prevalence of Oriental influences in cent. ix. a much more unlikely period.

Authorities.—(1) *Sources.* These have been already mentioned, the Book of Armagh as published in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, the Lives published by Colgan, St. Patrick's own writings,

found in a convenient shape in Migne *P. L.* t. liii., and the Annals of the *Four Masters* (O'Donovan's edition), being the most important. Colgan's Lives are not indeed all equally accessible. The *Tripartite Life*, which is most frequently quoted, has been translated by one of the most accomplished of modern Celtic scholars, Mr. Hennessy, of Her Majesty's Record Office, Dublin, for Miss Cusack's *Life of St. Patrick*, constituting, with translations of St. Patrick's genuine works, his *Confession* and *Epistle to Coroticus*, and other Patrician documents, the valuable elements in a work otherwise marked by the most amazing spirit of credulity. Jocelyn's life was translated about 80 years ago by Swift, and is a convenient edition of another 12th century life, which has considerably influenced modern traditions.

(2) *Literature*.—This division of our subject is immense. I can only mention the latest works on the subject, together with a few of the more prominent of the older writers. The latest work on St. Patrick is Sir Samuel Ferguson's treatise on the *Patrician Documents* in the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, Dec. 1885, and the next Benjamin Robert's *Étude Critique sur la vie de St. Patrice*, Paris, 1883, where a diligent use has been made of modern authorities, and, pp. 3-7, a convenient summary given of the literature of the subject. Warren's *Celtic Liturgy*, and Skene's *Celtic Scotland*, Wasserschleben's work quoted above, the writings of Todd, Whitley Stokes, Moran, Reeves, Petrie, Graves and Lanigan, scattered in the Proceedings and Transactions of the Irish Academy, as well as in independent volumes, should also be consulted. Lanigan's History, though written by an Irish Roman Catholic, and before many modern discoveries, is marked by a spirit of fearless honesty and courage. Shearman's *Loca Patriciana* is marked by an intimate personal knowledge of all the localities which lends a certain charm to his dry details. Bishop Graves's papers on the Book of Armagh in *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, t. iii., are models of acumen and research. Among the older writers we need only refer to Ussher's writings, specially his work on the *Antiquities of the British Churches*, t. v. and vi., of Erlington's edition, from which we have so often quoted, Ware's Works, ed. by Harris, and, from another point of view, the writings of Colgan. [G. T. S.]

PATRICIUS (11), abbat of Croyland, to whom Offa king of Mercia granted a charter of protection in 793 (*Monast. Anglic.* ii. 91, 108).

[C. H.]

PATRICIUS (12), April 28, bishop and mart. at Prusa, in Bithynia, under a proconsul Julius. His acts exhibit marks of authenticity such as Le Blant, in his book *Les Actes des Martyrs*, lays special stress upon. His date is uncertain. (Ruinar, *AA. Sinc.* p. 554.)

[G. T. S.]

PATRIMUS, monk, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (*lib. i. ep. 14*), who advised him to follow the spiritual life.

[J. G.]

PATRIPASSIANS. Origen, in his commentary on the Epistle to Titus, which we possess only in Rufinus's version, defines Patripassiani as those who identify the Father and the Son and represent them as one person under two different

names. One of the earliest consequences deduced from the teaching of Noetus and Praxeas by opponents like Hippolytus was this, if Christ was the same as the Father, then the Father had been born, had suffered and died, cf. Hippol. *adv. Noet.* c. i.; Tertull. *adv. Prax.* c. i. Patripassianism in fact was the Western name for the Sabellian heresy viewed from this particular point of view, Philast. *de Haeres.* c. 53; August. *de Haeres.* c. 41; cf. August. *Ser.* 52; Ceillier, ix. 237; cf. Hilgenfeld's *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, p. 615 [SABELLIANS]. The error seems to have revived among the Priscillianists of Spain in cent. v.; Ceill. x. 207. [G. T. S.]

PATROCLUS (1), legendary [LINUS, Vol. II. p. 728]. A Greek version of the Passions of Peter and Paul has been published from a Patmos MS. by Lipsius (*Jahrbücher f. prot. Theol.* 1886), but this is not the original of the Latin Acts, but rather itself a translation from the Latin.

[G. S.]

PATROCLUS (2) (ST. PARRE), 21 Jan., a martyr, supposed to have suffered under Aurelian, and commemorated by Greg. Turon. *Glor. Mart.* c. 64. His acts are told at length by the Bollandists, *AA. SS.* Jan. ii. 342-349. A curious story is told by Gregory *l.c.* which shows how his acts originated. Patroclus had a chapel in Gaul served by a solitary priest. The populace did not however esteem this chapel because it possessed no acts of his passion, and the priest saw the tide of popularity, with all its profits, passing away from him. A traveller came to him one day, and showed him a book which proved to be the very thing he required, the acts of his own saint. He sat up all night and copied them out, and then returned the book to the traveller, who went his way. The priest at once sought out his bishop to whom he showed the acts. The prelate was suspicious, however, taxed him with forgery, and, according to the stern discipline of the Gallic church, flogged him on the spot. An army, however, shortly afterwards invaded Italy, and brought back an identical copy of the acts, thus proving the good faith of the priest. The people thereupon built a splendid church in honour of Patroclus. [G. T. S.]

PATROCLUS (3), bishop of Arles, between St. Heros and St. Honoratus (A.D. 412-426). In 412 the people of Arles drove out Heros and elected in his place, Patroclus, a creature of Constantius (Prosper Aquit. *Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* li. 590). As bishop he is said to have sold ecclesiastical offices (Prosper Tyro, *Chronicon*, in Bouquet i. 638) and hoarded up stores of ill-gotten wealth (cf. the funeral sermon of Hilary of Arles upon St. Honoratus, cap. vi., *Patr. Lat.* l. 1265). He seems however to have commended himself to pope Zosimus, who conferred upon him unprecedented privileges of jurisdiction, and his history illustrates the relations of the French dioceses. On the ground that Arles was the fountain-head of Gallic Christianity, the pope confirmed to the see all parishes it had ever held, whether within the province or not, and gave Patroclus exclusive rights of ordination over the independent provinces of Vienne, Narbonensis Prima, and Narbonensis Secunda, and deposed Proculus bishop of Marseilles for infringing

these privileges by ordaining in his own diocese. On the ground also of Patroclus's personal merits, the pope in a letter addressed to all the Gallic bishops, forbade any cleric of whatever rank to visit Rome without first obtaining *litterae formatae*, or letters of identification and recommendation, from the bishop of Arles. See the pope's correspondence from March 22, 417 to Feb. 5, 418, which is chiefly occupied with Arles, *Epp.* i., v., vi., vii., x., xi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 643, 665, 666, 668, 673, 674. These privileges were productive of great dissatisfaction in the neighbouring provinces, and in the matter of the jurisdiction Zosimus's orders were virtually rescinded by his successor, Bonifacius I., who, in a letter written Feb. 9, 422, asserted the right of Hilary bishop of Narbonne, to consecrate the bishop of Lodève in his province, as against Patroclus, who had usurped it (*Epist.* xii. *Patr. Lat.* xx. 772-4). In 425 he was ordered by Theodosius to assemble for discussion the Gallic bishops who professed the Pelagian and Coelestian heresies, the emperor decreeing exile for such as should not recant within twenty days. Patroclus was murdered in the year 426 by a barbarian officer, probably one of the Goths who overran that part of Gaul in the previous year, at the secret order, as was said, of Felix, magister militum (Prosper. Aquit., *Chronicon*, *Patr. Lat.* li. 593-4).

[S. A. B.]

PATROCLUS (4), ST., Nov. 10, a recluse in Berri, celebrated in the sixth century for his austerities and miracles. Gregory of Tours gives his life in the rustic language in which he heard it. Born in the neighbourhood of Bourges, he was employed by his father, Aetherius, as a shepherd, but stung by the taunts of a brother who was destined for a learned profession, at the age of ten he deserted his flock, sought instruction, and applied himself to the acquisition of learning. As a youth he was attached to the service of Nunnio, one of Childebert's courtiers, to whom he endeared himself by his diligence and humility. On his father's death he devoted himself to conventual life, receiving the tonsure from Arcadius bishop of Bourges, and after a long life of austerity and solitude, interrupted only by the institution of religious houses, he died in his eightieth year, about 577, and was buried at Colombière, one of his foundations, in spite of the efforts of another of them, Nérus, to obtain his body. (Greg. Tur., *Vit. Patr.* cap. ix.: *Hist. Franc.* v. 10.)

[S. A. B.]

PATRON SAINTS AND ANGELS. The worship of the saints in its later form originated in the honours paid to martyrs at the shrine of their relics, *i. e.* in the worship of patron saints; while the selection of angels as patrons and their worship as such followed, as a corollary, on the establishment of saint worship. The present article is therefore an historical introduction to the whole subject of creature worship. Hence our first object must be to ascertain the practice of the first Christians; our next, to show how later ages gradually drifted into something very different.

I. *The Practice of the Apostles.*—With reference to the angels, St. Paul (Col. ii. 18) says: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels,

intruding into those things which he hath not seen." "Voluntary," or gratuitous, "humility" appears to express the very feeling which men professed, as we shall see, in the 5th century, when they declared themselves unworthy to go to Christ without a mediator, and therefore placed themselves under the patronage of the martyrs. It will be shown, as we proceed, that this was the meaning originally given to it in the church. St. John, in Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8, was not "intruding into those things which he had not seen" (for he plainly saw in his vision and conversed with the angel before whose feet he fell down to worship); yet the act was forbidden: "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God." We may add that this was in accordance with the traditional teaching of the Jewish church. Thus the Jerusalem Talmud says that, when one has a request to make of a great man, he first applies to "his favourite slave or his son, who then goes and tells the master inside, 'The man N. N. is left standing at the gate of the hall; shall he come in or not?' Not so the Holy: praised be He. If misfortune comes on a man, let him not cry to Michael, and not to Gabriel, but unto Me let him cry, and I will answer him right speedily" (*Quarterly Review* on the Talmud, No. 246, p. 457). We shall see the same illustration used by Christian writers.

Nor is there any trace in Holy Scripture of the invocation of martyrs, or of a belief that they exercised a special power on behalf of those who cherished their remains. Of John the Baptist, we only read that "his disciples came, and took up the body and buried it" (St. Matth. xiv. 12; St. Mark vi. 29). So again of the first martyr after Christ: "Devout men carried Stephen [to his burial] and made great lamentation over him" (Acts viii. 2); but not a word is said of any special value set on his remains, or of any posthumous honours paid to him. There is no reference whatever to the disposal of the body of St. James, the brother of John, whose death is also recorded in the Acts (xii. 2). Nor have we in or out of Scripture any authentic information of any special reverence shown to the remains of the Blessed Virgin, or of any of the immediate followers of Christ.

II. *Early Accord with Scripture.*—In the 2nd century we meet with facts which indicate a growing regard for the mortal relics of the martyrs. Such few remains of the body of Ignatius as had been left by the lions, A.D. 107, or of Polycarp by the fire, probably about 155, were carefully gathered, "a priceless treasure, left, as they were, to the holy church by the grace that was in the martyr" (*Martyr. S. Ign.* 6), "more precious than costly gems, and better proved than gold" (*Epist. Eccl. Smyrn. de S. Polyc. Mart.* 18). The bones of Ignatius were carried from Rome to Antioch, but in neither case is any motive for such care suggested other than an affectionate pride in the Christian hero, intensified as well as hallowed by religious enthusiasm. "We worship Christ," declared the church of Smyrna, "because He is the Son of God, but we love, as they deserve, the martyrs, as the disciples and followers of the Lord, and

account of their exceedingly good affection to their proper King and Master—whose partners and fellow disciples may it be our lot to become" (*Ibid.* 17).

The idea of a patron saint could not be built only on the opinion that the departed were pleased with the honour shown to their remains. It required, also, a belief in their particular intercession, of which we find no trace in the writings of the first ages.

The general teaching of the early fathers, as bearing on the worship of angels and martyrs, may be gathered from the following testimonies.^a Irenaeus, A.D. 167, declares that the church "does nothing by invocation of angels . . . but purely and openly directs its prayers unto the Lord the Maker of all things, and invokes the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (*c. Haer.* ii. 32, § 5). Tertullian, A.D. 202, "I cannot pray to obtain these things [the safety of the emperor, and the empire, &c.] from any other than Him from whom I know that I shall obtain them; because it is He who alone grants them, and I am one to whom that answer to prayer is due, as being His servant, who wait upon Him alone" (*Apol.* 30). Clemens of Alexandria, A.D. 211: "It is the extremity of folly to ask things from those who are not gods, as if they were gods . . . Wherefore, with good reason, seeing that the good God is one, do both we and the angels pray that some things may be given, and some assured to us, from Him alone" (*Strom.* vii. 7, § 39). Origen, writing about 247: "We must pray to God over all alone and the Only-begotten, born before all creatures, the Word of God, and we must entreat Him, as the high-priest, to offer to His God and our God the prayer that reaches Him from us" (*c. Cels.* viii. 26). "We must, therefore, seek to make the God over all well disposed to us, and to have Him propitious to us, who is made favourable by piety and all virtue. But if one wish also that others should be well disposed to him after the God over all, let him consider that, as the motion of the shadow of a body follows that body as it moves, so in the same manner does the possession of the good favour of all the friends of God, angels, and souls, and spirits, follow the good favour of the God over all. For they have a communion of feeling with those who are worthy of the favour that is from God. And not only are they themselves well disposed to those worthy of it, but they also co-operate with those who desire to serve the God over all, and are very favourable to them, and pray with them, and join their

^a We prefer to give in a note the much vexed statement of Justin Martyr, A.D. 140: "We reverence and worship Him (the Father), and the Son, who came from Him and taught us about those things and the host of the others imitating and made like unto Him, good angels, and the prophetic Spirit" (*Apol.* i. 6). This may mean (1) that the Son taught the angels as well as men, or (2) that He taught men about the angels as well as "those things" mentioned, or (3) that Christians revered and worshipped (*σεβόμεθα και προσκυνούμεν*) the angels. The last is the most natural rendering of the author's words, though the sense which it yields to modern ears could not have been that which he intended to convey. The words which we render by "worship," "adore," &c., were so vaguely used that they as often signified some low indication of respect as they did the highest acts of devotion.

entreaties with them. So that we venture to say that ten thousand sacred powers, without being invoked, are praying with those men who have heartily chosen the better part, when they pray to God" (*Ibid.* 64; comp. v. 5, where he teaches that a good disposition towards God is sufficient to make the angels love us and do all for us). Again: "If the saints out of the body who are with Christ do aught and labour for us, as the angels do, who minister to our safety, . . . let this also be classed among the hidden things of God and mysteries not to be committed to writing" (*Comment. in Ep. ad Rom.* ii. 4). Hilary the Deacon A.D. 354: "Men obtain access to a king through tribunes and officers; because the king is a man, and knows not to whom he ought to intrust the care of the state; but to obtain the favour of God, from whom nothing is hid (for He knows the deserts of all men), there is no need of a supporter [suffragatore], but of a devout mind" (*Comm. in Ep. Rom.* i. 22). By the worship of angels in Col. ii. 18, Hilary understood that of the stars, or perhaps astrology: "Infantur enim motum pervidentes stellarum, quas angelos vocat" (*Comment. in loc.*). He is unconscious of any practice among Christians with which the language of St. Paul might seem to clash. In the East, however, the council of Laodicea, held probably about 365, found it necessary to forbid "Christians to forsake the church of God, and go away and invoke [*ὀνομάζειν*] angels, and make [separate] synaxes" (can. 35). This worship it calls "clandestine idolatry." The several angels could not be invoked, unless names were given to them, as by the Essenes (Joseph. *de Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, § 7). Epiphanius, A.D. 374: "What Scripture hath discoursed about this? Which of the prophets hath permitted a man to be worshipped, not to say a woman? For she [the Blessed Virgin, who was worshipped by the heretics whom he is confuting] is a chosen vessel indeed, but a woman still, and in nowise changed in her nature, &c. . . . Nor is Elias to be worshipped, though among the living, nor is John, although through his own prayer he made his departure wonderful, or rather received that grace from God; nor is Thecla, nor any of the saints, to be worshipped . . . For if He will that none of the angels be worshipped, how much more she that was born of Anna?" (*C. Haer.* lxxix. 5.) "Let Mary be held in honour, but let the Father and Son and Holy Ghost be worshipped. Let no man worship Mary." (*Ibid.* 7.) St. Chrysostom, A.D. 387: "When we have to prevail on men, we must first treat with door-keepers, and persuade parasites and flatterers, and go a long way from home; but there is nothing of this sort with God; but He is prevailed on without a mediator [*χρησις μεσίτρου*], and will assent to our petition without money, without cost" (*Hom. de Poenit.* iv. § 4; comp. *Ecloge de Orat.* § 1, tom. xii. 444, ed. Ben.; and *Hom. in Ev. S. Matth.* 52 (or 53), § 2). This father was equally ignorant of the existence of angel-worship in his day; for interpreting Col. ii. 18, he only says, "There were some [in the Apostle's time] who said that we ought not to be brought [to God] through Christ, but through the angels; for that the former method is greater than becomes us" (*Hom. xii. in Ep. ad Col.* § 1). In 400, St.

Augustine writes thus of the angels: "Whom could I find to reconcile me to Thee? Was I to solicit the angels? With what prayer? With what sacraments? Many endeavouring to return to Thee, and, not being able, have tried these things, as I hear, and fallen into a desire for curious visions, and been held deserving of illusions" [which he ascribes to evil spirits] (*Confess.* x. 42, § 67). Elsewhere he says of them, "We honour them in charity, not by service; nor do we build temples to them. For they will not be thus honoured by us; for they know that we ourselves, when good, are temples of the most high God. Rightly, therefore, is it written (Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8) that a man was forbidden by an angel to worship him, but [commanded] to worship the one Lord under whom he also was his fellow-servant" (*De Vera Relig.* lv. § 110). Although in the 4th century undue honour began to be paid to martyrs at their tombs, we nevertheless find this father speaking as distinctly and decidedly on the subject of saint-worship as any of his predecessors. Thus in 389 he says: "I have known [among the bad Christians] many worshippers of tombs and pictures" (*de Moribus Eccl.* i. xxiv. 75). "Let not our religion be the worship of dead men; for if they lived piously, they are not such as to desire honours of that kind, but they would have Him to be worshipped by us, enlightened by whom they rejoice at our being partakers in their reward [meriti sui consortes]. They are therefore to be honoured by imitation, not worshipped from a motive of religion" (*De Vera Relig.* lv. 108). The later teaching was that they were to be worshipped as well as imitated. Later on, too, within our period, they were called intercessors; but St. Augustine (about 415), as well as Origen (see above), denies them the office implied by that title: "He is the priest who, having now entered within the veil, alone there of all who have borne flesh intercedes for us" (*Enarr. in Ps.* 64, § 6). And with regard to the angels, many years later in the East, Theodoret could still give this explanation of Col. ii. 18: "The advocates of the law introduced the worship of the angels to them. For this disease remained a long time in Phrygia and Pisidia. On which account, the council that met at Laodicea in Phrygia [see before] forbade by a decree that prayer should be made to the angels. To this day we may see oratories of the holy Michael among them and their neighbours. And this they would have done by common counsel under the plea of humility, saying that the God of all is invisible, and unattainable, and not to be taken hold of; and that it is meet to conciliate the divine clemency through the angels" (*Interpr. Ep. ad Col.* in loc.).

III. *Such Worship was held to imply Divinity.*—This was a principle inherited by the first Christians from their heathen, as well as Jewish, ancestors. "Varro says that all the dead were accounted by them *manes dei*, and proves it by the sacred rites which are bestowed on nearly all the dead, in which passage he also mentions the funeral games; as if this were the chief proof of their divinity, that games are not wont to be celebrated, except unto deities" (*Aug. de Civit. Dei*, viii. 26, § 1). The retention of this principle during the first three or four centuries is

another proof that patron saints were unknown to the ante-Nicene church. It will be seen that Christian writers so express themselves as to exclude patron angels also. Clemens of Alexandria, A.D. 192: "Believe, O man, in Him who suffered, and is worshipped, the living God" (*Protrep.* x. § 106). Novatian, 251, more directly: "If Christ be only a man, how is He present everywhere when invoked? . . . Why is a man invoked in our prayers as a mediator, since the invocation of a man is deemed of no avail to ensure safety?" (*De Trin.* 14.) When the heathen objected to Christians, that they worshipped a man, Arnobius, 303, declares Him to be God also, and says: "Seeing that He is certainly and without any manner of doubt God, do you imagine that we are likely to deny that He is in the highest degree worshipped by us?" (*Disp. adv. Gent.* i.) St. Athanasius infers from the prayer of Jacob, "The angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the lads" (*Gen.* xlvi. 16), that the angel must be "the Word of God whom he joined with the Father in his prayer" (*Or.* iii. c. *Arian.* § 12, i. 561). Similarly, on 1 Thess. iii. 11, he remarks: "No one would pray to receive aught from the Father and the angels or from any of the other creatures, nor would any one say, 'God and an angel give thee,' but from the Father and the Son because of their unity," &c. (*ibid.*).

Hence the Arians were charged with idolatry, because, holding Christ to be a creature, they nevertheless worshipped Him. Athanasius "We do not worship a creature: God forbid. That is the error of the heathen and the Arians" (*Ep. ad Adelph.* § 3, ii. 912). "Let them [the Arians] know, that, worshipping the Lord in the flesh, we are not worshipping a creature [as they do], but the Creator clothed with the created body" (*ibid.* 96, 15). Gregory of Nazianzus "What shall I say to them who worship Astaroth, or Chemosh the abomination of the Sidonians, or the figure of the star, . . . when either I do not worship the two [the Son and Holy Ghost] into whom I have been baptized, or worship my fellow-servants, for fellow-servants they [the two] are [on the Arian hypothesis], even if a little more honourable than myself" (*Or.* 40, § 42)?

The utter inconsistency of language like the foregoing with the practices to be mentioned in later sections in relation to patron saints or angels is too obvious to require comment. It is evident that for more than three centuries after Christ the whole church would have declared with Tertullian: "It is commanded me that I call no other person God, that I make none other God even in speech—not by tongue any more than by hand; that I do not adore or in any way whatever worship [quoquo modo venerer] any one other than that One [unicum illum] who enjoins this on me" (*c. Gnost. Scorp.* 4).

IV. *The Witness of the Liturgies.*—An undeniable proof that the primitive church did not worship the martyrs or other saints is the fact that she actually prayed for them. The evidence is extant in the ancient liturgies. Thus in the Clementine: "We offer unto Thee also on behalf of the saints who from the beginning have been well pleasing unto Thee, patriarchs, prophets, righteous men, apostles, martyrs," &c. (*Constit. Apost.* viii. 12); St. Mark: "Give rest to the souls of our fathers and brethren who have

fallen asleep in the faith of Christ, remembering our forefathers from the beginning, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs," &c. (Renaudot, *Collect. Liturg. Orient.* i. 149); St. James: "Remember, O Lord, . . . the orthodox whom we have commemorated and whom we have not commemorated from Abel the righteous unto this day," &c. (Assem. *Codex Liturg.* v. 46); St. Chrysostom: "We also offer unto Thee this reasonable service for those who rest in faith, forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, . . . especially for . . . the Virgin Mary, for St. John the prophet, forerunner," &c. (Goar, *Eucholog.* 78); the Armenian: "We pray that the mother of God, the holy Virgin Mary, John the Baptist, the first confessor St. Stephen, and all saints be commemorated in this liturgy. *Choir.* Remember them, O Lord, and have mercy upon them" (Neale, *Introd. Hist. East. Chr.* 594). Similar petitions are found in the Ordo Communis of the Syro-Jacobites (Renaud. ii. 18), in the very ancient liturgies of Theodore and Nestorius (*ibid.* 620, 633), &c. In the West the Mozarabic "offers on behalf of the spirits of those at rest, Hilary, Athanasius, Martin, Ambrose, Augustine," &c. (*Miss. Moz. Leslie*, 4). For many hundred years the Roman collects for the days of SS. Leo and Gregory contained this petition: "Grant . . . that this oblation may profit the soul of thy servant Leo," (or) "Gregory" (*Liturg. Rom. Vet.* ii. 25, 101). Innocent III. A.D. 1198, defended the alteration of this by pleading a sentiment of St. Augustine (*Serm.* 149, § 1; see also *Tract.* 84 in *S. Joan. Evang.* 15), which he alleges for Scripture, that it is "wrong to pray for a martyr to whose prayers we ought to be commended" (Innoc. *Opp.* ii. 764, ed. 1575).

V. Predisposition of Converts from Heathenism.

—We need not be surprised at the foregoing sentiment of St. Augustine; for it was during his life that the tendency which already existed to turn the martyrs into patrons and objects of worship became more marked and general. In the 4th century multitudes of semi-converts flocked into the church, whose prepossessions gradually led both to the corruption of doctrine and to the subversion of discipline. They had believed in the *genii locorum*, and in gods and heroes the especial patrons of cities and professions. They entered the church, therefore, ready, from their old associations, to attach a sacred presence to localities, and to elevate great men after their death into the especial protectors of classes and countries, if not at first of persons. If we clearly understand their previous opinions, we shall better see how these bore on the Christian superstition, and how natural was the transference of honour from the hero to the martyr. A few testimonies to the pre-Christian tradition are therefore desirable.

There was a widely spread belief among the Greeks and Romans in the presence of the spirits of the departed, especially of those who had died a violent death, about their tombs, and places which they had much frequented in life. Thus Plato says of those that had contracted great earthliness through habits of sensuality, "Such a soul is weighed down and dragged back again to the visible place through fear of the unseen and of Hades, as it is said, wandering about the monuments and tombs, about which

indeed certain dark shadows, phantoms of souls, have been seen, the *idols* that such souls present as are not thoroughly set free, but still partake of the visible, by reason of which they are also seen" (*Phaedo*, 30). Plotinus, speaking of those who have committed suicide under the influence of weak or base passions, says, "It must be that the soul on this forced departure should be bound yet more closely to the body, and in very deed for that reason is it that souls thus thrust out wander a long time about the body, or its tomb, or the place in which violence was done to it" (in Macrobius, in *Sonn. Scipionis*, i. 13). Macrobius affirms that a carnal soul "either wanders about its own body, or seeks the habitation of a new body, and that not human only, but also bestial, a kind being chosen suitable to its habits when in the flesh" (u. s. i. 9). So Porphyry held that "a depraved and irrational soul, when it leaves the body, is still compelled to adhere to it," and that the souls of those "who die by violence are detained about the body" (*de Abstina.* ii. 47, Taylor's tr. 82). This opinion of the Platonists was extended by popular superstition to all departed souls. "The vulgar," says Lactantius, "imagine that the souls of the dead wander about tombs and the remains of their bodies" (*Div. Instit.* ii. 2). Hence Tibullus represents himself as going to a tomb to intreat the aid of its occupant (*Eleg.* ii. vi. 33):

"Illius ad tumulum fugiam, supplexque sedebo,
Et mea cum muto fa'va querar cinere.
Non feret usque suum te propter flere clientem."

The belief that the manes of the dead could either hurt or help the living was universal, and, combined with a belief in their local presence, led to their worship as patrons. Hesiod says that the men of the golden age at their death became *δαίμονες*, "good, dwellers on earth, guardians of mortal men, watching over both acts of justice and wicked deeds, clothed with air, going everywhere to and fro on the earth, the givers of wealth" (*Opera et Dies*, 121). A part of this passage, with some difference of reading, is quoted by Plato (*de Republica*, Ast. iv. 292), who thus comments on it: "We will certainly accept this sentiment. For having consulted the deity how, and with what variety of rite, we ought to make both heroes (*δαίμονιοι*) and gods, we will so make them, and with such difference as he may teach us in reply. And why are we not to do so? From that time we will serve them as men who have become *δαίμονες*, and will worship their tombs, and we will observe the same custom when one of those who are deemed to have been excellently good in their life shall die from age or any other cause." This he asserts to have been done annually by the state, as well as by private persons at their will (*Menex.* Ast. 102). Examples are very numerous; e.g. "The inhabitants of Amphipolis having enclosed the monument [of Brasidas] both sacrificed to him as a hero and gave him honours, games, and yearly sacrifices, and made the colony over to him as to a founder" (Thucyd. v. 11). Τὸ θεῖον Βρασιδᾶ is instanced by Aristotle (*Eth. Nicom.* v. 7; Zell. i. 235) as an example of positive law. The citizens of Aenia "every year offered sacrifice with great ceremony to Aeneas their founder"

(Livy, xl. 4). Aelius Aristides, in his oration on the four heroes Miltiades, Themistocles, Pericles, and Cimon, says that they were "in a manner inhumed guardians and protectors of the Greeks, averters of evil, and good at all needs, and that they defended the country in no inferior degree to Oedipus, who was buried in Colonos, or any one who is believed to be buried in any other part of the country to the good of the living" (*Orat.* 44 in *Quat. Vir.* Dindorf, ii. 230). Pausanias, after telling us that the Oropii were the first to make Amphiaras a god, in which they were followed by the rest of the Greeks, adds, "I can enumerate others also who were men at that time who have the honours of gods with the Greeks" (*Perieg.* i. 24, § 2).

Plato, as we have seen, would "consult the deity" in reference to those who were to be thus canonised. To shew that this was actually done, we need only refer to Plotinus, who declares that the gods had by their oracles "ordered the anger of injured souls to be appeased, and that men should give honour to the dead, as yet conscious (which, indeed, all still observe towards the departed). And many souls," he adds, "formerly among men, after quitting the body, have not ceased to do good to men" (*Ennead.* iv. 7; Creuzer, ii. 871).

In these opinions and practices of the heathen in relation to departed heroes and others, we see the deep and broad foundation of the corrupt worship of the martyrs as the patrons of places, classes, and persons, and of its later offshoot, the worship of patron angels.

VI. *Acowals of Christian Writers.*—In ascribing to these opinions and rites a marked influence on the practice of the half taught Christians of the 4th century, and in time on that of the whole church, we are not following conjecture or probability. Eusebius of Caesarea, some time after 325, having cited Plato *de Republica* as above, remarks that such honours as he assigns to his heroes are especially suitable "on the death of those dear to God, whom you would rightly call soldiers of true godliness. Wherefore it is our custom also to go to their tombs, and to make prayers at them, and to honour their blessed souls, which things are with good reason done by us" (*Praep. Evang.* xiii. 11, p. 663). To the same effect Theodoret, after citing Plato and Hesiod, as above, argues: "If then the poet called those who had led excellent lives, and then died, both 'good and averters of evil and guardians of mortal men,' and the best of the philosophers sanctioned his dictum, . . . why do you find fault with our practices? For we call men averters of evil and healers who have shone in godliness and been slain for it, not calling them *δαίμονας* (may we never be so insane), but friends and loving servants of God who are bold of speech with Him, and promise us abundance of good things" (*Græc. Affect. Curat.* viii. ed. Schulze, iv. 915). The same writer says: "The Lord has brought His own dead into them (the temples converted into martyria) in the place of your gods, and has caused the latter to disappear, but assigned their honour to the former"; for, he adds, the heathen festivals of the Pandia, &c., have been replaced by those of Peter, Paul, &c., "and the other martyrs" (*ibid.* 923). Such being the language of writers esteemed Catholic,

we cannot be surprised at the effect on an independent mind, such as that of Vigilantius, to whom the cultus of relics, which was the practical root of patron-worship, appeared very like a return to heathenism, or, more correctly, the covert retention of one great feature of it: "Prope ritum Gentilium videmus sub praetextu religionis introductum in ecclesiis. . . . Ubi-
cunque pulvisculum nescio quod in modico vasculo pretioso linteamine circumdatum osculantes adorant" (Apud Hieronym. c. *Vigilant.* 4).

VII. *The Marvels of the Temple and of the Martyrium.*—Wonderful things (*miracula*, *θαύματα*), not to be referred to any merely natural cause, were said to happen in the temples and at the tombs of heroes. The mass of converts would expect phenomena of the same kind to attach themselves to the shrines of the martyrs, and what they expected, they would find. Such wonders would, moreover, be both multiplied and intensified by the excitement that frequently arose on the discovery or acquisition of the bodies of supposed martyrs (see e.g. Ambr. *Epist.* xxii. 9; Chrys. *Laud. Mart. Aegypt.*; Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 18, or Theodoret, iii. 10; Theod. iv. 36; Luciani *Epist. de Rev. S. Steph.* 8, in App. vi. ad *Opp.* Aug.; Greg. Tur. *Mirac.* i. 44, ii. 33; &c.). There appear to have been some real miracles of healing in the 4th century, as, for example, the sudden cures of a fistula and a cancer mentioned by St. Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8, §§ 2, 3), but these and others of the class had no connexion with relics, nor are they ascribed in any way to the merit of martyrs. They were granted to earnest faith and prayer alone. Those said to have been wrought by the martyrs have a more suspicious air. They are mysterious, and (assuming their truth) not to be explained with our present knowledge; but they are often only Christian counterparts of the old wonders of the temple. The resemblance was not denied, and Christians, believing in both, had to content themselves with pointing out the elements of difference. Thus St. Augustine: "The miracles which are reported to have taken place in their temples are in no wise to be compared to those which occur in the memoriae of our martyrs. Or if any seem alike, as the magicians of Pharaoh were conquered by Moses, so have their gods been overcome by our martyrs. The demons did those things in which they desired to be their gods, but the martyrs perform the other miracles, or rather God does them, they praying or co-operating, for the promotion of that faith by which we believe that they are not our gods, but have one God with us" (*Ibid.* xxii. 10).

Some of the alleged miracles on which the worship of patron saints (and through that of all saints) was founded, remind us of stories of modern "spiritualism"; others find a parallel in such phenomena (for instance) as were believed even by thoughtful and learned men to have been exhibited in 1727 at the grave of the deacon François Paris in the cemetery of St. Médard. They were, in a word, I would suggest with reverence, instances of a less common accident of human nature evoked and shaped by the condition of mind into which an enthusiastic multitude of half trained and half taught converts had been thrown by the change which they

had passed through, and the public calamities in which they all had a share. The occult cause of such manifestations is still unknown both to theology and science. To the early Christians, even with the highest knowledge of their day, but two alternatives were presented. They must either deny the fact, which, with the evidence before them, was in some cases impossible, or they must accept the solution which the traditions of the temple suggested to the multitude, and ascribe the wonder to the martyr whose relics sanctified the place. To the latter conclusion all at last came after some perplexity and struggle of mind, of which in the case of St. Augustine some proof is afforded both by his silence and his utterances (*u.s.* §§ ix.-xi.). His belief in the miracles said to have been wrought by the relics of St. Stephen, discovered in 415, would lead him a good way towards the popular view, but the extent to which he at last sympathised with it is not clearly defined. His testimony and that of many others will be given in the two following sections, to enable the reader to trace the rapid though gradual change which this new element of superstition effected in the opinions and practices of East and West alike.

VIII. *Growth of Superstition in the East.*—St. Basil and the two Gregories, his brother and friend, who flourished about 370, all show a belief in the particular intercession and assistance of martyrs. Thus St. Basil says of Mamas, "Remember the martyr, as many of you as have been visited by him in dreams. Let all remember him, who being settled in this place have had him for their helper in prayer, to whom, invoked by name, he hath been present at their work, whom he hath raised from sickness, to whom he hath given back their children already dead, to whom he hath granted a longer term of life" (*Hom. xxiii. in S. Mam. § 1*). Of the forty martyrs whose ashes had been mingled together and cast into a river, he says: "These are they who having taken possession of our land protect it, like closely set towers, from the inroads of the enemies, not confining themselves to one place, but already guests in many, and adorning many countries. He who is in affliction flies to the Forty; he who is in joy runs to them; the one that he may find deliverance from his troubles, the other that his better fortunes may be secured to him. There is found the devout woman praying for children, asking for the return of her husband, or recovery for him in sickness. Let your prayers be in conjunction with the martyrs" (*Hom. xix. in xl. Mart. § 8*). Gregory of Nyssa, in his *Oration on Theodore the Martyr*: "This, as we believe, is he who during the past year calmed the stormy fury of the barbarians, and stopped the terrible war of the savage Scythians" (*Opp. ii. 1010*). He thus addresses him: "Intercede for thy country with the king of all. For the country of a martyr is the place of his passion, and his fellow-citizens and kindred are they who have guarded him and possess and honour him" (1017). He further asks him to intercede with other saints less interested in the place: "Remind Peter; stir up Paul, and John the divine and beloved disciple also; to be careful of the churches which they have established" (1018). He buried his parents by some relics of the Forty Martyrs, whom he

styles, "strong champions against the enemies, and trustworthy advocates to intercede with the Lord" (*Orat. 3 in xl. Mart. App. 214*), "that at the time of the resurrection they might be raised in company with those allies full of good assurance" (*ibid. 211*). Gregory of Nazianzus, in a homily on Cyprian of Antioch, who, being confounded with him of Carthage, was more honoured at Constantinople than any of the other martyrs, appeals to him thus: "But do thou look down on us propitious from above, and be a shepherd to this sacred flock, or tend it with the shepherd, both directing other things for the best and driving away the grievous wolves" (*Hom. 24 in Cypr. § 18*). St. Chrysostom, before 397, referring to the chains of St. Paul, alleged to have been preserved at Rome, only says, "I would behold those chains at which devils are fear-struck and tremble, but which angels reverence" (*Hom. viii. in Ep. ad Eph. § 1*). Speaking of a destructive fall of rain at Constantinople in 399, he tells us that "the whole city ran like a torrent to the places of the Apostles and took the holy Peter, and the blessed Andrew. . . Paul and Timothy for their advocates" (*Hom. c. Ludos, 1*). The following passage, unlike his general language, exhorts to an invocation of the martyrs "Not on the day of this festival alone, but on other days, let us entreat them, let us implore them to become our patronesses" (*de SS. Bernice et Prosdoce, 7*). On occasion of some new relics being brought to the city, he says: "The bodies of these saints wall our city round, more securely than any adamantine and impregnable wall, and like lofty rocks, standing out all round, they not only repel the assaults of these sensible and visible foes, but overthrow the plots of the invisible demons and every crafty device of the devil. . . . If our common Lord be angry with us for the multitude of our sins, opposing these bodies (to His wrath), we shall soon be able to make Him propitious to the city" (*De Laud. Mart. Aegypt. § 1*). So any one in trouble is to fly "to His friends, the martyrs, the saints, who have pleased Him, and who have much freedom of speech with Him" (*Hom. viii. adv. Jud. § 6*). He especially dwells on the power of St. Ignatius at Antioch: "The blessed Ignatius sends home those who have recourse to him loaded with blessings, full of confidence, a generous spirit, and great courage; wherefore let us go to him, not this day only (his festival), but every day. . . . Not the bodies only, but the very coffins of the saints, are full of spiritual grace. . . . God hath therefore given us the relics of the saints, because He desires by their means to lead us to the same zeal, and to give us a harbour and sure comfort in the troubles that at any time befall us. Wherefore I exhort you all that, if any of you be in any distress of mind, or afflicted with sickness, or have met with injurious treatment or any other trouble of life, or be overwhelmed with sins, he come here with faith, and he will put off all those troubles, and return home with great joy. So that this treasure is useful to all," &c. (*Hom. in Ignatium Mart. § 5*). Asterius Amasenus, a contemporary of St. Augustine, says, "It is manifest that God, ever glorifying His own, even after death, works strange wonders at their tombs and resting-places" (*Hom. ad Sanct. Mart. p. 197, ed. 1648*):

"Though the stones cover their bodies," says Basil of Seleucia, 448, "they are yet able to save those in trouble who draw near them worthily" (*In S. Deiparam*, p. 598, ed. 1648). Theodoret, writing in 427, says of the martyria, "We frequently hold our assemblies (in their memoriae), and often even daily offer up hymns to their master, and those who are in health ask for the preservation of their health, those who are struggling with any disease, for deliverance from their sufferings; the childless ask for children, and the barren that they may become mothers; and those who receive the boon, that it may be secured to them. Persons going abroad beg earnestly for them to be their fellow-travellers and guides by the way, and those to whom a return has been granted offer an acknowledgment of the favour; not having recourse to them as gods, but entreating them as godlike men (*θελούς*), and begging them to become intercessors for them" (*Graec. Aff. Cur.* viii. Sch. iv. 921). Thus, according to this writer, prayer was already addressed to martyrs in the East. He further says: "The generous souls of those who have conquered now walk the heavens, and mingle with the choirs of the unembodied; but with regard to their bodies, no single tomb covers that of each, but cities and villages having divided them among themselves entitle them preservers of their souls and healers, and honour them as guardians of their city, and their protectors; and employing them as intercessors with the Lord of all, obtain the divine gifts through them. And though the body be divided, the grace remains undivided, and the small and minute relic has equal power with the wholly undivided body of the martyr" (*Ibid.* 902). The tokens of gratitude for answer to prayer, with which the heathen temples had been filled now reappear in Christian churches; but they are spoken of as offerings to God: "Some offer figures of eyes, some of feet, others of hands; and some those formed of gold, others of the material of silver. For their Lord accepts things small and cheap, measuring the gift by the ability of the giver. . . . These things proclaim the power of those lying there; but their power shews that their God is the true God" (*Ibid.* 922).

IX. *Progress of the Error in the West.*—Our first witness is St. Ambrose, who, writing in 377, says: "The angels are to be intreated for us, who have been assigned to us for a guard. The martyrs are to be intreated whose patronage we seem to claim for ourselves by some bodily pledge (relic). They can ask forgiveness of our sins, who, even if they had sins, have washed them in their own blood; for they are God's martyrs, our chiefs, and witnesses of our life and actions. Let us not be ashamed to make them intercessors of our infirmity, because they themselves were conscious of the infirmities of the body, even when they conquered" (*De Viduis*, ix. § 55). St. Jerome, about 390, tells us with approbation that a devout woman was wont to spend nights in watching at the tomb of Hilarion, and conversing with him as if present (compare Tibullus, as above, § v.), "ad adjuvandas orationes suas" (*Hilar. Vita*, 47). His body had been buried in a garden in Cyprus, but stolen thence and carried into Palestine; and yet, observes Jerome, "great signs are wrought in both places daily, but especially in the garden

in Cyprus, perhaps because he loved that place better" (*ibid.*). Paulinus of Nola says of the saints buried at Rome (*Poem.* xxi. 27):

"Pluribus haec etenim causa est curata patronis,
Ut Romana salus et publica vita maneret."

Speaking of the distribution of the bodies of the apostles, he says, with unconscious sarcasm (*P.* xxx. 26):

"Inde Petrum et Paulum Romana fixit in urbe (sc. Deus),
Principibus quoniam medicis caput orbis egebat."

Constantine transferred the bodies of St. Andrew and St. Timothy to his new capital:

"Ut sua apostolicis muniret moenia laetus
Corporibus" (*ibid.* 43).

Prudentius, 401, magnifies St. Laurence as one of the patrons of Rome. He had suffered there, and from his shrine in that city "tristis haud ullus redit." To him the poet prays (*de Cor.* ii. 529) in language which shews how fervid superstition can destroy the sense of incongruity:

"Ceu praesto semper adsies
Tuosque alumnos urbicos,
Lactante complexus sinu,
Paterno amore nutrias."

St. Augustine, about 400, recognised the advantage of praying at the shrine of a martyr: "The Christian people frequent together the memoriae of the martyrs with religious solemnity, both to encourage imitation of them, and that they may be associated with their merits and helped by their prayers" (*c. Faust.* xx. 21). In 404 he had been taught by Paulinus to believe that, at the shrine of St. Felix of Nola, God for his sake manifested His power in a miraculous manner; nor was he led to suspect the allegation by the fact, on which he remarked, that, although Africa was full of the relics of martyrs, nothing of the sort had happened there (*Epist.* 78, § 3). In 415 the burial-place of St. Stephen was thought to have been found, and Africa could soon boast of wonders as great as those of Italy (*Ep. Luciani de Revel. Corp. S. Steph.* &c. in *App. vi. ad Opp. Aug.*; *Ep. Severi, ibid.*; *Evodius de Mirac. S. Steph. ib.*). St. Augustine accepted these stories in good faith, and they evidently influenced his speculations. Of this discovery and the subsequent miracles, he speaks thus: "The place was shown by signs preceding, and as it had been revealed, so also was it found" (*Serm.* 318, § 1; see also *Tract.* 120 in *S. Joan. Ev.* § 4); "His body was hidden for so long a time, it came forth when it pleased God; it enlightened the earth; it performed so mighty miracles; though dead, it makes the dead to live, for it is not dead" (*Serm.* 319, § 6); "At Uzalis, where our brother Evodius is bishop, what great miracles are done, seek and ye will find" (*Serm.* 323, § 3). Of these miracles and others at Hippo, he gives many examples both in his sermons (322-324) and in his *City of God* (xxii. 8). Nevertheless there is no suggestion of prayer to the martyr. That was offered over his relics and heard for his sake; that is, because he prayed for the petitioner (*Serm.* 119, § 6): "Ipsium (Deum) habemus; ab Ipso petamus. Et si minus digni sumus, per amicos Ipsius . . . petamus. Orent ipsi pro nobis, ut donet et nobis" (*Serm.* 332, § 3). The martyrs were not

to be invoked ("suo loco et ordine nominantur, non tamen a sacerdote, qui sacrificat, invocantur," *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 10), but moved to intercession by compassion for those who thus honoured them. "I prayed daily," says one, "with abundance of tears in the place where is the memoria of the most glorious martyr St. Stephen." Being healed, he thanked, not the martyr, but God (*S.* 322; *Libell.* ad fin.). St. Maximus of Turin, 442: "All the martyrs are to be treated [colendi] most devoutly. But especially are those whose remains we possess to be revered by us. For they assist us by their prayers; they assist us even by their passion. With them we have a familiarity. For they are always with us, abide with us; that is to say, they both guard us while living in the body and receive us when we depart from it. . . . For therefore was it provided by our ancestors that we should mingle our bodies with the bones of the saints, that while Christ gives them light, the gloom of darkness may fly from us. Resting, therefore [in the cemeteries], with the holy martyrs, we escape the darkness of hell; by their proper merits indeed, yet partners in their holiness. . . . Therefore, brethren, let us venerate them in this life, that we may have them as defenders in that to come" (*Serm.* 61, p. 161, ad calc. *Opp.* Leon.). Valerian, bishop of Cemela in 450, betrays an opinion directly opposed to that of St. Chrysostom, Hilary, &c. cited above (§ II), when he declares that it is "unpardonable not to know how to intreat the friends of the King" (*Hom.* xv. *Opp.* 21, ed. 1633). Gregory the Great, 590, assigns to the saints, as Maximus (above) also appears to do, power to procure the forgiveness of sin, even in the day of judgment: "Hos ergo . . . in causa vestri examinis, quam cum districto iudice habetis, patronos facite; hos in die tanti terroris illius defensores adhibete. . . . Adsunt defensores nostri sancti Martyres; rogari volunt; atque, ut ita dixerim, quaerunt ut quaerantur. Hos ergo adjuutores vestrae orationis quaerite; hos protectores vestri reatus invenite" (*In Evang.* ii. *Hom.* 32, § 8).

X. *Could the Dead hear and see the Living?*
—During the period which we have traversed, though direct addresses to the departed were frequent, it was nevertheless still a question with many whether they know what is passing on earth, or can exercise direct power for the benefit of their votaries. All might be done by God, even unknown to them, though for their sake.

In the vision of Macarius, A.D. 373, which probably represents opinions widely spread in Egypt, the soul separated from the body is permitted "for two days to go wherever it likes on the earth with the angels who attend it." The soul that loves the body, he adds, spends the two days at the house of death or at the tomb, "but the virtuous soul goes to those places where it was wont to perform its deeds of righteousness." On the third day every soul passes from the earth. Until the 40th it is variously employed, but on that its final place is allotted to it (*de Exitu Animae*, Cave, *Hist. Litt.* v. *Maacar. Polit.*). Opinions like these were clearly inconsistent with superstitions already existing and daily gaining strength. St. Augustine, about 421, says: "It must be confessed that the dead are ignorant of what passes here, yet

only while it is passing here; but that they hear of it afterwards from those who dying go to them; not everything, indeed, but what they are permitted to tell, who are also permitted to remember those things, and what it is fit for them to hear to whom they tell them. The dead are also able to hear something from angels who are present at things done here; i.e. what He to whom all things are subject judges that each ought to hear. . . . The spirits of the dead may also know some things which it is necessary for them to know; i.e. those to whom such knowledge is necessary; not only things past and present, but even future, by revelation of the spirit of God" (*De Cura pro Mort.* xv. § 18). Comp. xiii. 16, where he denies in particular that they can see their own tombs or bodies. He concludes that, as the martyrs are thus cut off from us, "per divinam potentiam vivorum rebus intersunt;" but he does not understand "how the martyrs help those who certainly are helped by them—whether they are themselves present at one time in so many places, and those so distant from each other, at their memoriae, or wherever else they are found to be present," or whether they being altogether withdrawn from contact with the living but praying generally for us, God hearing their prayers sends relief by the ministry of angels as He judges fit, and so "commends the merits of His martyrs," and that "chiefly at their memoriae, because He knows that it is good for us, to build up the faith of Christ" (xvi. § 20; comp. *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 9). In one of his sermons, however (if it be genuine), apostrophising St. Paul and St. Stephen, he speaks more confidently: "Ye both see us there, ye both now hear our discourse. Do ye both pray for us" (*Serm.* 316, § 5). Gregory of Nazianzus shared the doubts expressed by St. Augustine in his more careful writings: "If thou hast any thought about our doings, and this reward is to holy souls that they can take cognisance of these things, receive this one oration instead of many, and in preference to many funeral gifts" (*Orat.* viii. § 23; sim. to Constantius, *Orat.* iv. § 3); but in one passage, he is bolder: "I am persuaded that the souls of the saints perceive what befalls us" (*Epist.* 223, ad Theclam). St. Jerome seemed to have had no misgivings. On the other hand, he ascribes a virtual ubiquity to the saints: "Wilt thou cast chains on the apostles, that they be held in ward until the day of judgment, and not be with their Lord, of whom it is written [Rev. xiv. 4], 'They follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth'? If the Lamb is everywhere, they who are with the Lamb are therefore to be believed to be everywhere" (*C. Vigilant.* 6). Vigilantius, to whom this argument is addressed, had denied that the souls of the apostles and martyrs could "de suis tumulis, et ubi voluerint adesse praesentes" (*ibid.*). That they heard immediately and directly was probably the belief of Prudentius, 405. At least it appears to me a just inference that he held this, after making due allowance for the language of poetry:

"Non sinunt inane ut ullus voce murmur fuderit:
Audiunt statimque ad aures Regis aeterni ferunt."
(*De Coron.* i. 17.)

"Illa Dei sita sub pedibus
Prospicit haec, populosque suos,
Carmine propitiata, fovet."
(*Ibid.* iii. 213.)

"Audit, cred., preces martir prosperrimus omnes.
Ratasque reddit quas videt probabiles."

(*Ibid.* ix. 97.)

To the same effect Severus, his contemporary: "Believe me, he will not fail us. No, he will not fail us. He will be among us as we discourse of him. He will stand by us as we pray. . . . He will protect us, as he did a little while ago, with his constant benediction" (*Epist.* ii. ad Aurel. pr. fin.).

XI. *Did the Martyrs themselves appear, and work the alleged miracles?*—An anonymous Greek writer, whose *Quaestiones ad Antiochum* are found among the works of Athanasius, says: "The shades and visions observed in the temples and tombs of the saints are not from the action of the souls of the saints, but from holy angels transfigured into the likeness of the saints. For how, I pray you, can the single soul of the blessed Peter, or Paul, appear at the same moment in a thousand temples sacred to him throughout the world" (*Quaest.* 26, iii. 274)? Similarly Anastasius Sinaita (*Quaest.* 89), who either borrows the words of Pseudo-Athanasius or is copied by him. St. Augustine thinks it possible that sometimes a martyr may himself appear or act, and sometimes an angel, "ut aliquando ista fiant per ipsam praesentiam martyrum, aliquando per angelos suscipientes personam martyrum" (*De Cur. pro Mort.* xvi. § 20).

XII. *The Effect on the Heathen.*—The heathen were not slow to observe and to ridicule the extravagant honours paid to the dead, even before they reached to invocation. In the scornful language of Libanius, about 350, Christians are already *οἱ ἐπὶ τοῖς τάφοις* (*Orat. adv.* xxv. *Apoog.* ii. 592). With him churches are tombs, and he expresses a hope that "the tombs will give way to the temples" (*Or. Funer.* in fin.). The emperor Julian, 363, used the same language, speaking contemptuously of "the old women who frequent the tombs" (*Misop.* p. 344, ed. 1696), and of Christian worship as the worship, "not of one man, instead of many gods, but rather of many wretched men" (*C. Christ.* in Cyr. Al. c. *Julianum*, vi. 201, *ibid.*). Again: "Who could execrate, as they deserve, your later inventions, your adding fresh dead men to that ancient dead man (Christ)? Ye have filled every place with tombs and monuments, although it has been nowhere prescribed among you, that you should frequent the tombs and occupy your elves with them. . . . If Jesus declared the tombs to be full of uncleanness, how is it that ye call upon God at them" (*Ibid.* x. 335)? It will be observed that he does not charge any with calling on the martyrs themselves. This excess was certainly as yet unknown. A heathen grammarian writing to St. Augustine about 390, after mention of certain martyrs of Madaura, where he lived, Migdon, Sanaë, and "the arch-martyr Namphanio," says, "The fools, if it is worth telling, deserting the temples and neglecting the graves of their ancestors, frequent the tombs of these persons" (*Ep.* 16, inter *Epp.* Aug § 2). So again in Eunapius, 404 (*Sophist. Vit.* in *Aedesius*, ed. Boissonade, i. 45): "Collecting the bones and heads of persons who have been convicted of many offences, whom the civil judicature punished, they both exhibited them as gods and, grovelling at their tombs,

tanced themselves made more than human by defiling themselves at their graves" (see Bois, note, ii. 158).

Thus early did an unhappy corruption enable the heathen to retort that their religion was the worship of dead men (urged by Minutius Felix, *Octav.* 6; by Arnobius, *adv. Gent.* vi. 4; Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* i. 15; Augustine, *Epist.* xvii. 3, *Serm.* 273, § 3, *de Civ. Dei*, iv. vii. 1; &c.), and that the temples of their gods were only glorious sepulchres (Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* iii. 44, 45; Arnobius, *u. s.*; George the Cappadocian in Ammian, xxii. 11; &c.). Hermes in his writings, observes Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, viii. xxvi. 1), "hoc videtur dolere quod memoriae martyrum nostrorum templis eorum delubris succederent; ut videlicet qui haec legunt animo a nobis averso atque perverso, putent a paganis deos cultos fuisse in templis, a nobis autem coli mortuos in sepulchris."

XIII. For details of practice, see PATRON SAINTS in the *Dict. of Chr. Antiq.*, 1578.—I am not acquainted with any book that treats exclusively or especially of patron saints. Works on the general cultus of the saints are, among others, J. Camerarius, *de Invocatione Sanctorum*, Graece, Lips. 1545; R. Montagu (bp.), *Treatise of Invocation of Saints*, 1624; Will. Forbes (bp.), *Considerationes Modestae de Invoc. Sanct.* Lond. 1658, Helmst. 1704, Frankfurt, 1707; Oxf. A. C. L. 1856; G. Morley (bp.), *Epistolae duae de Inv. Sanct.* Lond. 1683; Dean Freeman (Samuel), *Discourse concerning the Invocation of Saints*, in bp. Gibson's *Preservative against Popery*, vi. 4, Lond. 1738; W. Clagett, *Discourse concerning the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints*, Lond. 1686; reprinted in Gibson, *u. s.*; Caspar Sagittarius, *Dissert. de Natalitiis Martyrum*, Rotterd. 1699; J. E. Tyler, *Primitive Christian Worship*, Lond. 1840, 1847.

On the patronage of angels especially, see Steph. Clotz, *Tractatus de Angelotria*, Rostoch. 1636; Joh. Prideaux, *The Patronage of Angels*, Oxf. 1636. [W. E. S.]

PATROPHILUS (I) of Scythopolis, one of the original Arian party, who took a leading part in all their principal acts, and proved himself one of the most relentless opponents of Athanasius, by whom he is designated as a *πνευματόμαχος* (*Adv. Serap.* iv. 7, p. 360). (3.) He enjoyed considerable reputation for theological learning, and trained Eusebius of Emesa in the exposition of Scripture (*Socr. H. E.* ii. 9). When Arius, driven from Alexandria, took refuge in Palestine, Patrophilus was one of the Palestinian bishops who espoused his cause most warmly, and wrote in support of his teaching (Athanas. *de Synod.* p. 886) and in A.D. 323 joined with Paulinus of Tyre, and Eusebius of Caesarea, in summoning a local synod, which granted to Arius permission to hold private religious assemblies (*Soz. H. E.* i. 15). At Nicaea he was one of the seventeen episcopal partisans of Arius, and united with them in drawing up a creed which was indignantly rejected by the council (*Theod. H. E.* i. 7). His enmity to Athanasius being embittered by defeat, he became one of his most relentless persecutors. In A.D. 330 he took part in the synod at Antioch, by which Eustathius was deposed

(Theod. *H. E.* i. 21). At the Synod of Tyre in A.D. 335 he was one of the most active in bringing about the condemnation of Athanasius (Labbe, ii. 436; Athanas. *Apolog. c. Arian.* c. 73, 74, 77), and in the same year he attended the abortive synod of the Dedication at Jerusalem (Socr. *H. E.* i. 33; Soz. *H. E.* ii. 26; Theod. *H. E.* i. 31), and passing thence to Constantinople at the empress's command, denounced Athanasius as having threatened the imperial city with starvation by preventing the sailing of the Alexandrian corn ships, and procured his banishment to Treves (Socr. *H. E.* i. 35. Theod. *H. E.* i. 31; Theophan. p. 26; Athanas. *Apol. c. Ar.* c. 87). We find him again in A.D. 341 taking part in the ambiguous council of Antioch, in *Encænus* (Soz. *H. E.* iii. 5). He was one of the ordainers of George, the violent heterodox intruder into the see of Alexandria in A.D. 353 (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 8), and he and his leader Acacius kept entirely aloof from Athanasius when Maximus of Jerusalem welcomed him on his return from banishment in A.D. 346, and before long contrived to establish Cyril in Maximus's place as their own nominee (Theophan. p. 34; Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, p. 145). He was one of the few Eastern bishops who attended the council of Milan in 355 (his name appearing erroneously in the lists, as Stratophilus), and he took part in the condemnation and deposition of Eusebius of Vercellae, on whose banishment much against his wish to his episcopal city of Scythopolis, Patrophilus "his jailer," as Eusebius calls him, vented his annoyance by studied insults and ill-treatment (Euseb. *Vercell. Epist.* apud Baronius *Annal.* 356, No. 93). According to Philostorgius (*H. E.* iv. 8-10) Patrophilus poisoned the mind of Constantius against Basil of Ancyra, who had at one time exercised unbounded influence over him, and was the proposer of the specious but mischievous scheme of breaking up the proposed general council into two. When the Eastern division met at Seleucia, Sept. 27, 359, Patrophilus was a leading member of the shifty Acacian party pledged to the Homoeousion. An attack of ophthalmia prevented his attending the first session (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 39). Finding the majority of the synod against them he and his party refused to take part in the later sessions, and at the fourth sitting, Oct. 1, he shared in the sentence of deposition passed on Acacius and his followers. The nominal charge on which Patrophilus was deposed was that of contumacy, in not having appeared to answer an accusation brought against him by the presbyter Dorotheus (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 40; Soz. *H. E.* iv. 23). He immediately returned home, where he was kept informed by Acacius of the course events were taking in the Synod held at Constantinople the next year (Jan. A.D. 360), when Aetius and the Anomoeans were condemned, and several of the leading Semiarians deposed, the Ariminian creed was imposed and Eudoxius enthroned bishop of Constantinople (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 43). He must have died very soon afterwards, for his grave was desecrated during the temporary pagan reaction under Julian in 361, when his remains were scattered and his skull was mockingly used as a lamp (Theoph. p. 40; Niceph. x. 13; *Chron. Rasch.* ed. Ducauge, 1688, p. 295) (Tille-

mont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. vi. vii.; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 683. [E. V.]

PATROPHILUS (2), bishop of Egeae, in Cilicia, a friend of Eustathius of Sebaste and of Basil, who after Basil's breach with Eustathius remained a long time without writing to him, and at last sent a letter expressing his surprise that Basil should regard Eustathius as an enemy after having so long been his friend and protector. Basil, in his reply narrates at considerable length the circumstances and occasion of his separation from Eustathius, and requests Patrophilus to inform him whether he desires to remain in communion with him or to join that of his enemies (Basil, *Ep.* 224 [82]; Labbe, vii. 489). After some delay Patrophilus expressed his desire to retain Basil's friendship, and urged him to resume his former relations with Eustathius. Basil, in his reply, gives his reasons for retaining his former attitude towards one who had adopted heretical views, and had engaged in a schismatical course of action. (*Ibid.* *Ep.* 250 [85]), (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 895). [E. V.]

PATRUINUS, bishop of Merida, succeeded IDACIUS (1) c. 387, and presided at the first council of Toledo held in A.D. 400 against the Priscillianists. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can., de la Igl. Esp.* ii., 174; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (1) 389.) His see is not there mentioned, but Innocent I. mentions his successor Gregorius as bishop of Merida. (*Epp.* 3, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 491.) As the letter was written c. 404, Patruinus must have died soon after the council. (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 161.) [F. D.]

PAULA (1). (Cyp. *Ep.* 42.) A "sarcinatrix" excommunicated at Carthage as an adherent of Felicissimus by Rogatian. The employment is often mentioned in inscriptions, and was one of the offices of the Domus Augusta. See Orelli, *Inserr.* 645, (5372), 7275; a fine monument ap. Gruter, p. m.cxxvii, 9, "Fausta Saturnia Sarcinatrix Proculeio Verna suo puero ingeniosissimo," and five inscriptions on p. MDCXXX, where two of them have Greek names, and three are libertae; one is of "Julia Jucunda Aug. l. sarcinatrix a mundo muliebri," etc. Archbishop Lavigerie communicates to De Rossi one from Caesarea in Mauritania viz., "Rogata Sarcinatr. Saturno v. l. a. s. (Mommsen, viii. 2, 10938).

What the office was seems scarcely doubtful, if the passages quoted by Forcellini are compared. *Frontin.* p. 2192, *Putsch*, "Sartrix quae sarcit, sarcinatrix quae sarcinas servat;" *Non.* c. i. 276, "Sarcinatrices non, ut quidam volunt, sarcitricae quasi a sarciendo, sed magis a sarcinis quod plurimum vestium sumant;" but, as Paulus, *Dig.* l. 47, tit. 2, 83 (82), says, "Sarcinator, qui polienda aut sarcienda vestimenta accipit," etc., it seems that, though the grammarians are anxious about the formation of the words, their account is consistent with the employment being that of a "seamstress" or "mender," their *sarcinae* being packs of clothes. In *Dig.* l. 15 tit. 1, 27 (Gaius), it is coupled with that of "textrix," as an "artificium vulgare." So in Plant. *Aulul.* iii. 541, the "sarcinatores" are named with the "fullones," and in Lucil. *Ap. Non.* c. 2, n. 818, the sarcinator makes a

patchwork quilt, "centonem suit." What the *machinae* are in Varro, *Ap. Non. l. c.* "Homines rusticos in vindemia incondita cantare, sarcinatrices in machinis," is not so clear. This is of use with other passages [cf. AUGUSTINUS] only to mark the class in which the faction of Felicissimes prevailed. [E. W. B.]

PAULA (2), a noble and wealthy Roman lady, who accompanied Jerome to Palestine in 385, and lived the rest of her life at Bethlehem, dying in 404. The chief facts relating to her life were given in Jerome's Epitaphium of her addressed to Eustochium (Jerome, *Ep.* 108, *Ed. Vall.*) She was born in 347, and while quite young was married to the senator Toxotius, of the Julian family, who traced their descent from Aeneas. Through her mother Blasilla she was connected with the Scipios, and the Gracchi, through her father Rogatus with a Greek family, who traced their descent from Agamemnon. Her family was also connected with the Emilian gens, and her name was taken from that of the illustrious Paulus. Jerome records these ancestral glories in her epitaph,

Scipio quam genuit, Pauli fudere parentes,
Gracchorum soboles, Agamemnonis inclyta proles.

She was possessed of great wealth, owning, amongst other properties, the town of Nicopolis or Actium. During her early married life, though always without reproach in her character, she lived in the usual luxury of Roman patricians. She gave birth to four daughters, Blasilla (*q. v.*), who married, but lost her husband and died early in 384; Paulina, wife of Pammachius (*qq. v.*); Julia, called Eustochium (*q. v.*) and Ruffina, who died early, probably in 386; and one son, called after his father Toxotius. After the birth of a son, she appears to have adopted the practice of continency (*Jer. Ep. cviii. 4*), but to have still lived with her husband, whose death (probably in 380) she deeply lamented. In 382, during the synod held at Rome (following on the council of Constantinople), she entertained in her house the bishops Epiphanius of Salamis and Paulinus of Antioch, and by them her ascetic tendencies, already considerable, were heightened. Through them Jerome, who had come to Rome with them, became intimate with her. She imbibed through him her love for the study of Scripture, and, with her daughter Eustochium, attended his readings at the palace of Marcella. She gave vast sums to the poor, spending not only her own fortune but that of her children in charity. She assumed a coarse dress and a sordid appearance, and undertook all sorts of menial duties in the relief of distress. But her mind was set upon the monastic life, and upon the country of the Eastern hermits. After the death of her daughter Blasilla in 384, she determined to quit Rome, and, early in 385, disregarding the tears of her son Toxotius, then a child, who was left to the wardship of the praetor, and the entreaties of Ruffina, then a girl of marriageable age, who begged her mother to wait till she was married, she sailed for the east. After visiting Epiphanius in Cyprus, she rejoined Jerome and his friends at Antioch. In his company she passed, braving the winter's journey through Lebanon, on to Palestine [see the account of

their journey in the article HIERONYMUS—Section on *Emigration to Palestine*], and to Egypt, from whence returning the whole party settled in Bethlehem in the autumn of 386.

Their life there is related in the article on Jerome, and only personal details need here be given. Her letter to Marcella inviting her to come to Palestine (Jerome, *Ep.* 46) shows the enthusiastic delight with which these Roman ladies, to whom the scriptures were like a newly found treasure, regarded every place and association in the Holy Land. Paula and Eustochium lived at first in a cottage till their convent and Hospice (Diversorium) were built. They then founded a monastery for men, and a convent of three degrees for women, who lived separately, though having the same dress, and met for the services. Paula's capacity of management, her patience and her tact, are warmly praised by Jerome (*Ep. cviii. c. 19*). She is said by Palladius (*Hist. Laus. 79*) to have had the care of Jerome, and to have found it a difficult task. Her scriptural studies, begun in Rome, were carried on earnestly at Bethlehem. She had (through her father's family) a good knowledge of Greek as well as of Latin, and she learnt Hebrew in order to be able to repeat and sing the Psalms in the original (*c. 26*). She read constantly with Jerome, so that they went through the whole of the Bible together (*Ib.*) In his account of his writings in the catalogue (*De Vir. Ill. 135*) written in 392, Jerome says: "Epistolarum ad Paulam et Eustochium, quia quotidie scribuntur, incertus est numerus." She was remarkably teachable, and imbibed Jerome's instructions so thoroughly that when doubts were suggested to her by Origenistic teachers, she was able at once, with his help, to put them aside. Her incessant charities had consumed her fortune and much of her children's, so that Jerome states that she left Eustochium with a great debt, which she could only trust the mercy of Christ would enable her to pay (*c. 15*). It is believed that Jerome himself, who had in vain counselled her prudence and moderation (*Ib.*), gave pecuniary help in her later years to one who had been among the wealthiest women in Rome. Her health was weak, and her body slight; her mortifications and frequent illnesses, against many of which Jerome remonstrated, and which gave occasion to some scandals, had worn her away; and it was not to be wondered at that in her 57th year (404) she should have sunk under a severe attack of illness. Jerome describes with the deepest feeling the scene at her death, the personal attention of her daughter to all her wants, the concern of the whole Christian community. The bishops of the surrounding cities were present. John, of Jerusalem, who only four years before, had been at strife with the convents of Bethlehem, was there. Her funeral was a kind of triumph, the whole church being gathered together to carry her to her resting place in the centre of the cave of the Nativity. She is reckoned as a saint by the Roman church, her day, that of her death, being the 26th of January. [W. H. F.]

PAULA (3), granddaughter of foregoing, daughter of Toxotius, and of Laeta, the daughter of Albinus, who was still a heathen and a priest.

Laeta embraced Christianity, and wrote to consult Jerome as to the education of her child. This advice is given in his letter to Laeta (*Ep.* 107), written in the year 401. He desires that she should lead the ascetic life, and prepare to consecrate herself to Christ in virginity; and he begs that, if it is found impossible to carry out the system of instruction in scriptural knowledge, which he prescribed, at Rome, she might be sent to Bethlehem. We find that Paula had thoughts of returning to Rome to instruct or to bring back her granddaughter, and it is probable that the younger Paula was sent, while still a child, to Bethlehem, though not till after the death of her grandmother. Several of Jerome's commentaries are dedicated to her with her aunt Eustochium, and she is mentioned by both Jerome and Augustine in their correspondence in the year 416. (Jerome, *Ep.* 134 to Aug. 143, to Augustine.) [W. H. F.]

PAULIANISTS (Pauliani, Aug. *Haer.* xlv. Samosatensiani, Fabric; alias Samosatitae, Suicer. *Thes. s. v.*; *Παυλιανιστῆς*, alias *Παυλιανοί*, Suidas s. v. *Μάνης*), the followers of Paul of Samosata. We first notice them as an organized sect in one of Constantine's earliest laws against the Marcionites, Montanists, and other heretics, *Eus. Vit. Const.* iii. 63-66. We next find mention of their clergy, deaconesses, &c., in the 19th Canon of Nice, where their baptisms and ordinations were all rejected and ordered to be repeated. Athanasius (*Or. c. Ar.* sec. 48) mentions them as using the formula of baptism in a deceitful sense. In later times they were often confounded with the Paulicians and Manicheans. Georg. Cedrenus in fact (*Compen. l.* i. 756-57) tells us the reason; the Paulianists were merely Manicheans who adopted Paul's name because he was the son of a Manichean woman named Callinice. They were still in existence in the seventh century, as Sergius the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople sought the assistance of a Paulianist theologian, one George, in his struggle with orthodoxy (Ceill. xii. 922).

[G. T. S.]

PAULICIANI, an ancient sect of the Eastern church.* It originated in the 7th century on the south-western borders of Armenia, in the countries sometimes assigned to Syria and sometimes to Asia Minor. It spread its ramifications with varying fortunes through all the provinces of Asia Minor, and held its ground with more or less success during at least the three centuries from Constantine IV. to John Zimisces, 668-976. More has been preserved in detail of the history of the Paulicians than is usually the case with the ancient sects. We owe this mainly to their later military exploits, when they for a

* See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vols. v. vi.; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii.; Gibbon, ch. 54; Milner, cent. ix.; Millman, *Lat. Chr.* vol. iv.; J. C. Robertson, *Ch. Hist.* vols. iii. iv. v.; Hallam, *Middle Ages*, vol. ii. 439; Finlay, *Greek Hist.* vols. ii. iii.; Bossuet, *Hist. des Var.* lxi. 13; Schmidt, *Hist. des Cathares*, &c., 2 vols.; Page's Baronius; Schröckh's *Christ. Kirch.* xx.; Gfrörer, *Kirchen Gesch.* ii.; Döllinger's and Gieseler's *Lehrbuch*; Guericke's *Handbuch*; Engelhardt's *Handbuch*; Matter, *Hist. Univ. de l'Egl. Chrét.*; Henke, *Gesch. der Christl. Kirche*; Beausobre, *Hist. Man.* ii. 762, 777; Trench, *Lect. Eccl. Hist.*

while challenged the whole force of the empire. The Paulicians are noticed at greater or less length by almost all the historians of the Romans of the East, and referred to in the ecclesiastical documents. The rise and development of the Paulician sect are one of the rare oases in the Great Sahara of the Byzantine ecclesiastical annals. The two original authorities to whom we have recourse for the most complete information are Petrus Siculus (*Historia Manichaeorum*, with three discourses in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* vol. civ.) and Photius (*Contra Manichaeos*, Books I.-IV. in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* vol. cii.). Petrus Siculus in 870, under the reign of Basil Macedo, was sent ambassador to the Paulicians in their stronghold of Tephrike (Divriki) to treat for an exchange of prisoners. He lived there nine months. He collected his account of the Paulicians, he tells us, during this residence at the capital of the insurgent sect. His treatise is addressed to an unnamed "archbishop of the Bulgarians." Photius states that he derived his information from confessions of Paulician converts, who applied to him for baptism. Probably Photius embodies materials collected when he was ambassador from the Byzantine Emperor to the caliph, before his patriarchate (Dedicatory letter to Tarasius prefixed to the "*Bibliotheca*," Migne, *Patr. Gr.* vol. ciii.). The Paulicians were making incursions into the Roman provinces; they were infesting the frontiers of both empires; negotiations on the subject would be certain to come into diplomatic discussion. The travels of Photius through Asia Minor from Constantinople to Bagdad gave rich opportunity for observation and enquiry. After his deposition from the patriarchate, the last years of his life were spent by Photius in Armenia at a monastery in the Paulician neighbourhood, where he died 891. Later Byzantine histories mainly repeat the same details, occasionally supplying fresh material; viz., Theophanes, *Chronographia*; Theophanis *Contin.* iv.; George Hamartolus, § 238; Josephus Genesius, 120-125; Constantin. Porphyrog. *Vita Basil.*; Georgius Monachus (*Script. post Theoph.*); Georgius Cedrenus, i. and ii.; Joannes Zonaras, xv. xvi. xvii.; Anna Comnena, *Alexiad.* xiv.; Michael Glycas, *Annal.*; Joannes Seylitzes, *Hist.*; Nicetas Choniates; Euthymius Zigabenus.

1. Paulicianism has attracted attention as one important stage in the descent of the Manichaean tradition. The Paulicians did not adopt fully from the older Manichaeism its wild, half-poetic, half-rationalistic theory of Christianity, with its cumbersome and fantastic mystic machinery. They were probably, at least most of the sect, not altogether Manichaean. They adhered only to the broader principles of Orientalism. Yet they embraced opinions sufficiently resembling Manichaean tenets to justify their being included under the name, like other branches of the ancient Gnostic sects, so extremely numerous and diversified, who were finally lost in the common term of opprobrium. Though the application of the name has been keenly contested, it is clear that all the original authorities call the Paulicians "Manichaeans" in origin and doctrine. They were the Albigenes of the East.

2. An interest attaches to the Paulician sect from the place it occupies in ecclesiastical his-

tory as an early "Protestant" element. The Paulicians persistently rejected the vast fabric of traditional belief, which in the Greek and Latin church had grown up around the Gospel. With all disadvantages they were in truth a stronger reactionary party in favour of first principles than the Iconoclasts, their contemporaries. Iconoclasm was essentially negative and merely destructive, as its name expresses. The Paulicians, as their name implies, combined, with their partial Gnosticism or Manichaeism, a powerful and enduring element of good in their peculiar reverence for the writings of St. Paul. Consequently they represented and upheld, amidst their many errors, a powerful and enduring Protestant principle. Amidst their singular fusion and confusion of St. Paul's high moral antagonism of sin and grace in the soul of man, with the eternal war of the impersonated and deified powers of good and evil throughout the worlds, and other such admixtures of Oriental thought, they were a steady protest in favour of the right of the laity to the possession and use of the Holy Scriptures. They were, in this respect, under the Byzantine despotism, what the Donatists, Lollards, Waldenses, and Puritans have been in other times and places.

3. The severe persecutions which the Paulicians endured constitute a marked epoch in the tragic history of intolerance. The wars carried on by the Byzantine emperors against them are the first great example of an orthodox crusade against heretics. They are the earliest and not the least sad chapter of a dark and cruel history, the record of the series of internecine struggles between a dominant ecclesiastical system and as it were the outer barbarians assailing its ancient theological empire. In the East the traces of ill consequent on the barbarities of the Paulician persecutions and rebellions have been direly marked and permanent. The attendant distraction, depopulation, and disaffection of Asia Minor, especially between the Halys and the Euphrates, directly prepared the way for the Mohammedan invasion. As in the West, the kingdoms that repelled the Reformation and trampled out its various germinant seeds, paid the penalty in political as well as religious declension, so the cold orthodoxy and dead formalism of the Byzantine church and empire was "the curse of helplessness" that followed upon its intolerance and merciless use of authority in its dealings with enquiry and heresy. The Mohammedan conquest was its merited Nemesis.

4. The historical connexion between the Paulicians and the mediaeval sects of Western Europe has been often mooted. The Paulicians in the East, with their heroic faith and desperate bravery in the 9th century appear to be something more than the prototypes of the Hussites in Bohemia, and the Camisards in the Cevennes, and the Vaudois in the Alps, under the Ziskas, and Rolands, and Arnauds of later days. The subject is, from its nature, necessarily obscure, but the amount of truth and fact in such a connexion between Eastern and Western Anti-Sacerdotalists is an interesting problem of history. The ranks of the Byzantine armies, in which many Paulicians were enrolled, whose battalions were stationed in so many various districts, added to the opportunities and gave fresh facilities for proselytism, far beyond

the original seats of the sect.^b The chain of imperial Paulician colonies in Thrace, Macedonia, and Epirus, planted the heresy in Europe. Thence, by the routes of pilgrimage, or by the channels of commerce, the mystical speculations, allegorical methods, and free spirit of the Paulicians made their way over the Balkans into Bulgaria; and along the Danube, through Hungary and Bavaria, into Germany; by Lombardy, into Switzerland and France; by the Mediterranean, to Venice, and Italy, and Sicily. The sect of the Paulicians may thus claim a distinct relation to the wide history of the progress of religious thought in Western Europe.

5. Regarded thus from various points of view, the history of this ancient sect has excited an unusually vivid interest. It has more than once formed a subject of controversy. Party interests led Romanist writers to profess to discover in the Paulicians the forefathers of the Protestant Reformers. It was but a few steps further to detect, and expose, and condemn in these their descendants, the virus of the old Manichaean errors, however latent they might be, and diluted in the transmission. Party enthusiasm similarly led Protestants to take up the gauntlet, accept the ancestry, and vindicate the orthodoxy of the sect. If the partisans of the Paulicians are to be believed, in defiance, however, of the facts of the original evidence, these ancient sectaries were simply strict Evangelical Christians, who, recoiling from the simony, corruption, and superstition of the church of the East, revered the teaching and person of St. Paul, called themselves by his name, and proposed him as their sole spiritual guide and legislator. The celebrated mystic, Godfrey Arnold, thus vindicated Paulician orthodoxy long ago. This *r habilitati n* of the Paulicians has been in vogue in England, with similar paradoxical statements, amongst some modern writers.^c

We now proceed to the general history of the sect.

1. The search for the true origin of Paulicianism lands us in the second half of the 7th century.^d Its birth and infancy may be traced to the neighbourhood of Samosata, not far above the cataracts of the Euphrates mentioned by Pliny, and about a day's journey north from Edessa, the

^b For the theory of the derivation of the name of "Tsiganes" from the Paulician sect of the Athingani and the support of the argument by a variety of quotations from a catena of writers, see Dr. Franz Miklosich's *Ueber die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner in Europa* (part vi. § 3, *Zusammenhang der Zigeuner mit den Athingani*), Vienna, 1876. Also Bataillard's *L'Origine des Tsiganes* (Paris, 1877), p. 33-40, cf. Le Beau, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, xii. 442. For English aspects of such lore, see *In Gipsy Tents*, by F. H. Groome (Edinburgh, 1880), p. 281-283.

^c Godfrey Arnold's *Kirchen und Ketzler Historia*, 1688; Milner, *Ch. Hist.* ixth cent.; Vaughan, *Life of Wycliffe*, i. 110-122; Turner, *Hist. of England during Middle Ages*, v. 123-126; Blair, *Hist. of Waldenses*, Edinburgh, 1833; G. S. Faber, *Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*; Elliott, *Horae Apoc.* vol. ii. See the subject well canvassed between Faber and Dowling, in a series of letters, *British Magazine*, vols. xiv.-xv. Also in Dr. Maitland's *Albigenses and Waldenses*, § 3 p. 61-81, &c.

^d For story of John and Paul, sons of Callinice, see Art. CONSTANTINE—SILVANUS, Vol. I. p. 660. Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v.

ancient Ur of the Chaldees, the birthplace of Abraham. There in the village of Mananalis, among the southern spurs of the chain of Taurus, within sight of the snows of their central heights, lived, in the reigns of the Byzantine emperors Constans II. and Constantine IV., the patriarch of the Paulician creed and system, Constantine Silvanus. We ask in vain about Constantine's race, language, condition, or kindred. There is no record of his origin or antecedents. He comes before us, in his secluded mountain home, bearing the courtly name of Constantine, an Armenian or Syrian provincial living under the tolerating government of the Arabs. It is conjectured that he was brought up as a Gnostic; probably, as Neander and Gibbon suggest, he may have belonged to a Marcionite sect, and may also have been in contact with Manichaean books or teachers. An interesting story is told of his earliest possession of the New Testament. A deacon, returning home from Syria from captivity among the Saracens, in return for Constantine's hospitality, gave him as a token of gratitude two volumes, one containing the Gospels, the other the Epistles of St. Paul. This gift was the turning-point in the development of the Paulician doctrine. The precious manuscripts were eagerly studied, especially the Pauline Epistles. The fervent and original mind of Constantine, already preoccupied by the Oriental Dualism, discovered in the high moral antagonism of sin and grace in St. Paul, a *point d'appui* for a new phase of religious speculation. He devoted himself entirely to the study of the Christian Scriptures, rejecting all other writings. By allegorical interpretation and mystical adaptation, he interwove and harmonised the Oriental Theosophy with the Christian text, still especially attaching himself to the writings of St. Paul, and referring to these as the only source of his knowledge. His life of active missionary labour dates from about the year 657, and continued for twenty-seven years. From the neighbourhood of Samosata, Constantine removed a long distance northwards. We are not told at what call, at what age, or with what views, or with what resources or companions, this new patriarch forsook his kindred and his father's house, and went in search of a land of promise. Ascending the Euphrates, crossing with it the mighty barrier of the range of Mount Taurus, he ventured himself and his new scheme of faith among the races and regions of Asia Minor, then as much more nearly allied to the West as they are at present more nearly akin to the East. He settled at Cibossa, a fortified town, near Colonea, between Pontus and Armenia Minor, above Neo Caesarea, in the country through which the Lycus flows. His exchange of the tolerant rule of the Arabs for the dominions of the orthodox Byzantine emperors led to important results in the history of persecution. The new sect spread rapidly round Cibossa. Constantine's missionary zeal and activity drew upon himself about A.D. 684 the attention of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. By this time the peculiar sobriquet of "Paulicians" had sprung into existence. Constantine also had assumed the scriptural name of "Silvanus," to denote himself as an apostolic former and direct follower of the doctrine of

St. Paul. The chief centres of the sect were named on the same plan among themselves after the principal churches which St. Paul founded, or to which he addressed his Epistles. This idea, adopted in the first religious enthusiasm and infancy of their organisation, was extended afterwards in singular detail.* It may have proved a useful shelter and some aid to privacy of intercommunication amidst the persecutions. About A.D. 684 the emperor Constantine Pogonatus sent Simeon, an officer of his household, into the districts of Pontus or Armenia, where the Paulician sect was spreading, with orders to have the ringleaders stoned and their adherents brought over to the orthodox church. With the aid of Tryphon, a local chieftain, he took captive Constantine-Silvanus and many followers at Cibossa. There, on the south side of the town, at Simeon's command, Constantine was placed before a line of his disciples to be stoned to death by them as the price of their safety. Most of them refused pardon on these conditions, and adhered to their faith. At length a treacherous disciple, Justus, whom Constantine had adopted as his son, was found willing to comply. Constantine was slain, and a great heap of stones was raised on the spot. The memory of his death was still preserved, two centuries afterwards, by the name Soros or heap (*Σωρός*) given to the place where it occurred. There, as the Catholics began to boast, Justus, like a new David, had overthrown the Goliath of heresy (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* 25). Simeon, using his legal and military powers, continued to assist the bishops in their efforts to reclaim the sectaries. Their Christian fortitude and sincerity produced a profound impression on him. When he returned to the imperial court at Constantinople, he was at heart a convert to the Paulician opinions. After a stay there of three years, he could no longer conceal or deny his convictions. He secretly repaired to Cibossa in A.D. 687. There Constantine's remaining followers were still to be found. Simeon, who now took the apostolic name of "Titus" in the Paulician fashion, was placed at the head of the sect. Ere long the Paulician apostate, Justus, who had been the first to take part in the stoning of Constantine-Silvanus, accused Simeon before the bishop of Colonea. The result was an investigation by order of the emperor Justinian II. in A.D. 690. Simeon-Titus, with many other Paulicians, suffered at the stake near the Soros, the scene of Constantine's martyrdom. (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 25-27; Photius, *c. Man.* i. 17-18; Neander, v. 342; Gibbon, ch. 54.)

II. The 8th century was a disturbed and critical time internally to the Paulicians. Their history is a tangle of controversies. The Iconoclast period promised to be a favourable era for them externally, and partly realised the promise. But the sect was, as it were, come of age. In its juvenescence, corresponding traits of self-

* As the names of St. Paul's disciples, Silvanus, Titus, Timothy, Epaphroditus, Tychicus, were applied to Constantine and his successors, so the apostolic churches were represented by the Paulician communities—Achaia (Mananalis), Macedonians (Cibossa), Philippians (Antioch in Pisidia), Lyodiceans (Argaeum), Ephesian (Mopsuestia), Colossians (Cynochoritae) (Photius, *c. Man.* 5).

confidence, self-will, and impetuous waywardness are betrayed. Dissensions arose. Rival claimants to leadership sprang up asserting opposite principles. Rival communities or congregations of followers rallied round them. Early in this century a new leader became conspicuous, named Paul the Armenian. He had escaped from the persecution under Justinian II., and taken refuge at Episparis, in the great plain of Phanarea. There, in the lands watered by the united streams of the Lycus, Scylax, and Iris, near Amasus, the old capital of the kings of Pontus, and birthplace of Mithridates and Strabo, amidst the valleys full of fruit-trees and beech-woods, a transplanted offshoot of the Paulicians rooted itself. The name of Paulicians was traced by many to this Paul the Armenian, an association which serves rather to shew that the so early general acceptance of the title may be dated from the public attention bestowed on the heresy in the earlier persecutions a generation before. Paul the Armenian left two sons, Gegnoesius and Theodore. The sect now divided into two parties, headed by the two brothers. At his father's death, Gegnoesius, the elder, who took the apostolic name of Timothy, was appointed by him his successor. Theodore, the younger brother, headed an opposing party. The differences of opinion between these led to a lasting schism. The schism, to use Neander's comparison, grew out of the antagonism betwixt a Catholic and a Protestant principle. Gegnoesius, as appointed by his father, and believing in the transmission of spiritual gifts and grace, laid claim to be the principal leader, on the Catholic theory that these were connected with regularity of succession. Theodore, holding that such traditional mediation was not essential, with Protestant courage, traced all grace upward directly to the one heavenly source in every case, and claimed to have received his vocation and spiritual life immediately from the same Divine origin with their father. (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 341; Phot. i. 18; Pet. Sic. 28.) The activity of the controversialists drew on the sect at Episparis for the second time the attention of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. New complaints were laid against the Paulicians at the capital. About A.D. 722, Gegnoesius was summoned to Constantinople and there interrogated by the emperor Leo the Isaurian. A characteristic account is preserved both by Photius and Petrus Siculus of the trial before the patriarch. Gegnoesius had fallen on fortunate times. Those were the days of the first fervour of the Iconoclasts. In the examination before the aged Germanus, the allegorical and mystical explanations of the Paulician, usually so easy of detection, were pronounced harmless. His escape from the tests and toils of orthodoxy was not made difficult. He was finally dismissed with letters of protection under the emperor's seal. Leo III., the rugged mountaineer, the second founder of the Byzantine empire, who had found Constantinople besieged by the Saracens, had defeated them by sea and land, and driven them beyond Mount Taurus, was now seated firmly on the orthodox throne. Born at Germanicia, his own Syrian or Armenian extraction would lead him to some sympathy with the primitive Eastern simplicity of the rural sectaries from among their mountain pas-

turages. The Paulician abhorrence of image-worshippers and of the orthodox formalism was not greater than the emperor's. Leo's iconoclastic enthusiasm, with the stern wisdom and purity of his character and administration, made him willing to reserve his severities for more widespread evils nearer home, that had brought down the empire to the verge of dissolution. He was not, like some of his successors, compelled through the ignorant superstition of the populace and the bigotry of the monks to be the tyrant of heretics in order to escape being thwarted on all sides as the accomplice of heresy. We hear no more of the dispute between Gegnoesius and Theodore. Perhaps owing to this, or more probably in fear about the imperial favour and mistrust of the ecclesiastical power, Gegnoesius, with many followers, migrated from Episparis back to Mananalis, the original seat of the sect, on the extreme eastern limits of the empire. There he lived till A.D. 745, when he died, after having completed his thirty years of ministry. His death took place during a season of great mortality in those districts. Gegnoesius with unwearied activity had laboured for the spread of the Paulician sect and doctrines from A.D. 715 to A.D. 745, previously at Episparis northward in Phanarea of Pontus, and latterly around Samosata and the region to the westward of the Upper Euphrates.

After the death of Gegnoesius-Timothy, the sect was again rent by divisions. He had appointed as his successor his own son Zacharias. Another leader, Joseph the Bastard, who took the Pauline title of Epaphroditus, headed a party against him. Each arrogating to himself the Divine Spirit's call, and deriding the claims of the other, various scenes of violence followed. After a personal collision between them, in which Joseph narrowly escaped with his life from the stones of his assailants, they agreed to a mutual separation. Danger then threatened from the Saracens, who were engaged at that time in constant hostilities with the empire; their troops were hovering round, and their vigilance was aroused by the movement from Mananalis of the two bodies of Paulicians with their flocks and herds. On their hostile approach, Zacharias in alarm fled away alone from his followers, secured his own safety at their expense, and in reward for his cowardice was afterwards known as "The Hireling." His company were slain or dispersed. Joseph, with more tact, conciliated the Saracens, averted their attack by friendly overtures, and was allowed to go on his way. For a while he temporised, professing to be seeking only a change of pasturage. At length, taking advantage of a favourable opportunity, he recrossed the imperial frontier and successfully carried out his design of removing with all his friends and disciples to Episparis. Thus began a second impulse to the sect from Mananalis, which led to its being spread in new countries of Asia Minor.

Joseph-Epaphroditus was warmly received at Episparis. Probably, as the opponent of the son of Gegnoesius, he was welcomed by the partisans of Theodore, who still kept up the remembrance of the earlier schism. His arrival with his Paulicians was the signal for an outburst of enthusiasm. The strangers were met in procession with torches and lanterns, and the event was

celebrated with public festivities. All appeared to go well, till a local chieftain named Cricoraches was induced by the orthodox party of the neighbourhood to attack the heretical community at their worship and expel the newcomers. Joseph and his party turned their faces southward, traversed Phrygia, and at length found a resting-place in Antioch of Pisidia. There, like Gegnoesius at Mananalis, he completed his thirty years of successful ministry, and died about 775 in a suburban hamlet of the town known by the name of Chortocopium.

Not long before, occurred the earliest known point of contact between the Paulicians and Europe. It was in the eleventh year of the reign of Constantine V., the second of the Iconoclast emperors. The constant threatenings of the Bulgarians from their settlements about the Danube, and the no less frequent incursions of bands of Saracens across the Euphrates, called and recalled this fiery and active "Cœur de Lion" repeatedly to the head of his armies and the defence of his frontiers. At this time the empire of the caliphs was distracted by the civil wars between the Omniades and Abbassides. It was a few years only before the founding of Bagdad. Constantine reconquered Melitene and replanted the Christian standards on the banks of the Euphrates, but finding it impossible to retain secure possession of the country, removed large portions of the Christian population into the West. There he settled them in colonies as a barrier against the Bulgarians and Sclavonians. Among these many Paulicians in 752 were transplanted from Asia Minor to Constantinople and Thrace (Cedrenus, *Syn. Hist.* Theoph. 345, 360). The Asiatic colonists long continued to flourish and multiply, still distinguished by their religious opinions among the surrounding population. They made also many proselytes. Their doctrines, stigmatised as heretical by the dominant church, were recommended, as often amongst later mediaeval sects, by commercial skill, industry, and probity. They are said thus to have spread some of their Oriental opinions from thence into Western Europe.

In the earlier homes of the sect, in Asia Minor, the later years of the eighth century were a time of depression. Bad leaders rose up. The sect became subject to injurious influences. Inward divisions multiplied. The whole name and party were brought into bad repute. During this period a certain Baanes arose, whom his enemies record with disdain to have been sprung from a Paulician mother and a Jewish father. He was born during the life of Joseph-Epaphroditus. Some while after Joseph's death, Baanes acquired great local influence, and originated the name of "Baanites" to a part of the Paulician community. The names, Baanes, Baanites, occur conspicuously in the old Greek orthodox forms of Manichæan abjuration, used at the reception of heretical converts into the Eastern church. The name of Baanes is usually associated with the epithet "The Filthy" (*ὁ βυρρῶς*). This the Byzantine writers interpret as well merited by the immoral tendencies of the teacher, and made deservedly more notorious by the loose principles and practice of his disciples (*Baavīrai*), who perpetuated his name and teaching. Later authors have suggested that this may have originated in the coarsely ascetic and severely cy-

nical mode of life which Baanes adopted and encouraged. (Jacob Tollius, *Insig. Itur. Ital.* p. 105-177; Phot. *c. Man.* i. 21; Pet. Sic. *Hist. Mon.* 31; Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* vii.; Cotellier, *Patres Apost.* i. 545; Neander, v. 346.)

III. At the opening of the ninth century, with the life of Sergius, Paulicianism reached its climacteric. After this period of vigorous maturity, with the middle years of the century followed years of persecution, rebellion, and dispersion. Sergius was a native of Ania, or Annia, a village near the old Galatian town of Tavia. His father's name was Dryinus. Probably his parents belonged to the orthodox church, though the account of Photius (i. 21) would suggest that Sergius sprang from a family connected with the sect. He seems to have been carefully nurtured, to have received a good education, and to have led an unblemished life. His bitterest enemies can only reproach him with hypocrisy, as if he wore the virtues of a pure and benevolent life as a cloak for the defects of his faith. Amidst all the dearth of originality of Byzantine chronicles, Sergius is a lifelike portrait. His vivid individuality, even through the bitterness, taunts, and calumnies of hostile criticism, makes itself felt and understood. There were associated in him, with a practical piety and gentle tenderness of spirit, a Greek subtlety and eloquence, a luxuriance of imagination worthy of Persian or Indian poetry, a Roman strength of conviction, will, and purpose. His ministry was persuasive and affectionate, capable of attracting and instilling the deepest personal attachment and devotion. The account of the early instruction of Sergius in the Paulician doctrine is interesting as an illustration of Sergius's character and as an example of the way in which Paulicianism frequently made its conquests. While still a young man, he was attracted and won over to the Paulicians through the impression produced on him by conversation with a woman belonging to the sect. At her advice he diligently studied the Gospels and the writings of St. Paul. His teacher meantime strenuously prejudiced his mind against the orthodox church and clergy, drawing especial attention to their withdrawal of the Scriptures from the people. At the same time she warmly prepossessed his mind in favour of the speculative and mystical theories of the Gnostic dualism. Apprehending Christianity under these forms, Sergius started about the year 800 on his 34 years' career as an apostolic reformer. He adopted the name Tychicus, in the Paulician style, to designate his adherence to the principles and doctrines of St. Paul. The reign of Nicephorus, 802-811, an orthodox but tolerant emperor, was favourable to his designs. Nicephorus, himself a native of Seleucia in Pisidia, greatly to the dissatisfaction of the church party, refused to persecute the growing Paulician community. He allowed them with the Athingans to exercise their religion in peace, promising them the rights and security of citizens, so long as they violated no laws of the empire (Theoph. *Chron.* 413; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* ii. 115). During his missionary labours, Sergius penetrated almost every portion of the central plateaus of Asia Minor. He could boast in one of his epistles to a Paulician community, "I have run from East to West, and from North to South, till my knees were weary, preaching the Gospel of Christ"

(Phot. i. 22; Pet. Sic. 36). Thus traversing Asia Minor, he successfully promoted the spread of his reformed Paulicianism. Amidst the license of the Baanites, his irreproachable life and strict moral teaching won even the praise of opponents. Many monks, nuns, priests, and others from among the various lower ecclesiastical grades, were converted to his simple and practical, though alloyed, Christianity. Proclaiming to all ranks the hitherto almost unknown words of the Evangelists and Apostles, in wide districts where the rigid formal orthodoxy and tawdry picture-worship of the dominant church, and the too frequent ignorance, corruption, and simony of the clergy had alienated the laity, the fervid preaching of the gentle conciliatory Sergius, full of confidence and consciousness of his mission, overcame all hearts. In imitation of the great Apostle, Sergius maintained himself during his ministry by his own hands, working as a carpenter. His disciples rapidly outnumbered the Baanites. The controversy between these and Sergius and his followers was necessarily an irreconcilable one. Clouds began to gather overhead on the accession of Michael I., 812-813. This emperor was a man of mild and weak character, but what he wanted of religious zeal might have been supplied by the influence of Nicephorus, then patriarch of Constantinople. Happily these counsels were moderated by the more merciful influence of Theodore, the famous abbat of the Studion. Nicephorus sought to persuade Michael to persecute both Paulicians and Iconoclasts. A proposition was even made in an assembly of the senate to put all Paulician and Athingan leaders to death, in order to intimidate their followers and persuade them to become orthodox Christians (Theoph. Chron. p. 419). However, this method of conversion having excited a strong opposition, the patriarch and his clergy had to content themselves with securing the enactment of some severe laws, which might be turned to account as occasion served. The sect continued to spread. But the outlook became once more gloomy, when Leo V., the Armenian, began his reign, 813-820. In his ecclesiastical counsels, Leo, though an Iconoclast, was inclined to prudence and moderation. However, resolute as he was, through the almost universal intolerance round him, he was forced to choose his side. First, the Iconoclast council of Constantinople, 815, reversed the council of Nicaea, 787, and renewed the decrees for the abolition of images, as in the days of Leo III. in 754. Further, to satisfy the church party, he consented to be the tyrant of heresy in preference to being vituperated as its accomplice. Thus the tempest broke. A new Paulician persecution was inaugurated. A commission was issued in the name of Leo V., with full powers of investigation and process. Thomas (bishop of Neocaesarea in Cappadocia) and the abbat Paracondaces were entrusted with the inquisitorial mission. They were bidden to make strict search after all Paulicians. The repentant were to be handed over to the bishops for instruction and restoration to the church. Those who persisted were to be put to the sword. The cruelty with which they executed their mission drove the suffering sectaries to retaliation and vengeance. The people of Cynoschora in Armenia, where some of Sergius's chief disciples, called Astatii, were settled, rose up against the persecutors

(Phot. c. Man. i. 24; Pet. Sic. Hist. Man. 41; Neander, Ch. Hist. v. 366). The Astatii cut off the abbat Paracondaces by treachery, while the populace of the place, headed by one of the Sergiote fanatics, attacked and slew the bishop Thomas. After these wild scenes, reminding of the murder of the Abbé du Chaila by the Camisards or of Archbishop Sharpe at St. Andrews, the storm was allayed, the persecution was dropped, and a period of tranquillity followed. As many of the Paulicians as could fled to Heliene and escaped beyond the empire into Saracen territory. Monocherares, a Saracen emir received the fugitives, promised them safety, and assigned them a place called Argaeum^f for their settlement. Numerous other fugitives were soon attracted thither through the protection and favour thus granted. Under Michael II., 820-829, a Phrygian by birth and native of Amorium, there was some degree of religious toleration. This continued into the reign of his son, Theophilus, 829-842. The scattered congregations of Paulicians were left undisturbed. The sect was well known and widespread amongst the cities and villages of Asia Minor, and the influence of Sergius and his disciples was unbounded over the communities. He could appeal, as the credentials of his apostleship, not only to his own indefatigable activity, but to the general response this met with and the wide demand for his presence and efforts—"I have run from East to West and from North to South, till my knees were weary, preaching the Gospel of Christ." To this time of elation belongs the language of self-exaltation with which his enemies charge him, and which it is not easy to comprehend or explain.^g These expressions, which may in his case have been little more than Oriental hyperbole, appeared to his opponents to approach nearly to self-deification. Sergius undoubtedly spoke of himself, with reference to his doctrine, in the highest possible strain of confidence and commendation, e. g. "I am the porter and the good shepherd and the leader of the body of Christ, and the light of the house of God. I too am with you always even unto the end of the world" (Phot. i. 21; Pet. Sic. i. 37). But we have to set beside these counter phraseology, as where he represents St. Paul as the great teacher by whom alone Christianity was displayed in its plenitude of light and truth; and where he places himself contrasted with the Apostle only on a par with a Tychicus, the messenger and disciple, sent forth as the ambassador and herald of the doctrine of his master. It has been suggested that he may have used the term "Paraclete" in a secondary sense with self-application. But we may dismiss at once as "not proven" such additional charges as where his adversaries attribute to the sectaries the use of a prayer to Sergius as the Holy Ghost (Ph. i. 114). Sergius, at one time escaping from

^f Probably Arcas (so Neander and Gieseler), now Arka, a village on a high mound on the verge of the great plain of Melitene. See Ainsworth, *Researches in Asia Minor*, i. 251. Strabo, xii. 2, calls it, "ἔρμια ὑψηλὸν πρὸς τῷ Ταύρω." "The recesses of Mount Argaeus" (Gibbon) were too far west for the Saracens.

^g Compare the visionary fancies of Servetus about himself and the archangel Michael, which partly led to his condemnation to the stake, by the Romanists at Vienne, by the Protestants at Geneva, in 1553.

persecutions, at another bent on carrying out his mission, visited at intervals the fugitive colonies at Melitene, Argæum, Amara, and elsewhere, and spent some time amongst them. With his usual moderation and goodness of heart, he dissuaded his co-religionists from retaliatory measures against their Roman neighbours, but with little success. The Paulicians from the Saracen frontier too often acted as the vanguard of the Saracen power. They continually made fresh inroads into the nearer Byzantine provinces, dragging away captives for proselytism or slavery. At length the opportunity of a victim offered itself. In 835, in the reign of Theophilus, while Sergius was felling wood for his carpenter's work in one of the mountain forests near Argæum, he was assailed alone and off his guard and murdered with his own axe by an orthodox church zealot, Tzanio of Nicopolis. When the strong influence of Sergius in favour of conciliation was withdrawn, the work of disintegration soon began again. The oppositions of opinion and practice between the Baanites and Sergiotes became more clearly marked. Violent strife ensued between the different parties. This lasted some time with some bloodshed, till the factions were in part overawed by the local military authorities, who declared on the Sergiote side, and in part reconciled by the mediation of Theodotus the Sergiote. The writings of Sergius, which long perpetuated his name and authority as a Paulician reformer, are now only known by five or six sentences quoted by Photius and Petrus Siculus. He had sent "Epistles" from time to time during his life to the principal Paulician centres, in the Paulician fashion, addressing them by their titles derived from the writings of St. Paul in the New Testament, the Ephesians, Colossians, and others. These *Epistles of Sergius*, which have perished like most of such literature, were accepted as authoritative writings by the sect. They were widely multiplied and circulated. As long as Paulicianism lasted as a sect, they were quoted for faithful expositions of its doctrine both by friend and foe.

IV. We now pass into the last stage of the history, the final period of Paulician persecution, rebellion, and dispersion. After the death of Theophilus, during the regency of his empress Theodora, 842-857, Leo, son of Argyrus, Andronicus, son of Ducas, and Sudalis, with some others, were sent into the Paulician districts on the errand of reclaiming or extirpating the heretics. Theodora's relentless enthusiasm for orthodoxy thus opened a new page in church history. A cruel religious war began of Christians upon Christians, parallel only in former time to the persecutions of the church by the pagan emperors—an *auto de fé* of many days, prophetic of the barbarities of later Europe, such as the Albigensian crusades, or the Inquisition in Spain. The royal commissioners resorted in haste to severe measures. The details are recorded, not without a shade of triumph, by the Byzantine chroniclers. Those who resisted the imperial invitation to ecclesiastical union, were either condemned to death or their property confiscated. We hear of hanging, crucifying, beheading, drowning. Many thousands perished in this manner. Some reckon the sufferers at 100,000. A good deal of chivalrous valour, not unusual in such cases, was displayed by the sectaries. The

history reads like an anticipation of the sufferings of the Protestants of the Cévennes, of the Low Countries, of the valleys of Piedmont, or the Covenanters of Scotland. Many refugees escaped into the province of Melitene, where Omar, the Saracen emir, assisted them in their plans of revenge. These were established, by the caliph's order, in the two towns of Argæum and Amara. The arrival of fresh emigrants with Karbeas led to the founding of Tephrike (Divriki) in the district of Sebaste (Sivas).^b This Karbeas, one of the chief officers of Theodotus Melissenos, the general of the Anatolic theme, exasperated by the impaling of his own father, resolved by revolt to avenge his fate. Gathering 5,000 of his co-religionists, he fled to the frontier, and from the Saracen border rewarded his followers by an organised system of rapine and plunder in the territories near. The queen's brother, Petronas, governor of the Thrakesian theme, was sent against them. The Byzantine troops contended during the reign of Michael III., 842-867, without any decided success. They mostly limited their operations to defence, and were contented with checking these forays. Meanwhile other bodies of Paulicians still remained in the several provinces, who escaped persecution by outwardly conforming to the Greek church and paying the dues demanded by the clergy. In the reign of Basil I., 867-886, the whole force of the empire was again directed against the Paulicians. The existence of the little republic at Tephrike had become a serious danger to the emperors of Constantinople. It was a place of refuge for the fugitives and malcontents from their dominions. Chrysocheir, the son-in-law of Karbeas, succeeded him in the command of the armed bands of Tephrike. A romantic border war went on for many years, till Basil I., in 871, seriously undertook the task of destroying the Paulician strongholds. In Asia Minor in that age, as in the island of Sicily to recent times, owing to constant wars, frequent predatory incursions, and general insecurity of the country, it was unsafe for the peasantry to live scattered in villages. This class, therefore mainly contributed to the number and population of the squalid towns, and amidst these the Paulicians were often in strong force. The great number of prisoners taken by the borderers induced the emperor to send an embassy to Tephrike for the redemption of the captives. Petrus Siculus, the ambassador, lived at Tephrike for nine months, during which time he collected the materials for his treatise on the sect. He was not able to bring about any satisfactory and peaceable arrangements with Chrysocheir. The ill-success of these negotiations, the ravages committed by the Paulician inroads, and the fear of alliances between them and the Mohammedans, led to the two expeditions of Basil. This Paulician war is the principal military operation of his reign. In 871 his first attack was unsuccessful. The Paulicians gained decided advantages and inflicted severe loss on the imperial

^b For picturesque descriptions of this strong country and the modern town, Divriki, see Ainsworth, *Researches in Asia Minor*, vol. ii. 7-9; Burnaby, *On Horseback through Asia Minor*, vol. i. 334-340; Saint Martin, *Mémoires sur l'Arménie*, i. 188; Otter, *Voyage en Turquie*, ii. 306, in 1743.

forces. The emperor himself escaped with difficulty. Fortunately for Basil, the power of the caliphate was at a low ebb at the time, a succession of revolutions and seditions at Bagdad occupied the attention of the Saracens, the Paulicians could obtain only uncertain support from them. Basil turned from the siege of Tephrike to capture and destroy the frontier towns towards the Euphrates, which had assisted his insurgent subjects. After a variety of incidents, he returned to Constantinople disheartened, leaving Christophorus, his general, to conduct the difficult and desultory war. Meantime, to quote Gibbon's *résumé* of the career of Chrysocheir:—"He boldly penetrated into the heart of Asia; the troops of the frontier and the palace were repeatedly overthrown; the edicts of persecution were answered by the pillage of Nice and Nicomedia, of Ancyra and Ephesus. The cathedral of St. John at Ephesus was turned into a stable for mules and horses; and the Paulicians vied with the Saracens in their contempt and abhorrence of images and relics" (*Decl. and Fall*, ch. 54). Basil made overtures of peace to Chrysocheir, offering him royal donatives of gold and silver, and silk garments and captives. Chrysocheir's defiant and boastful reply left Basil no choice but to continue the war, sending no answer to the Paulician. In the course of two years Chrysocheir inflicted great losses on the neighbouring provinces. He was unable to maintain his troops without plunder, and relied on this system of successful rapine, much as the Danes and Normans about the same time were doing in France and England. At length the superior military skill of the Byzantine general made itself felt. Having invaded Cappadocia, Chrysocheir was overtaken by Christophorus at Agranés. He found himself forced to retreat, with an active enemy watching his movements. A sudden assault by night threw the Paulician camp into panic and flight. Chrysocheir himself fled, attended by Diaconitzes and a few other comrades. In the thirty miles' pursuit, he was overtaken at last by Pylades, formerly a captive at Tephrike, beheaded, and his head sent as a trophy of war to the emperor.¹ Tephrike was taken not long after and destroyed. Catabatala and other Paulician strongholds were captured in the following campaign. The power of the Paulicians was dissipated. They were unable to continue their ravages. Some retired into Armenia, or were scattered over the neighbouring countries. Others entered the imperial service and fought in South Italy against the African Saracens. (Const. Porph. *Basil*. 192; Genesisius, *Chron.* iv. 120-126; Cedrenus, *Hist. Comp.* ii. 206-213; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* ii. 243-6; Gibbon, ch. 54.) Long afterwards, on a less conspicuous scale, the Paulicians were still a powerful and enduring sect, though the chief interest of the sect passes over into Europe. Even in Asia, Paulicianism cast down was not destroyed. Their oasis of political and religious freedom flourished no more, but their faith and their communities still survived. Bands of

¹ The continuation of Const. Porph. is the only writer who mentions the story of the head of Chrysocheir being brought to Basil and his manner of treating it. On the head being presented at the foot of the throne, Basil, in accordance with a former vow and prayer, called for his bow and shot three arrows at his lifeless enemy.

heretics driven to the mountains continued to assert their independence, and to infest the Roman borders for above a hundred years. Wherever the Paulicians were to be found, a national feeling was now added to religious motives. The ruin of the Paulicians, like the downfall of the Iconoclasts, in each case a victory of the Greek race and church over the native Asiatics, was a victory not soon forgotten or forgiven. A national hatred fostered the religious zeal. The local disorganisation of society, and destruction of property and capital, that resulted from the Paulician war, the hatred for the Greek church and government engendered among the Asiatics, prepared a beaten track through Asia Minor for the Saracen and the Turk, and long after facilitated the entrance and progress of the Seljouk power, and so in ultimate consequence contributed to the final waning of the cross before the crescent in Constantinople itself.

Further traces of the Paulicians are to be found (1) in Armenia and Asia Minor; (2) in Bulgaria and the Byzantine provinces south of the Danube; (3) in mediæval Europe.

1. In Armenia and the adjacent Byzantine territory, scattered embers of Paulicianism, smouldering everywhere, burst out into new flame, more or less vigorously in various directions as time went on, deriving fresh fuel from new admixtures of Christian elements with Parsism^k or the other religions of the East. There were the Armenian Arevurdis, or children of the sun, who had long been a semi-Zoroastrian sect of heretics, worshippers of Ormuzd (Tsamtschean's *Hist. Arm.* P. i. p. 765; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vi. 341). A new phase of their history began with Sembat, a Paulician. Under the influence of Medschusic, a Persian physician and astronomer, Sembat formed a new combination of Parsism and Christianity. His opinions among his followers are said to have taken a pantheistic and antinomian direction. Between 833 and 854, Sembat established himself at Thontrac, in the province of Ararat. His sect thus obtained the name of Thondracians. These people, who spread their doctrine in secret, and accommodated themselves openly to the requirements of the orthodox church, were fiercely persecuted by the bishops. The sect of Athingani (*Αθίγγανοι*) are also associated with the Paulicians. (Theoph. 413;

^k Early in the eighth century, John Ozniensis, so called from his birthplace Oznun, in the province of Tascir in Greater Armenia, who became Catholicos or primate of the Armenian church about 718, wrote a controversial tract against the Paulicians. He ascribes to those at that time in his vicinity a certain adoration of the sun, p. 87. This harmonises little with the other doctrines of the sect. Still that even Mohammedans, in the old Parsee regions, are addicted to such a usage, the following modern testimony will serve as some indication:—"I have often wondered whether something connected with the old fire-worshippers' superstition has a lurking-place in the minds of the Persians or Kurds. Day after day and at the same hour, I have seen the entire inhabitants of a village turn out and gaze intently upon the great orb of light slowly sinking into space on the distant horizon. I have questioned them about this subject. They indignantly repudiate the idea of any sort of worship to the sun; they say that they do so because it is their habit, and because their fathers, grandfathers, and ancestors did the same thing before them." (Burnaby's *On Horseback through Asia Minor*, vol. ii. 201.)

Zonaras, *l. xv.*; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* ii. 97, 109; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 372, vi. 347.) Their opinions appear to have arisen out of a mixture of Judaism and Christianity. They may have been a remnant of the old Judaizing Christian sects, who had maintained themselves from the apostolic times in Phrygia. They are principally spoken of in association with Amorium, where many Jews resided. Their name arose from their Gnostic or Manichean principles, leading them to hold that the touch of many things was defiling. Possibly they were descendants of the false teachers with whom St. Paul contended, who corrupted the apostolic teaching at Colosse (cf. *μὴ θύγῃς*, Col. ii. 21). Thus the Paulicians and other kindred sects, though occasionally suppressed, continually sprang up afresh in Armenia and the neighbouring countries till the middle of the eleventh century.

2. From these Paulicians of Asia Minor, and from such eclectic sects that grew out of them or united with them, great numbers of offshoots gradually spread into Europe. Paulicianism, says Gibbon, "shook the East and enlightened the West." Amidst the violent translocations of population not unfrequent in those times, as in the Caucasus and other parts of Russia in modern days, Paulician colonies were planted in Thrace and Bulgaria. They were established as guards of the western frontiers of the empire, with permission to retain their religion. Amidst a native population sensibly diminishing, these military colonies were marked by the industry and vigour displayed in local affairs, their lands were well cultivated and bravely defended, and the moral training of the people was good. Their busy trading, aided afterwards by the commercial influences of the crusades, helped to spread their religious opinions into many parts of western Europe. This colonisation began in 752. Constantine V., after reconquering the Armenian province of Melitene, transported into Thrace numbers of Asiatic colonists from Germanicia, Doliche, Melitene, and Theodosiopolis (Theoph. 354-360). Many of these were Paulicians. Another such colony was brought from the eastern provinces of Asia Minor, by John Zimisces in 969, and settled in the important strategic position of Philippopolis (Zonaras, *Ann.* l. xvii.). It was in order to guard the then newly founded church of Bulgaria from the infection of their Thracian Paulician neighbours, that Petrus Siculus, about 870, addressed to the archbishop of the Bulgarians (name unknown) his treatise, which is now one of the chief sources of our information as to the sect (Pet. Sic. i. 1). The recognised bravery of the Paulicians obtained them frequent admission into the imperial armies. Among the hiring troops of the failing and hard-pressed empire, they found ample opportunities of diffusing their doctrines. Colonists also established themselves in fixed settlements beyond the limits of the Greek empire, with the same zeal for proselytism. In the cities, towns, or country villages, they had no difficulty in getting hearers. Laymen, ecclesiastics, and monks, received their doctrine and discipline.

Though the Paulicians had ceased to be formidable, they still could on occasion assert themselves. In the reign of Nicephorus III., 1067-1081, two of their leaders took up arms in Thrace, and committed many cruelties to revenge

themselves for the persecutions they had suffered. In 1081, when Alexius Comnenus marched against the Norman, Robert Guiscard, 2,800 Paulicians under Xantas and Kuleon joined his army as the military contingent they were required to furnish. Having lost 300 men in the defeat at Dyrrachium, the rest returned home. Alexius determined to punish their desertion and destroy their communal system. The chief men were summoned to the emperor at Mosynopolis, 90 miles from Philippopolis. The Paulicians were ordered to be disarmed, many had their property confiscated, and whole families were driven from their homes. Among these were the four sisters of Traulus, a Paulician convert, baptised during the reign of Nicephorus III., who had attained to the rank of *Domestikos*. When Alexius took reprisals against the Thracian Paulician community, Traulus, in revenge for the wrongs of his relatives, seized a fort called Veliatova, joined the Patzinaks in their marauding expeditions from the Danube, secured himself by their alliance, and plundered the orthodox Greeks over all Thrace. The Patzinak war ensured their impunity. Traulus repelled the forces sent against him in 1086, under Pakuvian, the Grand *Domestikos* of the West, and Branas, and maintained his independence for some years (Anna Comn. 157; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* iii. 65). Towards the end of his reign, Alexius, learning how the numbers of the Paulicians increased in Thrace and the adjacent provinces, and observing how ineffectual violent means had been against them, had recourse to argument and controversy with the leaders. Finding the important position of Philippopolis to be the place of rendezvous for the sects hostile to the church, he fixed his winter-quarters there, and spent whole days in succession disputing from morning to evening with the sectaries. Some of the imperial converts were brought to Constantinople. Others were established in a new city, which Alexius named after himself *Alexiopolis* (Alexius, l. xiv.). The imperial conversions many of them proved to be insincere. They were however partially successful, especially as rewards and punishments were among the arguments Alexius employed. In the issue he was disappointed, and his efforts are said to have contributed to the spread of the heresy by the dispersion of the heretics. Frederic Barbarossa and the crusaders in 1189 found them still at Philippopolis. (Nicetas, 258; Geoffrey de Villehardouin, 208; Matthew Paris, *H.M.*, p. 267; Finlay, *Gr. Hist.* iii. 234; Gibbon, ch. 54; Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 578; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* viii. 295.)¹

3. In Mediaeval Europe.—As the earlier persecutions tended to drive back the Paulicians to their first seats and promote the spread of the sect in the Eastern regions, where it was sheltered by Saracen protection, so the later efforts at violent repression resulted in the dispersion and settlement of the sectaries in new spheres of activity towards the West, and opened Europe to their movements. By merchants, monks, pilgrims, soldiers, gipsies, as well as direct missionaries, and later amidst the returning

¹ Interesting modern traces of descendants are recorded. Elliott, *Horae Apoc.* vol. ii. 550; Spenser, *Travels in European Turkey*, vol. ii. 352.

armies of the French crusaders, Paulician tenets were introduced into Liguria, Lombardy, Sicily, France, Germany, and the Netherlands. We hear of their descendants, through mediaeval chroniclers, and in the records of councils and persecutions, at Albi, Thoulouse, Turin, Milan, Orleans, Chalons, Cambrai, Arras, Cologne, Oxford. They probably spread also from Italy to Sardinia and Spain. No doubt the principles and doctrines received from abroad were elaborated and wrought out often in an independent manner. Many peculiar modifications were introduced, but the names of sects, Bulgari, Sclavoni, Publicani, Catharists, Bogomiles, and other such, point southeastward to their Byzantine origin, as in their so-called "Manichean" tenets is traceable their semi-oriental and Paulician ancestry.^m

We must now proceed to some concluding particulars as to the doctrines of the Paulicians.

1. The first thing on record about them, as to heretical tenets, is their Dualism. The second book of the treatise of Photius is chiefly occupied with disproving this. Like their remote descendants, the mediaeval sects, the early Paulicians, with whom we have to do, undoubtedly shared in this respect "the ghastly dream of the Gnostic and Manichean." Their Dualism was their λαμπρότατον ψεύδος. To their view the physical universe, the world of Nature, the κόσμος, including all τὰ αἰσθητά, is not a Divine world, not the architecture or work of the Supreme God, the Lord of the heavens (Phot. i. 6; Pet. Sic. 16-18). Photius quotes a statement, probably of Sergius, that "the Evil Spirit, or Demiurge, sprang into being out of darkness and fire" (Phot. ii. 3). In such a view, "darkness" was the proper principle of evil, and "fire" the principle of the sidereal world, both being principles opposed to the spiritual life. The combination of these formed the essence of the Demiurge, the creator of the visible and sensible world. The Paulicians accused the dominant church of confounding together the Demiurge and the Perfect God, and of worshipping the Demiurge only. In their teaching, as in the instance of the conversion of Sergius, they were always ready to start with impressing upon their proselytes this controversial axiom, so much to the prejudice of the Catholics (Phot. i. 21). It is doubtful whether there may have been allowed at all in the sect a distinction between the Evil Principle and the Creator of the World. Some may have adopted the idea of an intermediate Principle, as some of the older Gnostic systems did. Since no "Apology" of their own survives, we have to be content with the meagre and indefinite statements of doctrine given by their adversaries. These offer only a

^m Muratori, *Ant. It.* v. 83; Limborch, *Hist. Inq.* 31; Du Fresne, *Gloss. Lat. M. A.* i. 1338; Du Chesne, *Script. Hist. Fr.* v.; *Bibl. Patr.* Lugd.; Luc. Dacherius, *Spicileg. Veter. Script.* i. 604; Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, i. 366; Ricchini's *Moneta c. Cath.* p. 17; Glabr. Rodolph. *Hist.* i. iii. 8; Matt. Paris; *Codex Tolosanus*, 13-131; Villehardouin, *Hist. Const.* 169; Du Cange, *Lat. Gloss.*; Maitland, *Facts and Documents*, pp. 83-93; Roger Hoveden, *Ann.* 585; Reiner in Martene, *Thesaur.* v. 1767; Hen. Huntingd. vii. 374; Will. Neubrig. lib. ii. 13; Robert Monach. lib. iii. iv.; *Baldric. Dolens. Hist. Hieros.* lib. ii.; Tudebodus, i. iii. Hallam, *M. A.* ii. 439.

bare outline of their cosmical theories, invidiously coloured for polemical purposes.

2. The Paulician ideas about the origin and nature of man were closely connected with their system of the universe. Their psychology was involved in their cosmogony. The soul of man, according to them, proceeded from the author of good, the Supreme and Perfect God (Phot. ii. 1). The body was the work either of an inferior, imperfect, and intermediate power, or directly of the absolutely evil one. Photius quotes an obscure and singular extract of Sergius comparing the relation between soul and body to an unlawful marriage, branding it with the degradation and opprobrium of an unholy union (Phot. i. 22). We do not gather with any exactness how this *πορνεία* was brought about, but it evidently originated according to the Paulician scheme in the malice of the Demiurge. They must have held the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls. Thus, the sequence of ideas would be, either that these souls were constantly being drawn away from the higher world at every birth, and entangled with the bodily and material world by the Evil Power, or they started with the idea of one such original abduction, and imagined a constant, consequent, and subsequent process of spiritual evolution, apparent in our multiplied individualised humanity. They plainly held, that the soul of man is of Divine origin. It is a germ of life, akin to the essence of the God of the higher world. The recollection of the lost prior immortality floated still like a dream before the soul in its bodily thralldom in the kingdom of the Demiurge (Phot. ii. 3). The soul embodied and captive could thus never be so completely overborne by matter and debased in this world of sight and sense and darkness, that its innate light and revelation of God should be finally obscured and altogether lost. The soul of man was always capable of a mystical redemption.

3. The Christology of the Paulicians is a matter of interesting speculation. Their views as to the person and nature and work of Christ were in harmony with their Dualism. They were ardent opponents of any such thing as the Mariolatry of the Catholics. They scoffed at the church teaching about the perpetual virginity or even the superior sanctity of Mary, and undervalued her agency at the Incarnation. They equally and on similar principles stood aloof from the church veneration of the cross, describing it as mere "wood," an instrument for the death of malefactors, and in St. Paul's language "accursed" (Gal. iii. 13). The true cross of their worship was their mental image of Christ, as if crucified, expanding His arms in prayer or in blessing in the form of the crucifix. The true Virgin-mother of their faith was the pure privileged church of their communion realised in antitype in the "Jerusalem above; which is free, which is the mother of us all" (Gal. iv. 26). According to their views, and so contrary to the church view, redemption by Christ had nothing to do with sin-bearing. There is no such thing as atonement or expiation by His death and sufferings. The Paulicians were not strictly Docetic, though nearly so. The Redeemer was to them, not an incarnation, but rather a bright reflection, radiation, or emanation of God. This spiritual revelation in human nature

of the invisible incomprehensible God was manifested for the liberation of souls in bondage in the kingdom of the Demiurge. The redemption that was to follow was the illumination of the darkened souls in their bodily captivity, offering them once again release, and restoration to the light of life. Redemption was the promise of renewed spiritual liberty and communion with the Supreme God of the spiritual creation. The Christ, according to the Paulician creed, descended and brought with Him from the heavenly world His own ethereal body of no earthly stuff or material. Born of the Virgin Mary, *ὡς διὰ σαλῆρος*, not of her substance, He invaded and occupied the kingdom of the Demiurge. He so lived, as man among men, till His Ascension, and diffused Himself and His heavenly radiance and redemptive influence through this world. The faithful, ever aspiring to mystic union with His light and truth, are raised to spiritual union with the Redeemer, and in Him into perfect communion with the Supreme God, and so are brought to the perfect freedom of His service, till finally "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. viii. 21). Consistently with their theology, the church view of the sacraments was impossible and unintelligible to the Paulicians. They allegorised these in their usual figurative and typical style, interpreting the water in baptism and the elements in the Lord's Supper, in the way so congenial to them, as parables, similar to such texts of Scripture, as where Christ called Himself the bread of life, the water of life, the true vine, or illustrates in such language the benefit and efficacy of the Divine Word. The account of the examination of Gegnoesius before the patriarch of Constantinople gives us an exposure of the Paulician position in such aspects of it (Phot. i. 19; Pet. Sic. 29). Similar statements occur also in the six articles of controversy prefixed by Photius and Petrus Siculus to their histories of the sect (Phot. i. 6-10; Pet. Sic. 10).

4. The canon of Scripture among the Paulicians is an important consideration with respect to an estimate of their doctrinal errors. It is evident that they made a great display of veneration for the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul. The four Gospels were highly esteemed among them, especially those of St. Luke and St. John. They also received the Epistles of St. James, St. John, and St. Jude, and the Acts of the Apostles. The Book of Revelation does not appear to have formed part of their canon. The two Epistles of St. Peter were rejected by them, mainly on account of his opposition to St. Paul (Gal. ii. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 14-16), partly also on account of his denial of his Lord. For authoritative statements of their system the Epistles of Sergius must be added. These are known to us only through five or six fragmentary extracts, quoted by their opponents in their controversial treatises (Pet. Sic. 36-39; Phot. i. 21). It is evident that the Paulicians promoted to the utmost, and set high value on general access to the written records of the truth. Through all its history the sect was honourably marked by a staunch adherence to the Protestant principle of the free right of the laity to the unrestricted possession and use of the Scriptures. They had nothing to do with any of the spurious and apocryphal books.

The Gnostic and Manichaean writings were repudiated by them. Their Bible, as Gibbon says, was pure, though not perfect. Their great difference with the church was their rejection of the Old Testament, conceiving it to be the fabulous invention of men or demons, calling the prophets deceivers and robbers. The third book of Photius is occupied with the vindication of the Old Testament against the Paulicians, proving that the Old Dispensation was from the same Author as the New, against the Paulician position that they are contrary and hostile to one another. Such an eclecticism about the Scriptures, and free handling of the sacred volume, was consistent with and partly arose from their grotesque exaggerations and misinterpretation of Pauline doctrine. Paulicianism was not founded on scriptural simplicity and harmony of faith. The Paulicians had no church-consistency of creed. The perverse example of their still more visionary forerunners, the Gnostic and Manichaean sects, had been inherited by them. Like these, their spiritual ancestors, though in a far less degree, they turned to Scripture with minds preoccupied by the Oriental and metaphysical speculations prevalent in those regions. Mentally involved already in this intricate maze, apparently unconsciously, they thrust upon Scripture their own conclusions instead of evolving from Scripture its own profound and majestic evangelical principles. They thus used the Scripture, not so much to learn from it its own divine language as to compel it to speak theirs. They read the Scripture, less to hear about sin, grace, redemption, and God, than to derive an outward Christian varnish and colouring for: mystical and metaphysical theosophy essentially antichristian, unscriptural, and of independent growth. Their Oriental theories about the origin of creation, the genesis of evil, the birth of souls, having little or no counterpart in the actual world of reality, it both exercised all their dexterity, and required great latitude of interpretation to connect these with the literal sense. Like Swedenborg, for a modern example, the Paulicians attempted to graft upon Scripture another sense. They alloyed Scripture with a quasi-higher spiritual sense, above and previous to the actual sense. They dexterously adapted Orientalism to the Scripture, and then brought forward Scripture thus manipulated as a witness and an argument for the truth of what they taught. Some allowance may be made for the Paulician, yet the Paulician appeal to the sacred authority, as far as doctrine went, was but a later example of Irenaeus's striking image. In the 2nd century, he compares the early Gnostic manner of dealing with the divine rule of faith to the fault or fraud of breaking up a noble ancient mosaic and then fitting in the pieces anew, with the same gems and marbles composing an indifferent or vulgar modern imitation on a different plan, and finally claiming from the simple for the clumsy transposition the admiration due to the original masterpiece (Trench *On the Parables*, p. 41-44; Iren. *adv. Haer.* i. 15).

5. Our knowledge of the organisation and institutions of the Paulicians can be gathered only from such scattered hints and allusions as we find on record respecting these. They appear to have been of a simple and unpretending

description, suited to the rustic character of the provincial country people, who formed the great proportion of their communities. The eponym of Paulicians, so honourable in the eyes of the sectaries, was probably invented by their enemies to satirise the excessive devotion of the sect to the name and authority of St. Paul.ⁿ They retaliated on the churchmen by calling their adversaries 'Ρωμαῖοι, Romans, as having merely a political religion, while arrogating to themselves the sole right to the name of Christians, or sometimes Χριστοπολίται (Pet. Sic. 10; Phot. i. 6; Jacob T. M. *Anath.* p. 122). Beyond this we find little trace of higher or lower class distinctions within the sect. There is no indication of anything like Manichaean esoteric and exoteric organisation of their communities into "elect" and "auditors." In harmony with their aim at a reformation of church institutions in the sense of a return to primitive apostolical simplicity, they refused to call their places of worship *ιερά* or *ναοί*, as suggestive of Jewish or pagan temples. They were to be merely *προσευχαί* or "houses of prayer." In the same way they would have no sacerdotal caste among them. In their anti-hierarchical spirit they allowed in their ministers no distinguishing dress or badge of office or other outward mark of their calling. They would have no *ιερείς* or *πρεσβύτεροι*, names engrained with the recollections of the betrayal and condemnation of Christ by the Jewish rulers (Phot. i. 9; Pet. Sic. 6). At the head of the sect were their four first and original teachers and founders, distinguished by them as their "Apostles" or "Prophets." Subordinate to these ranked their ministers, called "teachers" and "pastors," *διδασκαλοὶ* and *ποιμένες*. In the next age, when a general reformer like Sergius, who commanded the reverence of the whole sect, no longer survived, their immediate disciples the *συνέκδημοι*,^o or "associate itinerants," took the first place in the general superintendence of the sect. Next came the *νωτάριοι* or copyists, who, as Gieseler points out, were like the scribes of the New Testament. These were occupied with multiplying the sacred writings and expounding them. In process of time these are said to have ranked highest in the Paulician ecclesiastical offices, and obtained the first authority in the sect as the surest depositaries of the sacred knowledge. Neander considers the *ἄστατοι* mentioned by Photius (i. 24) as elect disciples of Sergius, to have been a higher portion of the *συνέκδημοι*.

6. As to ethical system, a serious moral spirit mainly characterised the teachers and teaching of the sect, but combined with opposition to the

ⁿ The origin of the name "Paulician" from St. Paul has been controverted. That the Paulicians themselves accepted such a derivation and prided themselves upon it, see in Phot. ii. 11, iii. 10, iv. 6. Their opponents in controversy advocated an inferior source, as Paul and John the sons of Callinice, as if the name were from Παύλου καὶ Ἰωάννου, see Phot. l. i. 2; Zonaras, xvi. 2; Ann. Com. Alex. xiv.; Mich. Glyc. *Ann.* part iv. p. 335; Euthym. Zig. *Panopl. Dogm.* The Paulicians anathematised the sons of Callinice as Manicheans, with whom they had no connection. Another suggestion was to trace the name to Paul the father of Gegnoesius, Phot. i. 19.

^o The word occurs Acts xix. 29; 2 Cor. viii. 19 of companions in travel of St. Paul.

traditional ascetic prescriptions of the church. The Paulicians, as has been already pointed out, were enthusiastic iconoclasts. Their numbers are said to have been often recruited from these (John of Oznun, p. 76, 89). They were inveterately opposed to the church fasts, feasts, and all admixtures of Jewish, pagan, and political corruptions, such as they considered the orthodox church to represent and embody. Contrary to this, however, they were the subject of violent invective from their enemies on the subject of their dissimulation, hypocrisy, and bad faith, from the readiness with which on occasion many of their people united in the sacramental rites, and assented to other demands of the dominant church. If such compliance did not arise out of cowardice, like many other sectaries, the Paulicians allowed a great extent of this justifiable accommodation (*οἰκονομία*). They often had recourse to it, as it were, to merit or purchase neglect or toleration, and so avoid being molested. The permission of baptism to their children, as a sort of magical charm of possible benefit to the body, and the medicinal use of the cross by laying it on the body in times of sickness as a practice suitable to their present bodily thralldom in the kingdom of the Demiurge, was similarly allowed by the ruder and less enlightened Paulicians. They had been accustomed to hear great things said amongst the orthodox about the efficacy and potency of these church usages. In times of urgency they superstitiously made this sort of ignorant compromise with the powers that were, in order to the possible averting of felt evil and securing possible imaginary good (Neander, Gieseler, on Phot. i. 9). We have a graphic example of their equivocation and laxity of principle as to veracity in the evasive answers of Gegnoesius in his examination before the Greek patriarch at Constantinople (Phot. i. 19; Pet. Sic. 29). In the respect of practical morality, if we followed the clamorous accounts of their opponents, nothing was too bad to be said about them. But even amidst these authors, a distinction is made between the scandalous followers of Baanes and the rest of the Paulicians. It is not improbable, that as the sect grew popular, and its numbers multiplied, the charges may have had a foundation in various particular instances. Among the mixed multitude, who gathered round such a departure from the established order of things, and so gravitated towards the Paulician schism, there were likely to be the baser sort, who discredited the sect as they would have disgraced the church. The original spirit and true tendency of the Paulicians was no doubt in favour of a sober morality, a homely purity of family life, not rigid or ascetic, but such as would result from their close practical self-direction according to the teaching, as they understood it, of the New Testament Scriptures. [M. B. C.]

PAULINA (1), daughter of Paula the friend of Jerome, and wife of Pammachius (*q.v.*). She married about the time when her mother and her sister Eustochium went with Jerome to Palestine in 385. Her own desire was, after giving birth to children, to lead a life of continence; but her children died in the birth, and she herself probably died in childbirth in the year 397. Her merits are described in consola-

tory letters to Pammachius from Jerome (*Ep.* 66, ed. Vall.) and Paulinus (*Ep.* 13, Migne's *Patrol.* vol. 61). [W. H. F.]

PAULINA (2), a Christian lady, wife of Armamentarius. She and her husband made a vow to renounce the world, on which, St. Augustine, who heard of this through their kinsman Rufinus, wrote a letter, approving heartily of their resolution, c. A.D. 411. They had also added one of mutual continence, of which he also approved, but reminds Paulina that such a vow is permissible only on the condition laid down in 1 Cor. vii. 3-5. Her husband ought not to shrink from a course to which his wife consents, but the course thus adopted ought to be made an offering to God. (*Aug. Ep.* 127.) Paulina had also requested Augustine to explain to her the doctrine about "seeing" God, on which he appears to have written to her a short letter (*Ep.* 147, 17). He therefore replies to her at great length, so much so that he elsewhere calls his letter a book, *de Videndo Deo*. *Retract.* ii. 41. c. A.D. 413. In the course of the letter he quotes St. Ambrose on Luke i. and St. Jerome on Is. vi. and goes over much of the same ground as he does in his letters to Fortunatianus (4) (*Ep.* 148, vol. ii. p. 550) and to Italica (1) (*Ep.* 161, vol. iii. p. 322), and he treats a branch of the subject in the treatise *de Civ. Dei.*, xxii. 29. *Aug. Ep.* 147. [H. W. P.]

PAULINIANUS, younger brother of Jerome. He was still young in 385 (adolescens, *Jer. c. Ruf.* iii. 22), when he left Rome in company with his brother and their friend Vincenius, and he was under thirty years old when ordained in 394 (*Jer. adv. Joan. Hier.* § 8). He shared his brother's journeys in Palestine, and settled with him in Bethlehem, where he remained with him probably to the end of his life. He was modest, and aspired to nothing more than to help his brother in the monastery. But Epiphanius, coming to Jerusalem in 394, and finding (or rather promoting) a schism between the monasteries of Bethlehem and their bishop, John of Jerusalem, determined to ordain him priest. He took him, therefore, to the monastery which he had founded at Ad, and there, against the protests and even resistance of Paulinian, ordained him priest. (See in *Jerome, Ep.* li. 1, ed. Vall. the translation of Epiphanius's explanatory letter to John of Jerusalem.) Paulinian may perhaps have acted as presbyter in the monasteries for a time, but he felt it prudent during the vehement controversy which sprang up between Jerome and the bishop of Jerusalem to go to Epiphanius in Cyprus. Jerome declares in his book *Contra Joannem* (§ 41), that, notwithstanding the bishop's interdict, there were priests of his diocese who officiated in the monasteries, and that his brother was in Cyprus. In the year 398, when Rufinus had gone to Rome, Jerome sent his brother, together with Eusebius of Cremona, and another Rufinus to counteract the proceedings of Rufinus (*Cont. Ruf.* iii. 25). Paulinian had also the duty of proceeding to their old home at Stridon, near Aquileia, to sell what remained of their property (*semirutas villas, Ep.* lxxvi. 14) which had been ruined by the Gothic invasion. In the letter of reconciliation which Jerome wrote to Rufinus,

but which never reached him (81, A.D. 399), he speaks of his brother as not having yet returned, and thinks it probable that Rufinus has seen him at the house of the bishop Chromatius at Aquileia. He probably returned the next year to Bethlehem, and, peace having been made between Jerome and his bishop, and the parish of Bethlehem having been committed, as we learn from Sulpicius Severus (*Dial.* i. 4), to Jerome, his brother probably undertook the details of administration. The relations of the brothers seem to have always been cordial, though Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 79) insinuates the contrary. Augustine in his letter (see Jerome, *Ep.* 101) to Jerome in 402, sends his salutations to Paulinianus. He probably survived Jerome, but of his after history no traces appear. [W. H. F.]

PAULINUS (1), a layman, allowed by Celsus, bishop of Iconium, to preach in his presence (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 19). See NEO (4). [G. S.]

PAULINUS (2), bishop of Antioch, A.D. 321-325 (*Clinton, Fast. Rom.* ii. 548). He is omitted by Theodoret, who makes Eustathius the immediate successor of Philogonius (*H. E.* i. 7), but he appears in the *Chronicle* of Jerome, and under the name of Paul in that of Nicephorus, and of Apollinus in that of Eutychius, p. 431, and is mentioned by Theophanes, p. 11, and Nicetas, and is accepted by Valois (notes on Sozomen, *H. E.* p. 116) and Tillemont (*Mém. Eccles.* tom. vii. p. 649, notes sur *Saint Eustathe*) and Clinton (*u.s.*). He is distinctly named by Sozomen, and united with his successor Eustathius as bishops of Antioch, friendship with whom was one of the reasons for the deposition of Hosius by the Eastern bishops at Philippopolis (*Soz. H. E.* iii. 11). If the scandalous charges brought against Paulinus by the malcontents at Philippopolis in their encyclical, of magical arts, a debauched life, and of being the author of books which had been burnt for the impieties they contained, for which he had been deposed from the episcopate (*Hilar. Frag.* ii. p. 663) refer to this Paulinus, they are probably as devoid of foundation as those against Eustathius or other orthodox prelates in the same document. The reading, however, is doubtful, and though Valois in his notes on Sozomen (*H. E. u.s.*) reads "Antiochiae," and bases his argument on it, all other editions of the encyclical read "Daciae." Pagi accepts the deposition of Paulinus without being able to throw any light on its cause (*Critic. in Annal. Baron.* tom. i. p. 292). [E. V.]

PAULINUS (3), bishop, first of Tyre and then of Antioch for six months, A.D. 328-329 (*Clinton, F. R.*). He appears to have been a native of Antioch, and, according to his friend and panegyrist Eusebius (*Eus. in Marcell.* i. 4, p. 19), having filled the office of bishop of Tyre with great splendour, and after the cessation of the persecution rebuilt with great magnificence the cathedral elaborately described by the historian in the inaugural oration delivered by him at its dedication (*Eus. H. E.* x. 4) was "claimed by the church of the Antiochenes as their own property," *ὡς οἰκείου ἀγαθοῦ μεταποιηθῆναι*, and chosen their bishop. According to Philostorgius he only held his new dignity for half a year

before his death, *μετὰ μῆνας ἑξ ἀπεβίω* (Philost. *H. E.* iii. 15). Paulinus, like his friend Eusebius of Caesarea, was an Arianizer, claimed by Arius in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia as one of his sympathisers (Theod. *H. E.* i. 5). Eusebius of Caesarea lavishes unstinting praise on his fellow-partisan, styling him *τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπον, τὸν θαυμαστὸν, τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς τρισμακάριον* (in *Marcell. u. s.*), and dedicating to him his *Ecclesiastical History* (Eus. *H. E.* x. 1). He also speaks with great indignation of the unfounded charges brought against him by Marcellus, with the view of fixing on him the impious tenet that our Blessed Lord is no more than a created being (in *Marcell. u. s.*). There is no little uncertainty as to the succession of the bishops of Antioch immediately before and after the council of Nicaea, and it has been seriously questioned, and that on no insufficient grounds, whether there were two bishops of the name of Paulinus, one immediately preceding, the other immediately succeeding Eustathius, or only one; and also whether that one is to be placed before or after Eustathius. Dr. Lightfoot decides that there was only one, and makes him Eustathius's predecessor (*D. C. B.* vol. ii. p. 322*b*). But he seems to overlook the statement of the Eusebian bishops at Philippopolis (Hilar. *Frag.* ii. p. 26), supported by Sozomen (*H. E.* iii. 11) that Paulinus was the friend of Hosius, and had been deposed for magic, and other alleged crimes.

[E. V.]

PAULINUS (4), ST., sixth bishop of Trèves, between St. Maximinus and St. Bonosus, holds an important position as one of the foremost Gallic champions of orthodoxy against Arianism. Tradition says that he was a disciple and fellow-countryman of his predecessor, whom he accompanied from Aquitaine to Trèves. He was probably consecrated in the year 349, and must have proceeded almost immediately to Rome, if he was the Paulinus who conveyed to Athanasius the letter in which the two Arian bishops, Ursacius and Valens, announce to Julius of Rome their return to orthodoxy. See the passages from Athanasius collected in *Boll. Aug.* vi. 669, seqq. The Greek word *Τριβέρων*, however, is somewhat doubtful, and the bishop has been by some attributed to Tibur, Tivoli (see *Boll. ibid.*). In 351 was held the Council of Sirmium, at which Paulinus seems to have boldly championed the orthodox cause. The letter of condemnation of Athanasius tendered for his signature he scornfully rejected, with the exclamation that he would sign the condemnation of Photinus and Marcellus, but not of Athanasius (Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 37, *Migne, Patr. Lat.* xx. 150). It was however at the Council of Arles held in 353 that Paulinus's fate was decided. The emperor Constantius, who was present, decreed the penalty of exile for the bishops who should refuse to subscribe the condemnation of Athanasius. Paulinus remained steadfast, and after being condemned by the bishops, was driven into exile in Phrygia, to parts inhabited by heathen and heretics. This occurred in 353 or, at latest, in 354, not 356, as Jerome gives it. He died in 358 or 359. Patriotic chroniclers of Trèves have asserted that he suffered the violent death of a martyr, but there is no evidence of it (see *Boll. Acta SS.* vi. 672). The belief that

his body was brought home from Phrygia by Felix, a later bishop of Trèves, seemed improbable (see Rettberg, *infra*), but the coffin is said to have been discovered quite recently (1883) at Trèves. His day of celebration is Aug. 31 (*Boll. ibid.* Aug. vi. 668). The church of his name outside the walls was one of the earliest at Trèves (Wilmowsky, *Der Dom zu Trier*, p. 11).

From a passage in Athanasius he is believed to have left some treatises against the Arians which have been lost (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, tom. i. part ii. p. 123, 112).

For his life see, in addition to the authorities above cited, the passages from the works of Athanasius collected, *Boll. Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 669 seqq.; Hilarius *ad Const. Aug.* lib. i.; *Lib. contra Const. Imp.* 11; *Fragmentum*, *Migne, Patr. Lat.* x. 562, 588, 631; Hieronymus, *Chronicon* in Bouquet, i. 610; Mansi, iii. 179 seqq., 231; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 376-7; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 189 seqq.; Diel, P. *Der hl. Maximinus und der hl. Paulinus*, Trier, 1875, p. 179 seqq. The life published by the Bollandists (*ibid.* 676-9) is from internal evidence, at least as late as the end of the 9th century, and can only be trusted where corroborated by older testimony.

[S. A. B.]

PAULINUS (5) (PAULONAS), a priest, and a disciple of Ephraem Syrus. Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* c. iii. in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1062) gives a short account of him, speaking of his great talent, his knowledge of Scripture, and his power as a preacher. After his master's death he "separated from the church, and wrote much against the faith," being of an ambitious temperament, and eager for renown. St. Ephraem on his death-bed warned him of the danger of giving free play to his speculative powers, having previously shewn how well he understood the talents and proclivities of his pupil by speaking of him often as "Bardesanus novellus."

[G. W. D.]

PAULINUS (6), bishop of the Eustathian or old Catholic party at Antioch, A.D. 382-388, a man of the highest estimation for his piety and personal character. He was one of Eustathius's presbyters, and according to Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 18) was with him deposed by Leontius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, and accompanied his bishop into exile. Subsequently to the death of Eustathius, a too notorious schism arose from the unwillingness of the old Catholic party to recognise as bishop, or to hold communion with Meletius, with whom they were doctrinally agreed, in consequence of his having been appointed and consecrated by Arians. Paulinus was recognised as the head of the Eustathians, who remained some time without a bishop, holding their meetings for worship in a small church within the walls of Antioch, the use of which had been granted by the Arian bishop Evagrius, out of respect for Paulinus's high character. The authority he enjoyed, though still only a presbyter, is evidenced by his having sent two deacons to represent him at the synod summoned by Athanasius in Alexandria (Athanas. tom. i. p. 580; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 15). One of the first concernsments of the church after the recall of the orthodox bishops from exile consequent on the accession of Julian, A.D.

361, was to take measures for healing this unhappy breach between those who were united in faith. The wise and Christian course, which would at once have put an end to the schism, would have been for the acephalous Eustathians to have recognised Meletius as bishop of the whole orthodox body at Antioch. But the old suspicions of one who had commenced his career amid Arian environments, embittered by personal jealousies and exasperated by the dogmatic intolerance of a self-constituted peace-maker, effectually frustrated this healing measure. The "firebrand" Lucifer of Calaris, on his way home from his banishment in Upper Egypt, instead of accompanying his brother-exile, Eusebius of Vercellae, to the council held at Alexandria, A.D. 362, where his presence was eagerly anticipated, went at once straight to Antioch, confident of his powers of restoring unanimity. Finding it impossible to reconcile the two contending parties on the terms proposed by him, Lucifer rashly took the fatal step of ordaining Paulinus bishop of the old Catholics. This rendered union impossible. When Eusebius rejoined his hot-headed associate, he had to lament the complete frustration of the plans he had been deputed by the council of Alexandria to carry into effect. Respect for Lucifer kept him silent, and he took the earliest opportunity of leaving the city where his presence would only exasperate contentions already too bitter (Soc. *H. E.* iii. 6, 9; Soz. *H. E.* v. 12, 13; Theod. *H. E.* iii. 4, 5). But the mischief done could not be undone, and the church had to lament the fruits of the rash act of Lucifer in a schism which continued to weaken the Catholic cause at Antioch for more than half a century, and to furnish a subject of controversy between the churches of the West and of Egypt which supported Paulinus, and that of the East which adhered to Meletius, which was not finally healed till Alexander became bishop of Antioch, A.D. 413. The whole history of this protracted schism has been fully detailed in other articles, and it is needless to repeat it here. [LUCIFERUS of Calaris; EUSTATHIUS (3) of Antioch; MELETIUS (3) of Antioch; EUSEBIUS (93) of Vercellae; FLAVIAN.] One or two points only need to be noticed. When Valens a second time drove the orthodox bishops into exile, A.D. 364, Paulinus's reputation for supereminent piety caused him to remain unmolested at Antioch, when his rival Meletius was expelled (Socr. *H. E.* iv. 2; v. 5). The year 376 introduced a fresh element of division among the Catholics of Antioch in the ordination to the episcopate by Apollinaris of his disciple Vitalius, a former presbyter of Meletius. The orthodoxy of Paulinus had been recently recognised by pope Damasus, on the perusal of a formulary of faith sent by him to Rome, and being unable to satisfy himself completely as to the soundness in doctrine of Vitalius who had personally applied for communion with him he remitted the question whether he should be received by Rome or no to Paulinus, whose judgment he expressed his intention of following (*Epist. Damas. Labbe*, ii. 900). The issue of this affair, the vain attempts of Epiphanius to bring about an agreement between Paulinus and Vitalius, the ordination of Vitalius as bishop, the complete breach between Paulinus and him, and the perplexity caused to Jerome which of the three professedly orthodox

bishops he was to hold communion with, are narrated in another place. [VITALIUS.] The reader may also be referred to other articles for Paulinus's rejection of Meletius's proposal on his return from his last banishment, A.D. 378, of a joint episcopate to be continued to the survivor (Theod. *H. E.* v. 3, 23; Socr. *H. E.* v. 5) [MELETIUS (3) of Antioch]; for the "self-denying ordinance" agreed to by the six leading presbyters of Antioch, that the survivor of the rival prelates should be recognised by both parties as their bishop, and its frustration by the hasty action of the Eastern bishops at Constantinople, A.D. 381, in the ordination of Flavian [FLAVIANUS (4) of Antioch] followed in his turn by Paulinus in his uncanonical solitary ordination of Evagrius as his successor in his sick chamber (Theod. *H. E.* v. 23) [EVAGRIUS (5) of Antioch]. The death of Paulinus may be placed in A.D. 388. [E. V.]

PAULINUS (7), writer of the life of St. Ambrose, a work erroneously ascribed by Erasmus to Paulinus of Nola, but which Paulinus says himself that he undertook at the request of St. Augustine. He was well qualified for his task by his intimate acquaintance with St. Ambrose, and attendance upon him in his last illness, and also by information gathered from well informed persons, and especially his sister Marcelina. His intimacy is evident from the work itself, in which he seems to call himself the bishop's secretary (notarius) and he was certainly with him at the time of his death (c. 33, 35, 38, 42, 47). In his introduction he expresses his great anxiety to adhere strictly to the truth and to deliver what he has to say impartially, an intention which he appears to have carried out with fidelity. After the death of St. Ambrose he went to Africa, which, according to Baronius, he did at the desire of Venerius, bishop of Milan, next bishop but one of that see, but this is altogether unlikely (Baron. ann. 401, vii.; Marius Mercator, *Comm.* p. 68, note, ed. Migne). He was well received by the church there, and distinguished himself by defending the memory of his friend and patron against an attack upon him by Muranus, bishop of Bollita, during an entertainment at the house of Fortunatus, a deacon, brother to Aurelius, bishop of Carthage. It was perhaps this passage of arms which brought him into acquaintance with St. Augustine, and to become the biographer of St. Ambrose. He was present at the council held at Carthage, A.D. 412, against Coelestius, and took a prominent part in its proceedings, pressing him very hardly when he claimed the authority of Catholic presbyters on his side. The acts of the Council are lost, but a record of the proceedings was preserved by Aug. (*de peccato Aug.* 3, 4, 8; *c. ep. Pelag.* ii. 6). Five years later, when after the death of Innocent I. Coelestius endeavoured to persuade Zosimus his successor to sanction his doctrines (Baron. vol. v. 417, 24), Zosimus wrote to Aurelius and the African bishops, sending them a confession of faith drawn up by Pelagius, but they sent back to him in reply a document (libellus) containing the heads of the charges brought by Paulinus against Coelestius, and declaring their resolution to abide by the decision of Innocent (Prosper Aquit. *c. Collat.* 3). Several letters passed to and fro between Rome

and Africa (Aug. c. *Ep. Pel.* ii. 3), and in one sent by Basiliscus a subdeacon, and delivered Nov. 2, 417, Zosimus desired Paulinus to appear at Rome, reminding him of his former bond to do so; but in his reply dated Nov. 8, sent by Marcellinus, a subdeacon of Carthage, who also carried a letter from the bishops, Paulinus declined to do so, on the ground (a) that the time named in his bond had expired; (b) that his adversary had withdrawn from Rome, but expressing his willingness to appear if the case should be decided, not in his favour but against him. This document (libellus) is lost, but what has been stated just now is gathered from a later one, copied by Baronius from a MS. in the Vatican, and published by him, vol. v. 418, 11, and also by Labbe and Cossart, *Concil.* ii. 1578. In this Paulinus thanks Zosimus for having decided in his favour.

Nothing more is heard about Paulinus after this. He was thought by Erasmus to have been a bishop, but this statement is disproved by his own words in c. 42 of his life of St. Ambrose, and by the description of him by Marius Mercator, *Common.* 2, and there is no evidence to show that he advanced beyond the diaconate. He is said to have been the author of a work entitled "*de Benedictionibus Patriarcharum*," but this belonged to another Paulinus of Aquileia. Besides the authorities already quoted the reader may be referred to Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. pp. 57, 80; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 402; Ceillier, vol. vii. p. 533, viii. 549, ix. 453; Tillemont, who has a few words about him, x. p. 81.

[H. W. P.]

PAULINUS (8), PONTIUS MEROPIUS, and perhaps ANICIUS, ST., bishop of Nola, sprung of a patrician family, of whom some had been Christians (Ausonius, *Ep.* xxiv. 103; Paulin. *Ep.* xl. Prudentius, *Symm.* i. 558, 560; Baronius, 394, 78, 79). They had property in Aquitania, and probably resided there habitually (Ambros. *Ep.* lviii. 1). His father was *praefectus praetorio* of Gaul, had large possessions in the province in which he lived, and was the founder of the town of Burgus (Bourg) on the Dordogne, and as well as his wife appears to have been a Christian.

I. *First Period.* A.D. 353-394.

Besides Paulinus his parents had an elder son, and a daughter. Some have supposed that Paulinus was born at a place called Ebromagus, Hebromagus, or Ebromanus, where certainly in later days he possessed property, and which was situate either at a short distance from the Garonne, or may perhaps answer to *Brau*, a place about 14 miles from Carcassonne, a situation to which his request to Sulpicius about sending him wine stored at Narbonne seems more nearly to answer (Ausonius, *Ep.* xxi. 15, xxii. 25; Antoninus, *It.* 551, 7; Paulin. *Ep.* v. 22, xi. 14; Sidon. *Apoll. Carm.* xxii. 117; *Dict. G. & R. Geog.* i. 1033; Richard, *Guide*, p. 470). But he was probably born at Bordeaux, A.D. 353 or 354, and though in a poem, whose authenticity there is no reason to doubt, he describes himself as dedicated from his earliest years to St. Felix, it was not until many years after his birth that both he and his brother received baptism (Paul. *Carm.* xxi. 350). His tutor was Ausonius, who not only thought very highly of him as a pupil,

but regarded him with warm affection, and addressed to him many of his poetical epistles. The affection of Ausonius was fully returned by his pupil, who declares that he owed to him all the distinction which he had ever attained in the world.

Tibi disciplinas, dignitatem, literas,
Linguae, togae, famae decus,
Provectus, altus, institutus debeo,
Patrone, praeceptor, pater.

Among his early efforts in verse was an abstract of three books of the history of Suetonius, a subject which can hardly be called poetical, but of which a few lines remain quoted by Ausonius with approval, which must be regarded as more partial than discriminating (Aus. *Ep.* xix.; Paulin. *Carm.* iii. x. 89-96; 149-153). But whatever merit his Latin compositions possess, he was by his own admission not strong in Greek, and in a letter to Ruffinus, A.D. 408, regrets his inability to translate accurately an epistle of St. Clement (*Ep.* xlvi. 2). He entered early into public life, became a member of the senate, filled the office of consul for a portion of the official year, in the place of some one who had vacated it, but in what year is not known as his name does not appear in the *Fasti*. It must, however, have been before 379, in which year Ausonius held the office, who says that his pupil attained the dignity of the ivory chair earlier than himself (Aus. *Ep.* xx. 4, xxv. 60). He has been supposed also to have held the office of prefect of New Epirus, a supposition consistent with his own mention of frequent and laborious journeys by land and sea, but of which there is no direct evidence, though an edict of the joint emperors Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian, undoubtedly exists, addressed to a praefect of that province of his name, A.D. 372. We may add that a man named Paulinus filled the office of *praefectus urbi*, A.D. 380, but there is no evidence to identify him with Paulinus of Nola (Cod. Theodos. xv. tit. 7, 4, 5, xvi. tit. 2, 22). That he held a judicial office is certain, for in one of his poems he expresses satisfaction at having condemned no one to death during his tenure of it. Lebrun conjectures that after his consulship he became *consularis* of Campania and resided at Nola (*Carm.* xxi. 396; Tillemont, vol. xiv. p. 8). Possessed of easy fortune, and enjoying the best society of the day, he lived a life free from outward reproach, but one for which he afterwards found great fault with himself. His health was never good, and he suffered much from fatigue in his journeys (*Carm.* x. 134, xiii. 2, 10, *Ep.* v. 4). In the course of them he fell in with Victricius, bishop of Rouen, and with Martin, bishop of Tours, at Vienne in Gaul, and ascribed to the latter the restoration of his sight, the loss of which was threatened, as the narrative seems to say, by cataract (*Ep.* xviii. 9, Sulpic. *Ser. Vit. S. Mart.* xix. 3, ed. Halm.). He also regarded St. Ambrose with great veneration, calling him "father" (*Ep.* iii. 4). But his chief object of veneration was Felix of Nola, to whom, besides the early dedication mentioned above, he devoted himself specially when he visited Nola at about 26 or 27 years of age, A.D. 379 (*Carm.* xiii. 7, 9, xxi. 350, 381). It was about this time, but not later than 389, that as well as his brother, but perhaps rather later than he, he received baptism at Bordeaux, from Delphinus, bishop of that place (*Ep.* iii. 4, xx. 6, xxxv. xxxvi.). Not long

after this he began to think of retiring from the world, and in 389 or 390 went to Spain, residing chiefly at Barcelona. During this time he married a Spanish lady of good fortune and irreproachable character, named Therasia, and a son was born to them, who however died after a few days, and was buried near the graves of the martyrs, no doubt Justus and Pastor, at Complutum (Alcalá). Whether they had any more children does not appear, though a passage in one of his poems shews that at one time he desired to have a family. (Prudentius, *Peristeph.* v. 41, 44; Dexter, *Chron.* A.D. 296, *Carm.* v. 66, xxi. 400, xxxv. 599, 610.) There seems to be good reason for placing the death of his brother about this time, earlier than the date assigned by the recent editors, for a passage in the twenty-first poem plainly places this event before his own retirement. His brother lost his life by a violent death, perhaps in the contest between Arbogastes and Theodosius, A.D. 392; and after his death not only his property, which was of importance to his children, was in danger of confiscation, but the property also of Paulinus and even his life, dangers from which he was delivered, as he believed, by the intercession of Felix (*Carm.* xxi. 414-427, Buse, vol. i. p. 157). It was perhaps partly due to the impression made on his mind by these events that during his stay in Spain he was led to reflect more deeply than ever on the vanity of worldly aims, and to feel much alarm at the prospect of final judgment, and having been blessed by God with light, he determined to give up the senate and worldly business, and notwithstanding the remonstrances of Ausonius refused to take any further interest in "profane" literature, even apologising, though perhaps not quite seriously, for quoting Virgil (*Ep.* iv. 2, xxii. 3, *Carm.* x. 304, 316). But he continued to write verses to the end of his life, though only on sacred subjects. Ausonius taunted him with neglect of his old friend, imputing it to the domineering influence of his wife, whom he called Tanaquil, but after long silence he replied, defending her from his friend's reproaches as being no Tanaquil but a true Lucretia (Auson. *Ep.* xxii. 3, Paulin. *Ep.* xxxv. xxxvi. *Carm.* x. 192, xi. xxii. 414, 425). Determined to renounce the world, he took measures for parting with a large portion of the property belonging both to himself and to his wife, with whom he entered into a vow of continence. Some of the money thus realised he employed in redeeming captives, releasing debtors, and the like, but some he retained for future use in similar purposes. Towards the end of his stay at Barcelona, in compliance with a sudden popular demand (multitudine strangulante compulsus) by no means in accordance with his own desires, for he wished to have begun with the lowest office, even of door-keeper (aedituus) in the service of God, he received ordination to the priesthood, but without any especial care of souls, from Lampius, bishop of Barcelona, on Christmas Day, A.D. 393 (*Ep.* i. 10, ii. 2, iii. 4). Writing to his friend Sulpicius Severus, to inform him of this event, he begs him to come to him before Easter, that they may celebrate the festival together, or at any rate not to put off his coming much longer. Writing to Amandus, then a priest, at Bordeaux, on the same subject, he begs his

prayers for guidance in the work which he has undertaken, and seeks for instruction in the way of carrying it out. He appears, however, to have been already well acquainted with some of the most eminent of the African clergy, Alypius, Augustine, Aurelius, and others. To Alypius he writes by Julianus in reply to a letter received from him, acknowledging the receipt of a work by Augustine in five books, and informing him that he had been able to borrow for him, from Donnio at Rome, the Chronicle of Eusebius, which he wished to see, and which he sends with his letter to Aurelius, at Carthage, requesting him to get the book copied there by Comes and Evodius, and to transmit the copy to Alypius, in order that the borrowed one may be returned to its owner. In a subsequent letter addressed to St. Augustine he mentions the work in five books as his Pentateuch against the Manicheans, i.e. probably his work, in four books, *de doctrina Christiana*, together with the single volume *de vera Religione*, which last Augustine mentions distinctly as having been sent to Paulinus, and in which Manichean doctrine is discussed, though no mention of it is made in the other work (*Aug. Ep.* xxvii. 4). In the same letter Paulinus speaks of his own abandonment of the world, and the choice that has been made of him notwithstanding his unworthiness to be placed among the "princes" of God's people, and requests Augustine to write to him in order to instruct and direct him, and he concludes this letter, as he had the one to Alypius, by requesting Augustine to accept a loaf as a token of unity yet containing the solidity of the Trinity. A similar present with similar meaning was sent by him to other friends at other times (*Ep.* iii. 6, iv. 5, v. 21, vii. 3).

II. Second Period. A.D. 394-409.

In the course of this year, 394, he determined to retire to Nola, where he had property, including a house, and which was the burial of his patron Felix, to whom he says in one of his birth-day poems that he had long mentally dedicated himself, to whom he regarded himself as indebted for assistance and protection on many occasions, whom he invokes for like favour on his journey thither, whether to be made by sea or by land, and in whose service, even as a sweeper of the floor, he hopes to spend the remainder of his life. Of these poems, all of them dated Jan. 14, the anniversary of the death of Felix, fifteen are extant, either wholly or in part, and from them we gather nearly all that is known about Felix (*Carm.* xii. 34, xiv. 3; *Dict. of Chr. Ant.* vol. ii. 1379, NATALE). In the poem for the anniversary of the year after his arrival (395) Paulinus implies that he made his journey by sea, and ascribes to Felix its safe accomplishment (*Carm.* xiii. 14). On his way he saw St. Ambrose, probably at Florence, and in a letter to Sulpicius, whom he entreats to visit him at Nola, he speaks of his reception at Rome, where much jealousy towards him was shewn by the pope, Siricius, and others of the clergy, probably on account of the unusual circumstances of his ordination, whereas at Nola, where not long after his arrival he had a serious illness, he was visited after his recovery by nearly all the bishops of Campania, either in person or by deputy, by clergy of all sorts, by some of the laity, and

also received friendly letters from many African bishops who sent messengers to visit him. Sending his friend a loaf of Campanian bread, and as a proof of his wealth a dish of box-wood, he asks him to send him in return in the earthen vessels with which his messengers were furnished, some "nigellatum" (probably a sort of oil made from *nigella sativa*, μελάνθιον, Plin. *N. H.* xx. 17, 71, 182), and also requests him to cause some old wine to be conveyed to him, which he had left stored up at Narbonne (*Ep.* v. 13, 14, 21, 22, vii. 1, Ambros. *vit.* c. 133, vol. i. p. 106-108, ed. Migne, Baronius, 394, 90). Having now fulfilled his wish of taking up his residence at Nola, he entered with his wife at once upon the course of life which he had marked out for himself, and which he pursued as far as possible until his death, A.D. 431. Many of his friends and acquaintances blamed him greatly for giving up his worldly prospects, possessions and occupations, but men of higher aims, like St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome regarded his conduct and that of his wife with high respect and admiration for their self-sacrifice (Ambros. *Ep.* lviii. 1-3; Hieron. *Ep.* lviii. 6, cxviii. 5). In particular, Augustine writes to him in terms of warm admiration and affection, commending to him not only the bearer of his letter, Romanianus, his old friend, and the kinsman of Alypius, but also Licentius, son of Romanianus, whom he had exhorted to visit Paulinus, and over whom he hopes that he will exert a wholesome and religious influence (Aug. *Ep.* xxvii.). This latter was written in reply to a former one by Paulinus, but did not reach him so soon as might have been expected, and Paulinus, before he had received it, wrote again by Agilis and Romanus to complain, in a friendly way, of Augustine's silence (*Ep.* vi.). Augustine therefore writes a second time, acknowledging the receipt of both letters, announces his own appointment to the office of coadjutor to Valerius, bishop of Hippo, and urges Paulinus to visit him in Africa (Aug. *Ep.* xxxi.). St. Jerome writes in terms of commendation not less warm, exhorting both himself and Therasia to persevere in their course of self-denial, and praises highly his panegyric on the emperor Theodosius, a work which he himself mentions, but which has perished (Hieron. *Ep.* lviii. Paul. (*Ep.* xxviii. 6, Gennadius, c. 48). In reply to the letter of Augustine and to those of the African bishops, Paulinus writes to Romanianus, congratulating the African Church on the appointment of Augustine, and hoping that his "trumpet" may sound forcibly in the ears of Licentius, to whom also he addressed a letter partly in prose and partly in verse to exhort him to a holy life, ending with the following lines, which seem to be worthy of quotation.

Vive precor, sed vive Deo, nam vivere mundo
Mortis opus, vera est vivere vita Deo.

At the time when Paulinus took up his residence at Nola, the burial-place of Felix, situate at a place called in the Martyrology of Bede *in Pincis* or *in Pineis*, distant about a mile from the town, and still called "the cemetery," containing a tomb of a humble character, discovered in a miraculous manner, but left undisturbed, had become in course of time the site of four churches (basilicæ), one of them built by Pope Damasus, and also a chapel. The four churches

bore the names of St. John, St. Stephen, the martyrs, as well as that of St. Felix, and the chapel, at any rate in the 18th century, was called by the name of St. Julian. Probably none of these buildings were of any great size, and to them he added a fifth. To three of them there was a common access, though in what manner this was effected it is not very easy to understand in all respects. Two of them are described by himself in a letter to Sulpicius, and in some of the birth-day poems which he addressed to his beloved patron (Dominaedius). (*Ep.* xxxii. *Carm.* viii. 167-190; xxi. 586-635, xxvii. 360 et seq. xxviii. Remondini, *della Nolana ecclesiastica storia*, vol. i. p. 399, J. Caesar Capaccio, ap. Graevius *Theos.* vol. ix.). The church whose dedication he mentions in *Ep.* 32 is described by him as having a triple apse (*trichorum*, i.e. τριχωρον). Whether the word *apsidem* should be so spelt, or *absidem*, or again *absidam*, was at this time and until much later a doubtful point. (*Ep.* xxxii. 17, Isid. *Orig.* xv. 8, 7.) It was perhaps on the site of the one built by Damasus, and contained not only the tomb of Felix, but beneath the altar (altaria) remains of various saints and martyrs, including St. John Bapt., St. Andrew, St. Luke, St. Thomas, and others of less note, including St. Nazarius, of whom some relics were sent to him by St. Ambrose (*Ep.* xxxii. 17, *Carm.* xxvii. 436, 439), but above all the precious fragment of the True Cross, brought from Jerusalem by Melania, and presented by her to Paulinus A.D. 398, and of which he sent a chip (astula) enclosed in a tube of gold, to Sulpicius, as a special offering from Therasia and himself, to Bassula, his friend's mother-in-law, to honour the churches built by him at Primuliacum* (*Ep.* xxxi.). The pavement, walls, and columns of this apse were of marble, and the vaulted roof, from which lamps were suspended by chains, was ceiled with mosaic work representing the Trinity in a symbolical manner, and also the twelve apostles, with an inscription in verse describing the subjects represented. Of this mosaic some remains were visible in 1512. Another inscription, also in verse, on the plaster band below the spring of the vaulting indicated that the precious fragment of the Cross was deposited beneath the altar, and recorded the history of its arrival at Nola. Besides the suspended lamps and the silver lamp always burning before the altar, tall candles of parti-coloured wax stood in various parts of the building, and when lighted sent forth a sweet odour. The nave of the church was lofty and ceiled in panels (lacunatum). On each side were aisles, probably two, as the existing remains seem to show (geminis utrinque porticibus dilatatur), supported by columns, of which and to each arch there were two, i.e. they were set either in pairs on the same level, or in tiers, one upon the other, so as to form a sort of triforium gallery (duplex per singulos arcus columnarum ordo dirigitur), containing on each side four chambers or chapels (cubicula, coenacula) for people to pray in and meditate on Holy Scripture, and from which they might see the altar through latticed openings intended for the purpose (spectant de su-

* A place in Aquitaine, not far from Eluso (Eauze), perhaps P'alsance on the Adour.

peris altaria tota fenestris). They were also suited to be memorials of departed friends or holy persons interred beneath the ground-floor. (*Ep.* xxxii. 12, *Carm.* xviii. 35, xix. 408-411, xxvii. 362-402.) Each of the chambers bore in front an inscription in verse, as was the case with the entrances, and of these inscriptions he sends copies of two to his friend, in case he should wish to make use of them for his own churches lately built. Another church, altogether new, to which there was a private entrance through his own garden, with inscriptions on each side of the door, looked, not as was usually the case, to the east, but to the restored one containing the tomb of Felix, which may still be seen in its original place. With this church, the new one built by Paulinus, appears from the remains to have stood at right angles, in such a manner that the entrance of the one looked directly upon an opening in the side of the other, with only a small space between them, enclosed by open screen-work. In the sides of this and opposite to each other were three arches, bearing inscriptions in verse, through which when the folding doors were open a view might be obtained from the interior of the one church into the interior of the other, and in the open space there was a receptacle for water (cantharus) that people might wash their faces and hands before they entered the other church. (*Ep.* xiii. 13.) Like the church described above, this one had also an apse with semicircular recesses on each side, bearing inscriptions in verse, one for the ministering priest to make preparation for celebrating the Eucharist; the other a place of prayer for ministers and others after its conclusion. It had also three entrances in front, all bearing inscriptions, and the two on each side of the centre one had over them crosses painted in vermilion. That there were three churches there can be no doubt (*Carm.* xxviii. 37), but the situation of the third is not very clear, though, if we may judge from the existing remains and the plans of Remondini and Canina, it would seem to be the one bearing the name of the martyrs (dei martiri), at the south side of the older church of St. Felix. To all three, however, there was access from a paved court (atrium) surrounded by cloisters, in which were fountains for people to wash in before entering the church, and also a large reservoir (cantharus) with a lofty cover of perforated metal. Between the columns by which the roofs of these cloisters were supported there were railings or partitions, on which people might lean to rest themselves and enjoy in summer the shade, and in winter the shelter of the roof. Beyond this court outside there was another larger court (vestibulum) open, but, like the inner one, also surrounded with cloisters, and the junction of the gabled roofs presented the appearance, Paulinus says, of a castle (*Ep.* xxxii. 10-16; *Carm.* xxvii. 395-462, xxviii. 2-59). In both courts there were cells, and to those in the outer one three openings, of which the one in the middle was adorned with figures of saints of both sexes, while on those to the right and left respectively were represented the histories of Job and Tobit, and of Esther and Judith. The cells in the inner court (atrium) communicated with the principal church, so that they who wished to pray there might enter it either by day or night. There

was no separate building for a baptistry, a point in which Paulinus acknowledges willingly that his friend surpassed him, but the font was placed in a vaulted chamber having three recesses of a circular form. (*Ep.* xxxii. i. 5; *Carm.* xxviii. 180-195.) All the buildings, both churches and cloisters, were adorned with pictures representing Scripture subjects, in the older church from the N. T. and in the newer one from O. T., for the introduction of which Paulinus apologises on the score of their utility in occupying the attention of the illiterate people who flocked to the grave of Felix in large numbers at all times of the year, and sometimes spent whole nights there in the winter, watching and fasting, having brought torches with them. By means of these pictures Paulinus hoped to employ their minds, and prevent them from subsequent excess either in eating or drinking. (*Carm.* xxvii. 552-598.) In beginning his work of bringing his new church into close proximity to the tomb of Felix, Paulinus was hindered by the obstinate refusal of the occupiers of two poor cottages which stood in the way, to remove from them under any conditions whatever. But fortunately a fire broke out in one or other of them, which, after resisting all efforts to extinguish it, yielded at last only to the exhibition of the fragment of the Cross. On examination, it was found to have consumed only such parts of the cottages as obstructed the new work, and the occupiers were induced by what had taken place to abandon their opposition. Another difficulty arose in the course of construction from a deficiency of water to supply the various fountains and reservoirs. The people of Nola appear to have been unwilling to allow him to share in their own supply, and he prepared tanks and receptacles for rain-water, but the zeal of the people, especially of Abella, in their devotion to Felix, removed the difficulty. They set to work to improve an old watercourse near Abella (Malifera Abella, Virg. *Aen.* vii. 740), now *Avella*, a town in the mountains, six miles from Nola, and obtained an abundant supply both for the establishment of Paulinus and for the town of Nola, notwithstanding its churlish opposition. Of all this, the credit was due to Felix. (*Carm.* xxi. 650-794, xxvii. 463-479, xxviii. 180-195.) The dedication of the new buildings by the bishop of Nola took place on the birth-day of Felix, A.D. 403, but he was able to show them in a state approaching completion to his dear friend Nicetas, bishop of the Dacians, whose second visit, in 402, he celebrated with special delight.^b (*Carm.* xxvii.)

Besides these works Paulinus also devoted much pains and cost to the erection of a new church at Fundi, a place endeared to him by early recollections, and at which he possessed property. He also enriched it with relics of mar-

^b The writer of this article cannot pretend to have satisfied himself entirely as to the position and arrangement of the buildings, partly from the absence of precision in the terms used to describe them, and partly from the difficulty of providing a common access to three buildings, not all of them looking in the same direction. The kindness however of a friend who has examined the site carefully, has furnished information which removes much of the difficulty. Reference will be made at the end of the article to various authorities on the subject.

tyrs and apostles, including St. Andrew, St. Luke, SS. Nazarius, Gervasius, and Protasius (*Ep.* xxxii. 17).

His own residence was a house which he had formerly either built or enlarged as an asylum for the poor, and to which he added a second story for his own use and that of his associates, and the friends who visited him; but reserving the ground-floor for the poor, so that by their ascending prayers the building above might be strengthened. (*Ep.* xxix. 13; *Carm.* xxi. 390.) His companions, at first, were Proforus, a Jew by birth, and Restitutus, and afterwards Theridius, Agilis, and Romanus: but though he carried out the monastic rule with full severity, he received his friends hospitably, and spared no pains to induce them to visit him. (*Ep.* v. 19, vi. 3, xv. 4, xviii. 1-3; *Carm.* xxi. 385-394, xxiii. 106; *Aug.* *Ep.* xxvi. 5.) In particular the two visits paid to him by Nicetas in 398 and 402 were occasions of great rejoicing. (*Carm.* xvii. xxvii.)

The mode of life adopted by Paulinus was monastic in the fullest sense, and he himself calls his house a monastery. (*Ep.* v. 15.) The inmates dressed themselves in hair cloth, with a rope round their waists instead of a girdle, cut their hair in a manner studiously unbecoming, were perhaps not careful as to personal cleanliness, observed strict rules of silence and fasting, even during Easter-tide did not eat until about 3 P.M., and used for the most part a vegetable diet, lying down to sleep on the ground or the floor, wrapped only in a coarse cloak or patch-work blanket, and abridging the time usually devoted to sleep. (*Ep.* xv. 4, xxii. 1, 2, 3, 6, xxix. i. 13; *Carm.* xxxv. 445-497.) In one of his letters he thanks his friend Sulpicius for sending him a dress of camel's hair as being suited by its roughness to be an instrument of discipline to the skin and to remind the wearer of his sins (*Ep.* xxix. 1); in another for sending him a cook, Victor by name, who was skilful in dressing vegetables for monastic diet, and who also condescended to shave him, (*Ep.* xxii. 3, xxiii. 7, 9, 10), and wished to be allowed to wash his feet and clean his shoes, the former of which services was accepted by Paulinus because it reminded him of the apostles, receiving the like service from their Master. Victor was frequently employed in carrying letters, and became much endeared to Paulinus (*Ep.* xxiii. 5, xxviii. 1, 3, xxxiii. 17). Another carrier of letters sent by Delphinus, bishop of Bordeaux, and Amandus, a priest of that diocese, Cardamas, an actor by profession, and not remarkable for sobriety, arrived during Lent, and at first complained of the meagre diet of the season, but afterwards submitted to it cheerfully, and even to the wine drunk by the brethren, and appears afterwards to have been admitted to one of the minor orders of the church, as an exorcist. (*Ep.* xv. 4, xix. 4.) Both Paulinus and his wife were lavish in almsgiving, though the latter was more thrifty than himself, and a story is related by Gregory of Tours, but concerned with an earlier period of his life than his residence at Nola, to show how, when he wished to give some money to a beggar, she objected on the ground that there was only one loaf in the house. "Give it then," said her husband, "for God will replace it for us." Pre-

sently came a message to announce the loss of a ship expected to arrive with a cargo of grain and wine, a calamity which he interpreted to be a punishment sent from God for the refusal of the loaf. (Greg. Turon. *de Glor. Confess.* cx. [cvii].) One of the first of the messengers who brought letters to him and carried back his replies was Vigilantius, probably the same as he who afterwards became notorious for his controversy with St. Jerome. He brought letters from Sulpicius, soon after the arrival of Paulinus at Nola, but fell ill on his journey, and in consequence of this was detained there longer than would otherwise have been the case. It is plain that at this time Paulinus esteemed him highly, and had no suspicion of any unsoundness in his opinions. (*Ep.* v. 11, Hieron. *Ep.* 61, *contr. Vig. Opp.* ii. p. 339 (387), *adv. Ruf.* 14, Gilly, *Vigilantius*, pp. 173, 176.) All the bearers of letters for him were not equally trustworthy: one of them, called Marracinius—if indeed this word be a personal and not a tribal name—came as far as Rome, but whether from fear of monastic diet, or from some other cause, abandoned his charge there and handed it over to his companion Sorianus, who was more faithful than himself (*Ep.* xxii. 1). On the other hand, Paschasius, a deacon who brought letters from Victorius, bishop of Rouen, found Paulinus at Rome, and made himself so acceptable that he took him with him to Nola, where he was able not only to nurse him during a severe illness, but also his companion Ursus, whose recovery Paulinus attributed to the influence of Felix, and whom Paschasius, with the approval of Paulinus, baptized on his sick bed. (*Ep.* xviii. 1-3.) It is perhaps worth noticing that some of these messengers—e.g., Sanemarius and Victor, had only lately been set free from servitude, the former by Paulinus, the latter by Sulpicius. (*Ep.* xii. 12, xxii. 3, xxiii. 4.) For Sanemarius, who carried a letter to Amandus, Paulinus requested that his friend would make interest with Exsuperius, a priest of Bordeaux, afterwards probably bishop of Toulouse, to obtain for him a piece of ground as a means of living, on condition of his taking care of the burial-place of his parents. (*Ep.* xii. 12, Baronius, 4^o 5, 61, 62.) In the same letter he requested his friend to forward to Daducius, a Christian, but of whom nothing more is known, a letter pleading the cause of Basilus, an aged presbyter of Capua, whom he wished to get reinstated in his home, from which he had been driven by the encroachments of some wealthy persons of that neighbourhood, and with whom Daducius was in some way connected. In subsequent letters he expresses his thankfulness for the accomplishment of his wish, at which he says that all Capua rejoices. (*Ep.* xii. 12, xiv. 4, xv. 2, 3.)

Having once settled at Nola, he seldom, if ever, left his abode there, except to pay a visit once a year to Rome, to join in the festival of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, on June 29, the day of their martyrdom (beatorum apostolorum natalem) (*Ep.* xvii. 2, xviii. 1, xx. 2, xliii. 1, xlv. 1; *Carm.* xxi. 132-166; *Aug.* *Ep.* xcv. 6.) As the distance between Rome and Nola is about 160 miles, a longer distance than he himself states, he doubtless took many days for making the journey; and on one occasion he tells us that he stopped a day at Formiæ, in order to enjoy

there the reading of a letter received from St. Augustine, at Rome, by the hands of Quintus, a deacon. On these occasions, however, his time was so much occupied, not only by the special employments of the festival and visits paid to the churches of the martyrs, but in receiving visits from many people, personal friends and others, who came to consult and converse with him on religious subjects, that he had little or no time to spare even for the perusal of a letter from so valued a correspondent. (*Ep.* xvii. 2, xlv. 1; *Carm.* xiv. 66-70.) It was just after one of these annual pilgrimages, in 399, that he became ill, as has been mentioned above, and when so much sympathy was shown towards him by the bishops and clergy of Campania.

But though he took great pains to attend at this great general festival, and to do it all the honour in his power, the event which in all the year was the chief subject of interest for him and his little community at Nola was the festival of St. Felix, on January 14. For many years he did not omit to compose a poem in honour of the day, setting forth either the praises of the saint or his own endeavours to do him honour. We have already seen that the popularity of St. Felix, and the great numbers of the people who flocked to his shrine, led eventually to the building of the churches described above; and in one of the earlier of the poems Paulinus tells us how multitudes came from all parts of Southern Italy, either to be cured of their ailments, and be relieved of their troubles of various kinds, or to thank God for cures already performed or relief obtained; how even Rome itself sent forth its thousands on the Appian road, which became encumbered by the crowds of pilgrims, and how Nola, for a short time, became, he says, almost as populous as Rome. (*Ep.* xiv.) When the Goths invaded Italy, A.D. 400, 401, as a punishment, Paulinus says, for the sins of the Roman people, he exhorted Christians to trust for protection, not to human arms but to the mercy of God, whose favour they ought to seek in penitence and prayer; and as Isaiah was sent to comfort and encourage Hezekiah, so may Felix become an intercessor with God for the deliverance of His people. (*Carm.* xxvi. 74, 195.) In a poem written five years later, A.D. 406, of which a fragment only remains, he speaks with thankfulness of the defeat of the invaders, no doubt that of Rhadagaisus by Stilicho, A.D. 405, a deliverance which he attributes to the intercessions of the patron saints of the church, including Felix (*Carm.* xxxi.; *Aug. Civ. D.* v. 23).

III. Third Period. A.D. c. 409-431.

At some time during the next four years, Paulinus became bishop of Nola, and though it is impossible to fix the date exactly, it must have been before the autumn of 410, at which time Alaric laid waste Campania, for St. Augustine speaks of him as being then bishop of Nola. Therasia was probably dead, though not very long before this time, for a letter of Paulinus to Augustine superscribed, as was frequently though not invariably the case, both with his own name and that of his wife, *Paulinus et Therasia peccatores*, appears to belong to the year 408; and certainly to the month of May, and later still in the same year, the reply of Augus-

tine, conveyed in all probability by Possidius, bishop of Calama, is addressed to both names. The letter, however, of Paulinus, just mentioned, is the last which bears the double superscription; and as there is no subsequent mention of Therasia, even in connection with the capture of Nola, we may perhaps conclude that her death took place in the latter part of the year 408, though Tillemont and Buse seem to place it a year or two later than this; and Gregory of Tours seems to speak of her as alive during a part at any rate of his episcopate. (*Ep.* xlv. p. 8, *Aug. Civ. D.* i. 10; *Ep. Gregorius Tur. de Glor. Conf.* cx. (cvii.); Baronius, 410, 45; Gams, *Series Episc.*, p. 907; Tillemont, vol. xiv. 50, p. 156; Buse, vol. ii. pp. 192, 193.) His diocese was a small one, and appears, at any rate in former times, to have been notorious for drunkenness and immorality. (*Ep.* xlix. 14; *Carm.* xix. 164-218.) Without adopting the whole of the glowing panegyric applied by Uranius to his behaviour as bishop, we may well believe that he shewed himself in this, as in other respects, a faithful, devout, humble, and munificent follower of his divine Master; and when Campania was laid waste by the army of Alaric, A.D. 410, Paulinus devoted all that he had to the relief of the sufferers and captives. In reference to this calamity, Baronius, in contradiction to the plain statement of St. Augustine, thinks that the people of Nola, through the influence of Felix, escaped from it, but the prayer which he offered at the time when he was in the hands of the captors shows sufficiently both the fact and also his habit of life and temper of mind. "Lord, let me not suffer torture for the sake of gold or silver, for whither all these are gone that were mine Thou knowest." The story which St. Gregory the Great, 200 years later, relates, that Paulinus gave himself as a captive in exchange for a widow's son, though accepted by M. Lagrange, seems hardly worth consideration. (*Aug. Civ. D.* i. 10, *de cur. mort.* xvi. 19; *Greg. Mag. Dial.* iii. 1; Baronius, 410, xlv. xlvii., Gaston Boissier, *Revue des deux Mondes, Vie de S. Paul par l'Abbé Lagrange*, vol. xxviii. 1878.) See also (FELIX (186), vol. ii., p. 499.) The barbarian occupation did not last long, and made no difference to Paulinus as to his residence, nor, as it seems, to his buildings, for the treatise of *Aug. de cura pro mortuis gerenda*, written A.D. 421; addressed to Paulinus, and sent to him by Candidianus, speaks of the burial of a young man named Cynegius, in the Church of St. Felix (c. i. 1, and xviii. 23). From this time until his death, in 431, there are few events to record in the life of Paulinus. A letter addressed to him by St. Augustine, probably in 417, seems to hint at a tendency on his part to adopt some, at least, of the erroneous doctrines of Pelagius, with whom he had been on friendly terms (*Aug. Ep.* 186 i. 1, and xii. 41). He may perhaps have taken part in the proceedings at Rome and at Ravenna, A.D. 418, which led to the condemnation of Pelagius and the deposition of Julianus, bishop of Eclanum, on whose marriage with Ia Paulinus had written a poem (*Carm.* xxv.; JULIANUS (15), vol. iii. 469-472.) When after the death of Zosimus, in December of the same year, the appointment of his successor in the see of Rome became a matter of dispute, the emperor Honorius, having summoned a council

of bishops to meet at Ravenna, and afterwards at Spoletum, to settle the question, invited Paulinus to attend at both of these places, but he excused himself on the first occasion on the ground of ill-health, and was probably prevented by the same cause from appearing on the second. (Baronius, 419, 19, 20.) After a residence of thirty-six years in his retirement at Nola, a period devoted both by himself, and during her lifetime by his wife, to unsparing self-denial, to religious observances, and to works of piety and charity without stint, he died June 22, A.D. 431, aged 77 or 78. An account of his last illness and death has been left by Uranius in a letter addressed to Pacatus. Uranius was perhaps the same man as he who, 22 years before this time, had incurred the displeasure of Paulinus by long delay in conveyance of a letter to him from Delphinus (*Ep.* xix. i.). As the account is not very long, it may, perhaps, be well to give it with some abridgment, as follows:—“Three days before his death he was visited by two bishops, Symmachus (of Capua) and Acyndinus, by whose conversation he was much refreshed. He desired the sacred mysteries to be exhibited before his bed, so that the sacrifice having been offered in their company, he might commend his own soul to the Lord, and at the same time recall to their former peace those on whom, in the exercise of church discipline, he had pronounced sentence of exclusion from communion. When this was over he called for his brothers, by whom the bystanders thought that he meant the bishops who were present; but he said that he called for Januarius, bishop of Naples, and Martin of Tours (both of them deceased), who, he said, had promised to be with him. He then raised his hands to heaven, and repeated Psalm cxx. (cxi.), ‘I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills,’ &c. Being reminded by Posthuvianus that 40 *solidi* were due for garments given to the poor, he replied, smiling, ‘Be not disturbed, my son; believe that one will not be wanting to discharge the debt of the poor.’ And presently came in a presbyter from Lucania, sent either by Exsuperantius or his brother Ursatius, bringing 50 *solidi*. He blessed God for not deserting him, and having given 2 *solidi* to the presbyter, gave the rest to the tradesmen who had supplied the clothes. He then slept till midnight, but was awakened by the pain in his side, which was much increased by the violent means (ustiones) employed by the physicians. As his custom was, he celebrated matins, and when day broke, after the Lord’s example, he pronounced the commandment of peace (*pacem hereditariam*). Later in the day, as if the hour for vesper were come, perhaps at that time (*lucernaria devotionis tempus agnoscens*), he recited slowly, with outstretched hands, the words, ‘I have prepared a lamp for my anointed’ Ps. cxxxii. 17 (cxxxii. 17). At about the fourth hour of the night, while all were watching, the cell was shaken by an earthquake, which was felt nowhere else, and during this he expired.” He was buried in the Church of St. Felix, in Pincis, and his funeral was attended not only by Christians, but by Jews and Pagans. His body is said to have been afterwards removed to Rome and interred in the Church of St. Bartholomew. (Uranius, *de ob. S. Paul* ap. Migne

Patrol., vol. liii.; Baronius, 431, 193-197; Remordini, vol. i. p. 399.)

Writings of Paulinus. a. Prose.

He has left behind fifty-one letters and thirty-six poems, and besides these and the Panegyric on Theodosius already mentioned, is said by Gennadius to have written several letters to his sister (?) about contempt of the world, also various discourses on a description of the martyrdom of Genesius of Arles, one on almsgiving, one on repentance, and one in praise of all martyrs; also to have composed a Hymnary, a statement which seems to rest chiefly on a passage in the letter to Alypius (*Ep.* iii.). The same writer says, that he was eminent not only for his learning and holiness of life, but also for his power in expelling evil spirits. (Gennad. c. 48.) Excepting the letters and the poems mentioned above, which are some of them imperfect, the other works have perished, but there are sufficient to give us a full idea of the man’s character and abilities, and also incidentally some pictures of the state of society, both high and low, during his lifetime. Of the letters, 13, some of them very long, are addressed to Sulpicius Severus, the first in 394, and the last of them in A.D. 403, 5 to Delphinus, bishop of Bordeaux, 6 to Amandus his successor, 4 to Augustine, 3 to Aper and Amanda, 2 to another Amandus and Sanctus, 2 to Rufinus, 2 to Victricius, 3 to persons unknown, and single letters to Alethius, Alypius, Desiderius, Eucherius and Gallus, Florentius, Jovius, Licentius, Macarius, Pamachius, Romanianus, Sebastianus, besides the account of the martyrdom of Genesius which comes as a sort of postscript to the letter to Eucherius and Gallus, *Ep.* 51. One to Marcella, and one to Celancia are probably not genuine. The double superscription to many of his letters has been already mentioned. It does not appear that he ever saw Sulpicius after his visit to Spain, but the love of the two men for each other never failed. Again and again he entreats Sulpicius to come and see him, “veni ad nos,” he says in one letter, “et si potes advola.” (*Ep.* xi. 14.) Many times he laments over delay in hearing from him, and expresses his own affection and also that of his wife both for himself and his mother-in-law Bassula. Sulpicius on his side sends him his life of St. Martin, which he reads to Melania, and also to his friend Nicetas, lately arrived from Dacia. (*Ep.* xxix. 14.) The cook has already been mentioned. He also asked Paulinus to let him have his picture to place in the church which he was building. This last request, Paulinus with much earnestness declined to grant, “erubescio pingere quod sum, non audeo pingere quod non sum,” but rejoices that a picture of himself is painted in his friend’s heart. (*Ep.* xxx.) In return Paulinus sends to Sulpicius various presents, loaves of unity, a fragment of the Cross, a dress, blessed by Melania, and which he had worn himself that he might share the blessing with his friend (*Ep.* xxix.), poems frequently, and his panegyric on Theodosius. The last letter describes the churches at Nola, and their dedication. (*Ep.* xxxii.) His letters to Delphinus and Amandus, though they exhibit the same deep humility and also the cheerful humour which was a part of his character, are chiefly

remarkable for the earnest request made to both of these friends, that they will offer their prayers on behalf of his deceased brother, of whom he speaks with great affection but with deep regret for his neglect in spiritual matters, and hopes that by their prayers he may obtain some refreshment in the other world. (*Ep.* xxxv. xxxvi.) Of those to St. Augustine the first two (iv. vi.) contain nothing of special importance, beyond some gracious expressions of profound respect; the third is chiefly occupied with remarks on the grief of Melania for the loss of her only son Publicola, and a reply to Augustine on the condition of the soul in celestial glory, which he thinks will be one of highly exalted powers and beauty resembling the condition of our Lord after His resurrection. He asks Augustine for his own opinion on the same subject. (*Ep.* xiv.) To this letter Augustine replied, and speaks of the pleasure which Possidius, the bearer, must be enjoying in the society of Paulinus and Therasia, regretting his own inability to cross the sea to visit them. As regards this question, he agrees with Paulinus that it is more important to attend to our own life and conduct in this world, for as is our life here so in the main will our condition be hereafter. He points out some of the difficulties by which our life among men is beset, begs his advice, and requests him to ask for the advice of others on the subject of Christian behaviour in society. He has little doubt that the condition of just men made perfect will be one of enlarged and exalted bodily faculties, but in a spiritual condition. (*Aug. Ep.* xcv.) In the 4th letter Paulinus asks for the opinion of Augustine as a doctor of Israel on various passages in scripture according to the Latin version. (1) Ps. xv. 3 (xvi. 4), *sanctis . . . multiplicatae sunt infirmitates eorum, postea acceleraverunt* who are meant by the "saints," and how are their infirmities multiplied? (2) Ps. xvi. 15, 16 (xvii. 14) what is meant by *de absconditis tuis adimpletus est venter eorum, and saturati sunt porcina*, or, as he hears is read by some, *filii*. (3) Ps. lviii. 11 (lix. 11) *ne unquam obliviscantur legis tuae* (Vulg. *populi tui*). He cannot understand how knowledge of the law can be sufficient without faith in Christ. (4) Ps. lxxvii. 23, 25 (lxxviii. 21, 23). *Deus conquassavit capita inimicorum suorum, verticem capilli &c.*, which last expression he thinks to be void of sense, though he could understand *verticem capitis*, who are the "dogs," v. 25, and what is the meaning of *ab ipso*? Some questions follow on passages in St. Paul's epistles. (1) Eph. iv. 11, What are the special functions of each order named by St. Paul, what difference is there between "pastors" and "teachers." (2) 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, What difference between "prayers" and "supplications." &c. (3) Rom. xi. 28. How can the people of Israel be at the same time friends and enemies; why enemies for the sake of Christians, friends for that of the fathers? (4) Col. ii. 18, *nemo vos seducat in humilitate et religione angelorum*. What angels does St. Paul mean: if bad angels, how can there be any *humilitas* or *religio* connected with them? Paulinus thinks that heretics must be intended. (5) Col. ii. 18. 21. He asks Augustine to explain to him these two passages from the Epistle to the Colossians, which seem to him to

contradict each other: what "show of wisdom" (*ratio sapientiae*) can there be in "will worship" (*superstitio*) and how can "neglect of the body" (*non parcendum corpori*) agree with "satisfying of the flesh" (*saturitas carnis*), which seems contrary to St. Paul's own practice as mentioned 1 Cor. ix. 27. He also asks Augustine to explain to him how it came to pass that our Lord was and was not recognised by the women and disciples on the Day of Resurrection, how He came to be known by the latter in the "breaking of bread;" what did He mean by bidding Mary not to touch Him until after His ascension (John xx. 17), as to which he supposes that He meant that He was to be touched by faith hereafter, though not then by the hand. Again, what did Symeon mean by his words to the Virgin Mother (Luke ii. 34, 35), what "sword" was it that was to pierce her soul, was it the word of God; and how could this cause the "thoughts of many hearts" to be "revealed"? These questions he doubts not that Augustine will be able to explain to him. (*Ep.* L.) In replying to them, St. Augustine says, that he has consulted MSS., in order to consider various readings of some of the passages, especially how they stand in the original Greek, (of N. T.) (1) Ps. xv. 3 (xvi. 4), he explains by reference to Rom. v. 20, if sins abounded, mercies abounded still more. (2) Ps. xvi. 15 (xvii. 14). the "world" here means the church, from which the ungodly must be rejected, and *de absconditis*, &c., means the evil harboured in the consciences of the bad. In v. 16 of same Psalm (xvii. 15), the reading *porcina*, which proceeded from one of LXX. *δῶν* or *δελῶν* instead of *νῶν* or *νέων*, Augustine mentions as erroneous, and shows that the true reading must imply that the evil of bad men must descend to their children. (See Hieron. *Brev. in Ps.* xvi. vol. vii. p. 862.) (3) Ps. lviii. 11 (lix. 11). Augustine shows that in speaking of Jews the passage means, that the people would not be destroyed lest the law would be forgotten. (4) Ps. lxxvii. 23. (lxxviii. 21.) The expression refers to the pride of some people, and by *canum tuorum* (v. 25) the enemies are meant, who had become by conversion God's servants, faithful like watch-dogs to their masters. The words *ab ipso* imply God's grace. Turning to St. Paul's Epistles, he shows (1) that the prophets mentioned in Eph. iv. 11, are men like Agabus, and the evangelists are such as St. Luke or St. Mark. Pastors and teachers are the same in different aspects of their office. (2) 1 Tim. ii. 1. The Greek must be consulted, whose meaning the translators have scarcely reached. MSS. differ as to the reading, some reading *deprecationes* for *obsecrationes* (*δεήσεις*) and *postulationes* for *interpellationes* (*ἐντροχίσεις*). Though the difference between the words is very slight, he prefers to agree with the church that *precationes* (*δεήσεις* or *εὐχαί*) are to be understood of such prayers as are made before the consecration of the elements in the Eucharistic Service; *orationes* (*προσευχαί*) after this, which is almost everywhere followed by the Lord's Prayer, and after all come *gratiarum actiones* (*εὐχαριστίαι*) which St. Paul places last of all. (3) Rom. xi. 25, 26. There is no real difficulty in this passage. Those who become Christians are "beloved," while the rest are "enemies." The "beloved" according to elec-

tion are the predestinated, but those who fail to persevere to the end in faith working by love are not included in the call, as is the case with some infants who otherwise would undoubtedly be saved, but that they afterwards fell away. The case is not in all its parts thoroughly intelligible to us. (4) Col. ii. 18, 23. He confesses the obscurity of the passage, and would prefer to talk it over with Paulinus. By "philosophy" is meant attention to useless subjects, including Judaism: by angels are meant those of them who devote their attention to the world, and *religio, cultus* of them answers to *θρησκεία*. By *rationem habentia sapientiae* is meant, things of which another account can be given by worldly philosophy; *ad non parcendum corpori, &c.*, implies a superstitious humiliation by which the body is defrauded of the food from which it is compelled to abstain, though we know that no one sort of food is more honourable than another. (5) As to our Lord's appearances after His resurrection, no doubt He presented more than one bodily appearance at different times, e.g. at the transfiguration. In the meaning of His words to Mary *noli me tangere*, Augustine agrees with Paulinus: the "breaking of bread" was no doubt a sacrament which unites us in acknowledgment of Him. (6) The "thoughts of many hearts to be revealed" includes thoughts of all kinds, bad and good; the "sword" must mean sorrow. This correspondence is interesting and also valuable, as showing (1) the opinions of St. Augustine on certain passages of scripture, and (2) his just conception of the true principles of biblical criticism, and though the imperfect nature of his own qualifications for the task especially as regards O. T., must be admitted, the acuteness of his perception and clearness of his judgment together with his firm grasp of the true function of scripture in the system of the church give great weight to his opinions on all the points submitted to him. (3) We may add also, from the view which it gives of the attention paid by a diligent intelligent and devout man like Paulinus to the text of scripture in its Latin version, the only one accessible to him, and of the difficulties with which he met in his study of it. The three letters to Aper and Amanda, a priest and his wife, who had adopted a rule of life similar to that of Paulinus with Therasia, contain nothing worthy of special remark, except a wish for the welfare of their children, combined with approval of their own way of life (*Ep.* xxxviii. xxxix. xlv.). In one of two to Amandus and Sanctus he mentions an observation by his friend Rufinus in natural history, as to the pelican in Egypt feeding on serpents, and ventures on an etymology in Greek as to the word *nycticorax*, which can hardly be called successful. He also finds some remarks on the Latin reading of Ps. cxl. 6, cxli. 5, (*impinguet caput meum*) on which so much perverse discussion arose in the Donatist controversy. (*Ep.* xl. 6; xli. 5.) In the first of the two to Rufinus, he laments his imperfect acquaintance with Greek, and asks him to explain the blessing of Jacob (*Gen.* xlix.), an explanation which in the second of them he asks him to complete. (*Ep.* xlvi. xlvii.) In the letter to Alypius, besides what has already been mentioned, Paulinus asks him to give an

account of his life and conversion, and wishes to know what hymn of his own composition he has seen. (*Ep.* iii.) On the letters to Florentius and Alethius, bishops successively of Cahors (*Ep.* xlii. iii.), to Desiderius in answer to one from him which has perished *Ep.* xliii. (vol. i. p. 818) to Sebastianus, a hermit, (*Ep.* xxxvi.) and to Romanianus (*Ep.* vii.), no special remark need be made. In the first of the two to Victricius, bishop of Rouen, he tells him how he had learned from his messenger Ursus, who, as was seen above, had fallen sick at Nola, of his successful labours among the distant Morini and Nervii, how the city of Rouen has become filled with holy persons, how he had suffered persecution, and of the miracles performed in connection with the same (*Ep.* xviii.). In the second he declares very clearly the true faith in the Trinity (*Ep.* xxxvii.). The one to Licentius is partly in prose and partly in verse, and consists mainly of an exhortation to him to leave the army and devote himself to Christ, and to remember Augustine. (*Ep.* viii. LICENTIUS (1), vol. iii. 724.) The one to Macarius (m. 23, vol. iii. 775) describes the miraculous preservation of an old man named Valgius, afterwards at his baptism called Victor, who after a shipwreck, was carried about in the vessel to various places, until on the 23rd day it was cast on the shore of Lucania. He begs him to show Christian love to this man, by assisting Secundinianus, the owner of the ship which had been seized by the agent of Posthonianus, on whose property it was cast away, and emptied of its contents. The case had been laid before the provincial judge, but his heart was hardened, and he went to Rome to be out of the way, whither Secundinianus and Valgius had followed him. He begs his friend to use his influence with Posthonianus to obtain redress for the injustice. (*Ep.* xlix.) The letter to Pammachius is a very long one of condolence and exhortation on the loss of his wife Paulina, daughter of Paula, and sister of Eustochium. He asks forgiveness for delay in writing on the ground, that seeing so few people he had not heard of the loss until some time after it took place when the news was brought by Olympius, and then after this of his own weak health during winter. Feeling deeply for him in his loss, he nevertheless doubts whether he ought to write more in sorrow or in thankfulness for the faith which he has shewn, in honouring her funeral, not with ostentatious pomp or gladiatorial shows, but with alms and good works, first presenting the sacred oblation to God and the pure libation (*sacras hostias et casta libamina*) with commemoration of her whom he had lost, and then providing a meal for the poor of Rome, collected in great numbers in the church of St. Peter, following in this the example of scripture saints of Christ himself, and of the first Christians. But faith is a greater comfort than any words of his, by means of which we can walk in paradise with the souls of the departed. Relying on the truth of scripture we can have no doubt as to the resurrection, his only doubt is as to his own claim to admission into the heavenly kingdom. Yet the door, he knows, is open to all, and the departed wife of his friend is a pledge to himself of the future in Christ. Happy is she who is honoured

by his charity, fed with his loaves, abounding in his riches, for whom so many prayers intercede, whose head is crowned with flowers from her own household. (*Ep.* xiii. see Hieron. *Ep.* lxvi.) In a letter to Jovius his kinsman, he reproves him for complaining of the weather, as a part of God's work which is beyond our understanding, exhorts him to find time for studying scripture and becoming a Christian, for which his previous training has prepared him (*Ep.* xvi.). The last letter is one to Eucherius and Gallus, who had taken up a monastic life at Lerins, and from whom three of the brothers Augendus, Gelasius, and Tigradius had visited Paulinus at Nola (*Ep.* li.). At the end of this letter is an account, whether by way of postscript to the letter, or as a separate narrative, of the martyrdom of St. Genesis of Arles. Two letters addressed to him by St. Jerome exist, in the first of which, besides the topics already mentioned, he makes remarks on the style of Tertullian, Cyprian, Victorinus, Lactantius and Hilarius, and of that of Paulinus himself, which he commends highly, as is also the case in the other of his letters in which replying to some questions addressed to him, by Paulinus as to the meaning of some scripture passages, one of them concerning the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, he describes his style as equal to that of Cicero, an opinion copied by Erasmus. He also disclaims entire condemnation of the works of Origen, though he finds great fault with the one *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, (*Hieron. Ep.* lviii. lxxxv.). Without accepting the somewhat exaggerated encomium of St. Jerome, we may say that the letters of Paulinus are generally speaking clear and intelligible, pleasing as regards style, remarkable for humility of mind, an affectionate disposition, and a cheerful playful humour, free from all moroseness or ascetic bitterness. Many of his remarks both on scripture and on other subjects bear the marks of good sense and sound judgment, and though free from any pretension to learning, show him to have been an industrious student and careful enquirer in the sacred writings in their Latin dress.

b. Verse.—But he also wrote much in verse at all times of his life, and, as we have seen, sent many of his poems to his friends. The earliest of those which are extant is addressed, together with a short letter in prose, and a present of ortolans to a friend named Gestidius, the second with one of oysters to the same friend. Both of them are in Hexameter verse. The third in Hexameter, a fragment of the Suetonian poem has been already mentioned, the 4th also in Hexameters, consists of devout Christian prayers and reflections with an outline of scripture doctrine and of the Christian faith. The next is a longer composition concerning St. John the Baptist, the 7th, 8th, and 9th are paraphrases on the 1st, 2nd, and 136th (137th) Psalms, the first of these in Iambics; a metre evidently suggested by the 2nd of the epodes of Horace, the other two in Hexameters. The 10th and 11th poems are letters to Ausonius in reply to his reproachful appeals on the change of life adopted by Paulinus, and the consequent change in behaviour which he attributed to him. The 10th is partly in Elegiacs, a second portion in Iambics, and the rest in Hexameters, the 11th partly in Hexameters and the remainder in Iambics. They

contain earnest remonstrances against his friend's imputations, a defence of his own and his wife's behaviour, and entreaties to him to follow his example. Of the remaining poems seventeen are more or less directly in praise of Felix, all of them dated on his birth-day January 14, i.e. the day of his death, and have consequently been called Natalitia, though not by Paulinus himself. The first (*Carm.* xii.) was written by him in Spain, but with a full intention of retiring to Nola, A.D. 394, the second, shortly after his arrival there (*Carm.* xiii.). The third describes the concourse of people resorting from all parts to the tomb of Felix, and the power which he manifested of casting out devils and curing diseases (*Carm.* xiv. 21-43):

immensi Felix gloria Christi.

The 15th and 16th poems relate the legend of Felix (*FELIX*, 186, Vol. II. p. 499). The 17th is a Sapphic ode to Nicetas, who was about to return to his see after his visit to Nola, A.D. 398. (*Carm.* xvii.) He came a second time, A.D. 402, and his visit is mentioned with much satisfaction in the 27th poem. The 18th poem, 6th in honour of Felix, describes in Hexameters the discovery of his tomb, mentions the five churches built around it, and how the country people not only come themselves, but brought their animals also to be cured of their maladies by the saint's influence. He relates a wondrous tale of a countryman whose two oxen, his whole property, were stolen from him, but restored by night unexpectedly after long prayer at the saint's tomb continued in spite of the opposition of the guardians of the church. Nor was this all, for by much weeping he had injured his sight, and this also he prayed might be restored to him:

miseratus, Sancte, meorum
Damna boum, miserare itidem mihi damna oculorum.

The people laughed at him, but his prayer (Paulinus says) was heard, his eyes regained their sight, and he went home rejoicing over his oxen recovered and his eyesight restored. (*Carm.* xviii.) The 19th, 20th, and 21st poems, of which a few lines are quoted by Dungalus in the 9th century, all of them in honour of Felix, were discovered by Muratori in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and published by him in 1697. In order of the series they stand as 11, 12, 13, and belong to the years 404, 405, 406. The first of these, a poem of 730 lines, describes how the relics of martyrs had been transferred to other places than those in which they died, especially the more notable among them; how Nola was honoured and benefited by the grave of Felix, and how a thief who had stolen an ornament in the church containing a figure of the cross was discovered, partly by the agency of Felix, and partly by the miraculous operation of the sacred emblem. (*Carm.* xix.) The 20th poem, 12th in honour of Felix, contains three marvellous tales, one of a man who professed to offer a pig on the festival day, to be eaten by the poor, but fraudulently withdrew the greater part of it, and having been as a punishment deprived of the use of his limbs, on confession of his fraud was restored to their use by Felix, as he said, in the name of Christ (v. 1-303). The second story is also about a pig which had been devoted to Felix by a man from beyond Beneventum, but was unable to

move on account of its size. One of its progeny was therefore substituted; but to the man's astonishment the original pig appeared at the place where he had rested for the night (v. 304-387). The third is about a heifer, also devoted, but which being fraudulently put in harness for the use of the owners refused the yoke, but accompanied the cart which bore them to the shrine of Felix, and there calmly submitted itself to the knife of the butcher. (*Carm.* xx. 388-444.) The 21st poem, 13th in honour of Felix, A.D. 406, expresses thankfulness for the return of peace, after the victory of Stilicho over Rhadagaisus, A.D. 405, a blessing which Paulinus attributes in great measure to the influence of Felix, whose praises he celebrates partly in Iambic verse, mentioning the names of those who had taken refuge with him in his retreat at Nola, when Rome was threatened with invasion, Turcius Apronianus, with his wife Avita, sister of the elder Melania, and their children, Asterius, also probably called Suerius, and Eunomia; his own wife, Herasia, or Therasia, Albina, widow of Publicola, son of the elder Melania, and her daughter Melania, with her husband Pinianus; and lastly, Aemilius, perhaps bishop of Beneventum, and son of the Julianus, on whose marriage Paulinus wrote a poem. He then relates in Hexameters the story of his own early attachment to Felix, and devotion to him for Christ's sake (v. 445); the discovery of his tomb and erection over it of a mausoleum, the unexpected supply of water from Abella, for which the city of Nola was indebted to Felix. (*Carm.* xxi.) The 22nd poem, addressed to his kinsman, Jovius, A.D. 399 or 400, contains an account of Scripture doctrine compared with statements of heathen writers. (*Carm.* xxii.) The 23rd, 7th in honour of Felix, A.D. 400, describes his power over evil spirits, and the manner in which by an accidental wound in the dark Theridius lost his eye, but recovered its use through Felix. (*Carm.* xxiii.) The 24th poem, addressed to Cytherius, relates the shipwreck of Martinianus, with instances from Scripture of divine preservation. (*Carm.* xxiv.) The 25th is in honour of the marriage of Julianus, bishop of Eclanum, with Ia, mentioned above, and describes the circumstances of some of the marriages mentioned in Scripture. (*Carm.* xxv.) The 26th, 8th in honour of Felix, speaks of the expected invasion of the Goths and his own entire trust in God and in Felix for protection. (*Carm.* xxvi.) The 27th, 9th in honour of Felix, speaks of his pleasure in receiving a second visit from Nicetas, and describes his churches. (*Carm.* xxvii.) In the 28th poem he continues this description, and describes also his own dwelling and the fire mentioned above. (*Carm.* xxviii.) The 29th is a fragment of nine lines. The 30th, in honour of Felix, is imperfect, but describes how the relics of saints have been carried into various parts of the world, and the benefit derived from them. (*Carm.* xxx.) The 31st poem is a fragment from the 13th, in honour of Felix, and mentions the victory of Stilicho. (*Carm.* xxxi.) The 32nd is the 14th in honour of Felix, A.D. 407, and is also only a fragment. (*Carm.* xxxii.) The 33rd is a fragment of the 15th in honour of Felix, as is also the 34th. (*Carm.* xxxiii., xxxiv.) The 35th is a long letter of condolence, in elegiac verse, to Pneumatius and Fidelis his wife, on the loss of their son Celsus, and enlarges on the com-

fort to be derived from the doctrine of the resurrection. It mentions the loss of his own child, and assures his friends of the warm affection entertained for them both by himself and Therasia. (*Carm.* xxxv.) The poem last in order is dedicated to a friend whom he calls Antonius, by which name he has been thought to denote Ausonius, and consists of a discourse of the insufficiency of the old mythological systems and of the advantages of the true one which he has himself adopted, whose Trinitarian doctrine he has described, and also that of final judgment, and of redemption through Christ, and invites his friend to consider the blessing of eternal life opened to all who avail themselves of the offer. (*Carm.* xxxvi.) A poem entitled *Conjugis ad uxorem*, sometimes attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine, has also been attributed to Paulinus.

As a writer of prose, Paulinus has been compared to Cicero, as a writer of verse to Virgil; but though his writings show that he had studied both Cicero, Virgil, and Horace, no impartial judge can place him on a level with either of those great masters, either in style or in power. Nor as a writer of verses can the writer of this article regard him as equal either to Claudian, to Ausonius, his own master, or even to Prudentius, though M. Gaston Boissier is of a different opinion. As Bosc remarks, the laws of versification and prosody were undergoing a great change in his day, and either of this or of intentional neglect of those laws, the verses of Paulinus afford abundant evidence. Still less can it be said truly that they show much poetic power, though many of them are graceful and pleasing, especially his letters to Ausonius and his address to Nicetas. He wrote them with facility, took great pleasure in writing them, and frequently wrote them well, but they cannot justly claim a high rank as poetry. Ozanam however expresses a very favourable opinion of his verse-writings. (*Civilisation au cinquième Siècle*, vol. ii. p. 238-247.) Of the amiable and affectionate disposition of Paulinus, his love for his friends, his profound humility, and entire abnegation of self, his earnest piety, and devotion to the service of God, sufficient evidence has been already given. He was studiously orthodox on the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which he states clearly on many occasions, but seems in one of his letters to favour the views of the semi-Pelagians. (*Ep.* xxix. 7.) That he believed devoutly in the power and influence of departed saints, including their relics, there can be no doubt; his whole life from the time of his retirement to Nola may be said to turn upon this belief, and it is difficult, or perhaps, as Dr. Gilly says, impossible, to rescue his memory from the charge of saint-worship, or at least an amount of veneration for his own patron saint, and belief in his power, derivative, no doubt, but direct in its exercise, equivalent in the ordinary use of language to worship, and carried, as the stories in his poems mentioned above show plainly, to the utmost bound of human credulity. In reading them, as I. I. Ampère remarks, one might imagine oneself to be seeing and listening to a Neapolitan peasant of our own day. (*Revue des deux Mondes*, 1837, vol. xii. p. 66.) See also his work, *Littérature Chrétienne au 5^e siècle*, vol. i. p. 288.

The works of Paulinus were first published in

a very incorrect form at Paris, in 1516, and republished at Cologne 1560. A life of him, by Andrew Schott, appeared in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* in 1618, but the first formal life of him, written with great care by Sacchini, a Jesuit, was published without his name in an edition of the works of Paulinus, with "Amoebœan" notes, by Fronto Ducaeus and Herbert Rosweyd, also Jesuits, at Antwerp, 1622. Forty years later, Peter Francis Chifflet published a work in two parts, called *Paulinus Illustratus*, in which some of the mistakes of the Antwerp edition were corrected, Dijon, 1662; and this was followed by a more complete and careful work by Lebrun des Marettes, embodying the labours of Chifflet, and which has formed the basis of all subsequent editions, 2 vols., Paris, 1685. Of this a reprint was published by Muratori, at Verona, in 1736, but containing four more poems discovered by himself at Milan, which had been published by him in 1698. A new and more careful edition of these, by Mingarelli, together with some additions discovered by him at Bologna, and published at Rome, 1756, was included in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, of Galland, vol. viii., in 1772. Cardinal Angelo Mai, in vol. v. of his *Classici Auctores*, Rome, 1827, published two more pieces in verse, (1) *ad Deum, post conversionem et baptismum suum*, (2) *de domesticis suis calamitatibus* taken from a MS. in the Vatican (Dowling, *Notitia Scriptorum*, p. 230), but M. Emile Chatelain, in his pamphlet entitled *Notice sur les MSS. des Poésies de S. Paul de Nole*, says that he has been unable to find the MS. in the Vatican Library. Doubts have been entertained as to the genuineness of these poems. The edition of the works of Paulinus published by the Abbé Migne, in vol. lxi. of his *Patrologia*, is chiefly a reprint of the Verona edition, and contains the matter of most of the former editions, including two letters and two poems of doubtful authority, but not the two poems published by Cardinal Mai. This work, however, is in all matters of reference edited so carelessly as to make the process extremely difficult, and the index which it contains is remarkable chiefly for its inaccuracy. An account of St. Paulinus is contained in the 4th volume of the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum* for June, but it only makes scanty reference to the poem discovered by Muratori. An account of him is given by Cave, *Historia Literaria*, vol. i. p. 288; by Dupin, *Hist. Eccl.* vol. iii.; by Tillemont, vol. xiv.; by Ceillier, vol. viii. A little book was published in 1654, entitled, "The Life of blessed Paulinus, the most reverend and blessed bishop of Nola, collected out of his own works and other primitive authors, by Henry Vaughan, Silurist." It consists of a panegyric on Paulinus, with translations of portions of his poems. Dr. Gilly, in his work, London, 1844, entitled, *Vigilantius and his Times*, describes the mode of life of Paulinus, giving him full credit for his piety, but blaming greatly both his mode of life and his theology. A full account of him and of his works will be found in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vol. ii. An article by I. Ampère, in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, vol. xii. 1837, has an account of him, with critical remarks on his works, and in the same Review for 1878, vol. xxviii., there is one by M. Gaston Boissier, on a Life of Paulinus by the Abbé Lagrange, published in 1877. A

chapter is also devoted to him by Ampère in his *Littérature Chrétienne*, mentioned above, vol. i., pp. 271-295. The work on the MSS. of his works, by M. Emile Chatelain, has been already mentioned. An account of him will be found in Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, June 22. One by M. Rabanis was published at Bordeaux in 1840, and another by M. Fabre, at Strasburg, in 1862. Dr. Adolf Bose, professor at the Seminary of Cologne, has written a book in two volumes, *Paulin und seine Zeit*, Regensburg, 1856, which answers fully to its title, contains all or nearly all that is known about him, and is written with great care, moderation, and critical judgment. He avoids most of the legends, and also shows that the use of bells in churches, an invention credited to him by tradition, is not due to him, nor even to the town of Nola.

Reference may be made on the subject of the buildings to the following authorities: *Canones Apostol.* ii. 57; Eusebius, *H. E.* x. 4; *Vit. Const.* ii. 36, 39; Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 31 Vitruvius, vi. 10; Bingham, *Ecc. Ant.* pp. 392, 400, 415, vol. ii. 392, 400, 415, 8vo. ed. Ambrosius Leo, a physician of Nola in the 16th century, described, but not very accurately, the buildings and relics of Paulinus existing in his time, Naples, 1738. The treatise is to be found in the 9th volume of the *Thesaurus Antiquitatum* of Graevius, pp. 4, 72, in which volume are also contained papers about Naples, Nola, and other neighbouring places, by I. Caesar Capaccio, who contradicts Ambrosius Leo in some points. Gian Stefano Remondini, a Neapolitan priest, wrote a book in three volumes, in great detail, entitled, *Della Nolana Ecclesiastica Storia*, dedicated to Pope Benedict XIV., Napoli, 1747, and in vols. i. and ii. of this he describes at length the buildings, with plates representing the ground-plans of them, according to his views of their arrangement, and including the ancient bell called the bell of St. Paulinus. Remondini places the two principal churches in a line with each other, with the tombs between them, and the others in other parts of the general enclosure, an arrangement which is followed, for the most part, by Canina, who measured the old remains himself before the building of the modern church on the same site. *Ricerchi dell'Architettura dei Tempi Cristiani*, Roma, 1846. A similar view is taken by Zestermann, de Basilicis, in *Mémoires couronnés de l'Académie Royale de Bruxelles*, 1847, vol. xxi. p. 138, et seq.; but Bunsen thought the two churches were at right angles to each other, which, as mentioned above, appears to be the true state of the case, *Basiliken des Christlichen Roms*, p. 38; Gilly, *Vigilantius and his times*, p. 178. Rheinwald, *Kirchl. Archiol.* s. 52, p. 134. Bose, *Paulin u. seine Zeit*, book 14, pp. 69, 112. [H. W. P.]

PAULINUS (9), a priest, probably of Hippo, mentioned by St. Augustine as having joined the society of S. Paulinus of Nola. (*Aug. Ep.* 149, 34.) [H. W. P.]

PAULINUS (10), a deacon under S. Ambrose, whose zeal in denouncing the errors of Coelestius led to the Council of Carthage, A.D. 412. (*Aug. de Peccato Orig.* iii. iv. vi., c. duas epist. Pelag. ii. 4, 6.) He presented a memorial on the subject to Pope Zosimus, A.D. 417. (*Opp. Aug. Appendix*, vol. x. 1724.) [H. W. P.]

PAULINUS (11), bishop of Béziers. In the year 419 many terrifying portents occurred in Béziers, of which Paulinus gave a description in a circular letter (Idatius, *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxiv. 715). This letter has not been preserved. Dupin identifies this bishop of Béziers with a disciple of St. Ambrose of the same name, but without authority (*Ecclesiastical Writers*, i. 502, Dublin, 1722; *Gall. Christ.* vi. 295; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 131-2; Ceillier, viii. 432.) [S. A. B.]

PAULINUS (12) of Pella, the son of a prefect (probably a vicarius) of Illyricum, born at Pella. His father was soon afterwards removed to Carthage as proconsul, and the young Paulinus was before long sent to Bordeaux to be brought up in the house of his grandfather, who is supposed by some, but without much probability, to have been the poet Ansonius. Late in life, in his 84th year (probably about A.D. 460), he wrote a poem called "Eucharisticon Deo sub Ephemeridis meae textu," in which he returns thanks to God for his preservation and for many blessings throughout a long and rather eventful life. The poem, which he describes, not inappropriately, as "carmen incultum," is perhaps more finished than we might expect to find the work of one whose mother-tongue was Greek. It is interesting as a piece of autobiography, and though referring, of course, especially to the personal experience of the writer, it throws some light on the history of his times, and particularly on the movement of the northern nations. This work, originally written, it would seem, for private circulation, has been erroneously attributed, like certain works of Paulinus of Périgueux, to St. Paulinus of Nola. It is to be found in De la Bigne, *Bibl. Patr.* (Appendix, col. 281, Paris, 1579), and was edited by Daumius (Lips. 1686). (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 363, where the events of his life are traced in some detail, from the account given in the poem itself; Alzog, *Handb. der Patrologie*; Ebert, *Gesch. der Chr. Lat. Lit.*; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 290; Teuffel, vol. ii.) [H. A. W.]

PAULINUS (13) of Périgueux (PETROCORIUS or PETRICORIUS), a poet of the second half of the 5th century, to whom properly belong certain works sometimes attributed to St. Paulinus of Nola, viz. *Vita Martini* in six books, a poem, "de visitatione nepotuli sui," and a short poem composed as a dedicatory inscription for the basilica of St. Martin at Tours. Nothing can be clearly made out concerning his life, or his parentage, save the inference from the name of Petrocorius, that he was most likely a native of Périgueux. It may be that Venantius Fortunatus refers to him in the lines:

"Stemmate, corde, fide, pollens Paulinus et arte
Versibus explicuit Martini dogma magistri."

But it is perhaps more likely that he has fallen into the same error as Gregory of Tours, and confounded the real author of the *Vita S. Martini* with his more celebrated namesake, to whom certainly the phrases are applicable enough. The poem on St. Martin was probably written about 470, certainly during the episcopate of Perpetuus of Tours (who presided at

the council of Tours in 461), since it is dedicated to that bishop, and is partly based on a document drawn up by him.

The work is in the main a rather rough versification of the Life of St. Martin by Sulpicius Severus, and of parts of the dialogues of the same writer; the last book has a more especial interest, as representing a formal account by the bishop of Tours of the miracles wrought at his predecessor's tomb.

The short dedication poem for the new basilica was written later, at the request of Perpetuus. The poem "de visitatione nepotuli sui" records a miraculous cure of the author's grandson, by the joint agency, as he appears to consider, of St. Martin and Perpetuus.

The works of this poet were at first published under the name of St. Paulinus of Nola. They are to be found in the patristic collections (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxi.), having first been edited by Juretus, on whose work a later edition by Daumius was based (Lips. 1681). (Ebert, *Gesch. der Chr. Lat. Lit.* 385; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 449; Teuffel, vol. ii.; Greg. Turon. *de mir. B. Mart.*, and Ruinart's note in the Benedictine Ed.) [H. A. W.]

PAULINUS (14), (PAULUS), patriarch of Aquileia, died about the end of A.D. 569, or beginning of A.D. 570, after an episcopate of twelve years (Paul. Diac. *Hist. Lang.* ii. 25). He was therefore consecrated in A.D. 557, or 558. His episcopate is remarkable for two reasons. On the Lombard invasion in A.D. 568, he fled from Aquileia to the island of Grado, carrying with him all the treasures of the church, and the relics of various saints. (Paul. Diac. ii. 10; *Chron. Patr. Grad. in Script. Rer. Lang.* 393.) Hence came the translation of the see of Aquileia to Grado, and ultimately its division into the patriarchates of Aquileia and Grado, which last became the patriarchate of Venice. Like the other Venetian and Istrian bishops he was a strenuous defender of the Three Chapters. Soon after his election he convened a synod at Aquileia which dissented from the decrees of the 5th General Council. Pope Pelagius I. was exceedingly indignant at these proceedings, and wrote several letters to Narses demanding that he should arrest Paulinus, who, he further alleged, had been consecrated by the archbishop of Milan, not at Aquileia, but elsewhere, such a consecration being uncanonical, and send him in custody with his consecrator to the Emperor. Nothing however, followed from these demands. It appears that Narses had been excommunicated by Paulinus and his party. (Pelagii I. *Epp.* 1-4, and fragment in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxix. 393, 411.) He is called Paulinus by Pelagius, Paulus by Paulus Diaconus; the authority for the former name being contemporary is the preferable. [F. D.]

PAULINUS (15) II., patriarch of Aquileia, a prominent figure in the Adoptionist controversy, is first mentioned in a grant dated June 17, 776 at Eporea (Ivrea), by Charles the Great, to him of the forfeited property of one Waldand, who had joined in the unsuccessful rebellion of Rodgaud, duke of Friuli, early in that year and had been killed (Sickel, *Acta Kar.* ii. 33, 246). He is there styled "grammaticus

artis magister," and was already, or then became, one of the band of scholars that frequented the court of Charles. On the death of SIGVALDUS Paulinus was appointed Patriarch. The date is uncertain. Madrisi (50) argues that it was late in A.D. 776, but Jaffé (*Mon. Alc.* 162) contends that it was in A.D. 787, inasmuch as Paulinus died in A.D. 802 (*Ann. Lauriss. Min.* and Einhardi *Ann.* in Pertz, *SS.* i. 120, 363), and the chronicle printed by De Rubéis (*Mon. Aquil.* App. 8) assigns him an episcopate of 15 years. His close friendship with Alcuin, who first became attached to the court of Charles in A.D. 782, is strong evidence in favour of the later date. The account of the Monk of St. Gall (ii. 17 in Jaffé, *Mon. Car.* 693), besides being written 100 years later, unfortunately leaves the date undetermined, as though Charles was in Friuli early in A.D. 776, the grant shows that Paulinus was not patriarch in the following June, and Charles may have visited Friuli again in his journey to Italy late in A.D. 786.

Paulinus was at the council of Ratibson in A.D. 792, when FELIX (176) of Urgel recanted his Adoptionist tenets (c. *Felicem*, i. 5), and on this occasion obtained two grants from Charles, dated August 4th, the first conceding to the clergy of Aquileia the right of freely electing the patriarch and exemption from certain burdens, the second confirming to that church all its possessions, especially the monastery of St. Maria ad Organum at Verona, the church of Biue in Friuli, and the hospice of St. John at Friuli (Sickel, ii. 54, 270). Felix having recanted his recantation, another council was held at Frankfort in the summer of 794. At the first session, after a letter of ELIPANDUS had been read, and Charles had addressed the council, the bishops asked for an adjournment in order to draw up a reply, which was composed by Paulinus with the assistance of the archbishop of Milan and the North Italian bishops, was adopted by the council, and ordered to be published throughout Gaul and Spain, a copy being sent to ELIPANDUS (*Libellus Sacrosyllabus*). On the same occasion was written the letter to one Heistulf, who had killed his wife on suspicion of her having been unfaithful to him. If he desired to be saved, said Paulinus, two courses were open to him, either to enter a monastery, or to do penance all his life in the manner Paulinus prescribed (*Ep. ad Heistulfum*).

Immediately after Easter A.D. 796 he assembled a council of his suffragan bishops at Friuli, in which the Adoptionist doctrines were again condemned, and the addition of the *Filioque* to the creed defended, and several canons were passed, some of which related to the discipline of the clergy; by others marriages within the prohibited degrees were forbidden, and also those of persons below the age of puberty; another forbade a man who had divorced his wife to remarry in her lifetime, while others related to the conduct of nuns, to the observance of Sunday and to tithes.

In the same year a new field of activity was opened to Paulinus by the victories of Pippin, king of Italy, and Eric, duke of Friuli, over the Avars and Huns, and the submission and baptism of Tudun, a man of great power among the Avars with a great part of his race (*Ann.*

Lauriss. in Pertz, *S. S.* i. 182). In the summer Pippin summoned a meeting of bishops, presided over by Paulinus, at his camp on the Danube, to deliberate about the baptism and conversion of the Huns and Avars. With regard to the first, Paulinus decided that it should be deferred till the converts had received some instruction in the faith; and with regard to the second, that they should be won by gentle teaching, not driven to the font at the sword's point. The length of their probation was to be left to the discretion of the priest, but was not to be less than seven or more than forty days, and directions as to the preparation before baptism were given. Infants, unless in peril of death, were to be reserved for the regular seasons for baptism, Easter and Pentecost. The case of converts whose previous baptism was doubtful was also dealt with (*Mon. Alc.* 311-318). Paulinus, notwithstanding the exhortations of Alcuin (*Ep.* 56 in *Mon. Alc.* 284), does not appear to have personally taken part in the missionary work.

On September 1st, 799, Eric, duke of Friuli, was killed in Liburnia. He was the intimate friend of Alcuin and Paulinus, who some years before had addressed to him a treatise on the Christian life (*Liber Exhortationis*), in which he made considerable use of the treatise of JULIANUS (72) POMERIUS on the Contemplative Life. Paulinus now lamented the untimely death of his friend in an elegy, which shows how deeply he felt his loss (Dümmler, 131).

In the early part of A.D. 800 (Alcuin, *Ep.* 147 in *Mon. Alc.* 557) a gross outrage was committed at Grado. Maurice, the son of the doge of Venice, attacked the place and cruelly murdered the patriarch, an atrocity to which Paulinus alludes in his letter giving Charles an account of the business transacted in the synod he had held at Altinum at Easter in that year.

About the same time he composed and sent to Charles a treatise in three books against Felix of Urgel. The mystical explanation of the number of days in the year in the letter of dedication shows that it was written in a leap-year, while in a letter of Alcuin's (*Ep.* 148 in *Mon. Alc.* 561), written after June 800, it is alluded to as a recent work, and spoken of in terms of high approbation. Paulinus died, as has been mentioned, in A.D. 802 on January 11th, on which day he is commemorated (*AA. SS.* Jan. i. 713).

Besides the works already mentioned, Paulinus wrote a metrical version of the creed and a poem on the miracle of the raising of Lazarus. Walafrid Strabo (*De Exordiis Eccl. Rer.* c. 25, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxiv. 954) asserts that Paulinus composed hymns. Madrisi from the resemblance of style attributed six hymns and one rhythm, and fragments of two others to him. These have been recently edited in a complete form by Dümmler (who gives a full account of them and their MSS. in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, iv. 113) in *Mon. Germ. Hist. Poet. Lat. Med. Aevi*, i. 1, 123, who doubts whether any except the *de Regula Fidei*, the poem on Lazarus, and the lament for Eric, as to which there is MS. authority for the authorship of Paulinus are rightly ascribed to him. His collected works were published in 1737 by his fellow

countryman Madrisi, with an exhaustive life, disfigured however by a tendency to conjecture, and illustrated with elaborate dissertations. This edition is reprinted in *Patr. Lat.* xcix.

[F. D.]

PAULINUS (16), bishop of Taurianum, on the N.W. coast of Bruttium, had been obliged by the Lombards to retire to Sicily about A.D. 590, where his monks had also taken refuge. As they were wandering about under no discipline, Gregory the Great, early in A.D. 591, ordered them to be collected in the monastery of St. Theodore at Messina, and, with those already in the monastery, to be placed under the care of Paulinus (*Epp.* i. 40, 41). In March, 592, Gregory directed the bishop of Syracuse to appoint Paulinus to the vacant see of Lipara, from which he was to visit his own see when opportunities presented themselves (*Epp.* ii. 16, 17). Finally, in 599, Gregory commissioned him with certain other bishops to hold an inquiry into certain charges made by the clergy of Rhegium against their bishop. (*Epp.* ix. 47, 48.)

[F. D.]

PAULINUS (17), priest of the monastery of St. Erasmus on mount Soracte. Gregory the Great, early in 591, directed the sub-deacon, Anthemius, to pay him two solidi. (*Epp.* i. 24.)

[F. D.]

PAULINUS (18), bishop or unknown see, and **HONORATUS (28)**, refused to communicate with **MAXIMUS (18)**, bishop of Salona, and were in consequence persecuted by him, and obliged to give bail not to leave the city or their own houses. Gregory the Great, early in 596, wrote to Maximus ordering him to cease persecuting them, and to allow them to go to Rome or elsewhere as they wished. (*Epp.* vi. 25, 26.)

[F. D.]

PAULINUS (19), bishop of Tegessis, an otherwise unknown see in Numidia, was accused of simony and violent treatment of his clergy. Gregory the Great, early in A.D. 602, directed Victor the primate, and Columbus, a bishop of Numidia, to hold an inquiry into these charges. (*Epp.* xii. 28, 29.)

[F. D.]

PAULINUS (20), the first Christian missionary from Rome to Northumbria, and the bishop who begins the recognized succession in the archiepiscopal see of York.

Alcuin (*De SS. Ecol. Ebor.* 135-6) says that Paulinus was a citizen of Rome, and, on the wall of the famous monastery of St. Andrew on the Coelian hill, his name is inscribed among the most illustrious inmates of that house. The Pseudo-Nennius, however, ascribes the evangelization of Northumbria to Rum, the son of Urien. Mr. Hodgson Hinde (*Hist. of North-merberland*, 77) has suggested the identity of this person with Paulinus. He thinks it possible that, after the fall of Urien and his family, Rum may have been educated at Rome, changing his name when he was ordained, as was frequently the case. If this were so, there would be a peculiar propriety in his subsequent mission into Northumbria from the Kentish Court.

Paulinus was sent from Rome by Gregory in A.D. 601, with Mellitus, Justus, and Rufinianus. They joined Augustine in Kent, and would take an active part in the evangelization of that kingdom. They brought with them a letter from Gregory to Augustine, in which he expressed his wish that York should be made a metropolitical see with twelve suffragans.

The British succession at York had disappeared with the coming of the English, and the North had relapsed, for the most part, into heathenism. It is probable enough that Columba and Kentigern and their disciples made themselves felt in Cumbria and the Lothians, and possibly farther south, but to what extent we have no means of ascertaining. British Christianity found a home in Wales, and had no hold upon Bernicia and Deira in the 7th century. But the sites once consecrated to religious worship were remembered, and reclaimed, in part, by Wilfrid.

Between 593 and 617, the King of Northumbria was Ethelfrith, who slew the monks at Bangor. He had usurped the throne of Edwin, his wife's brother, whom he dreaded on that account [EDWIN]. To calm his fears he sought Edwin's life, who fled for safety to the court of Redwald, king of East Anglia. It was there that he was the subject of a marvellous appearance or dream. Edwin sat, or fancied he was sitting, on a stone bench in front of Redwald's palace, sick at heart as his life was in peril, and almost hopeless, when a stranger suddenly stood before him, and sought the cause of his distress. Edwin told his tale, and then the stranger announced his coming deliverance and future triumph, and when Edwin promised that he would not be remiss in manifesting his gratitude, the stranger obtained from him an assurance that, when the proper time arrived, he would accept and follow a better rule of life than any of his fathers had practised. To seal the promise, as it were, the visitant's hand was laid upon the fugitive's head, and he then disappeared as suddenly as he came. The first part of the prediction of the stranger was soon realized, and, through the interposition of Redwald, Edwin was seated, in 617, on the Northumbrian throne.

In 625, Edwin sought in marriage the hand of Ethelburga, daughter of Eadbald, king of Kent, who refused to accept a pagan son-in-law. A second embassy from the north revealed Edwin's eagerness. He promised not merely to allow the princess and her suite entire freedom in their religious worship, but stated also that he himself would adopt the lady's faith, if his wise men should consider it to be right and just. Here was an opportunity for evangelizing Northumbria, which was not to be despised, and Eadbald sent his daughter into the north. Paulinus accompanied the princess as her religious adviser, and, to add dignity and importance to his mission, Augustine consecrated him bishop before he set out, on the 21st of July, 625.

Paulinus, however, found no field in Northumbria for spreading his religion. The king was respectful but quiescent; the people paid no attention. Paulinus had enough to do to preserve his little party from the taint of heathenism. Month after month passed away until the feast of Easter, 626, arrived, when an attempt was made upon Edwin's life. That act probably accelerated the birth of Ethelburga's

first child, a daughter, and Paulinus, with a grateful heart, thanked God for the preservation of his master and mistress with such fervour that Edwin, touched at last, promised to become a Christian if he could be avenged upon those who had sent forth the assassin; and, to show that he was in earnest, he permitted Paulinus to baptize the new-born princess, with eleven courtiers who chose to accompany her to the font.

Edwin obtained his revenge, but loitered over the fulfilment of his promise. Such conduct might be expected from one who by long and painful experience had learned the necessity of caution. A letter from Pope Boniface arrived, urging Ethelburga to accelerate, if she could, the happy end, showing that many hearts in distant places were longing and praying for it. But Edwin still held back. Then it was that Paulinus reminded the hesitating monarch of what had taken place twelve years before at Redwald's court. He laid his hand upon Edwin's head, and asked him if he remembered that sign and his pledge. Now was the time for its fulfilment. Whether Paulinus was the stranger himself, or had gathered from the queen, or some courtier, that Edwin had seen and heard all this in a dream, is a matter of doubt. Edwin recognized the token and acknowledged his vow, merely asking for a little delay that his courtiers and subjects might, if possible, become Christians with him. A national gathering took place at Goodmanham, near York, to consider the subject. The arguments which were used and the part which Coifi, the pagan high-priest, took on the occasion are too well known to be repeated [COIFI]. The result was that the Northumbrian king and court and many of the people became Christians. A little chapel or oratory of wood, dedicated to St. Peter, was hastily constructed at York, and in it, on Easter Sunday, 627, the king and many of his relatives and friends were baptized. The thankful monarch began immediately to enclose this in a large church of stone, but the chapel was for a long time preserved as a sacred relic. The builders of the glorious minster at York were not ashamed of its humble beginning.

Northumbria was now opened to the missionary work of Paulinus, and his time seems to have been fully occupied. The kingdom of Edwin was a very extensive one, and his influence as Bretwalda was wider still. We hear of Paulinus making a convert of Blecca, the reeve of Lincoln, and through his means a church was erected on the summit of that noble hill in which Paulinus consecrated Archbishop Honorius in 627. Soon after this he is said to have founded Southwell minster, and his appearance was described to Beda as he stood in the river baptizing convert after convert in king Edwin's presence.

Mark him, of shoulders curved, and stature tall,
Black hair, and vivid eyes, and meagre cheek.

At Donafeld, probably the modern Doncaster, amid the remains of the Roman camp, there was a Christian basilica with a stone altar, which may be ascribed to Paulinus. At Dewsbury, in the West Riding, was a stone cross bearing an inscription which stated that he preached there; whilst at Whalley in Lancashire and near Easing-

wold, close to York, there were other crosses connected with his name. He is said to have baptized very many at Brafferton and Catterick. In Bernicia, we have a streamlet in the northern part of the present county of Northumberland, which, in Pallinsburn, retains the great preacher's name, who is said, also, to have been occupied in instructing and baptizing for thirty-six continuous days at Adgebrin or Yeavinger. Of actual churches there would be very few in existence, and these, in the first instance, were chiefly baptisteries on the banks of rivers. There the catechumens were assembled and taught, and thence they went down with their instructor, like the Ethiopian eunuch, into the water below.

In 633, after six years of unceasing and successful exertion, the labours of Paulinus in the north came abruptly to a close. His master and lord, Edwin, was slain in battle at Hatfield near Doncaster, and the disaster was so complete that the new-born Christianity of the north seemed to be utterly overwhelmed by the idolatry which it had displaced. Paulinus thought that he owed his first duty to the widowed queen who had come with him into Northumbria. Accordingly he took her back, with her children and suite, to her old home in Kent. They carried with them the treasure of Edwin, including a cross of gold, and a chalice of the same precious metal, which were afterwards preserved at Canterbury. One friend alone remained behind in the north, James the deacon, as he was called, to keep some of the fragments together, and to let the believers see that there was a hope at least of better days to come. [JAMES THE DEACON.] In the villages of Richmondshire, where Paulinus had made so many converts, James sang the old hymns, and his very presence was an encouragement and a comfort.

Paulinus reached Kent with his precious charge in safety, and was there made Bishop of Rochester, a see which had been vacant for some time. In the autumn of the same year (633) he received by a messenger from the pope a pall designed for his use as archbishop of York. The pope had not then heard of the great disaster in the north. Whether or no, by virtue of the gift and the possession of this pall, he had a just claim to be considered an archbishop, is a matter for argument; but Paulinus never went back into Northumbria. He is said to have been a benefactor to the monastery of Glastonbury, rebuilding the church and covering it with lead, and to have spent some time within its walls. He died on Oct. 10, 644, and was buried in the chapter-house at Rochester, of which place he became the patron saint. Lanfranc translated his remains, depositing them in a silver shrine, and giving a cross to hang over it. Among the relics in York minster were a few of his bones and two of his teeth, and there was nothing else in that sacred fane to commemorate his great work in the north, save an altar which bore his name and that of Chad conjoined.

The life of Paulinus has been carefully drawn up in Dr. Bright's *Chapters of Early English Church History*, and in the *Lives of the Archbishops of York*, vol. i. The authorities on which the life depends are so fully stated and sifted in those two works that it is unnecessary to repeat them.

[J. R.]

PAULUS APOSTOLUS, APOCRYPHAL ACTS OF [ACTS OF THE APOSTLES (APOC.), p. 29].

PAULUS.—Bishops whose Sees or Countries are not named.

PAULUS (1), a bishop mentioned, together with Eutropius, by Orosius as having been disturbed by the errors of the Priscillianists and the followers of Origen. (Oros. *Common.* 1; Aug. *Opp.* viii. 665.) To the same two bishops Augustine addressed his book against Pelagius. (*De perfectione justitiae*, *Opp.* x. 292.)

[H. W. P.]

PAULUS (2), deposed bishop, mentioned in a letter of Gregory the Great to Theodorus, bishop of Lilybaeum, in A.D. 593. He directs that he was to continue to do penance in the monastery where he was, and that the church property found in his possession was to be deposited in the treasury of the church, and an inventory taken of it. (*Ep.* iii. 50.) [F. D.]

Bishops arranged by Sees or Countries, including Africa, East, Spanish, &c.

PAULUS (3), bishop of Acci. On a stone inserted in the wall of the church of St. Mary in the Alhambra, is an inscription recording the consecration by him in A.D. 607 of a church of St. Stephen at a place called Nativola. (Hübner, *Insc. Hisp. Christ.* n. 115; *Esp. Sag.* vii. 34.) Gams (*Kirch. von Sp.* ii. (2), 21) discusses the probable locality of Nativola. [F. D.]

PAULUS (4), bishop of unknown African see. In A.D. 594, Gregory the Great directed him to be sent to Rome, that he might give him information about the increase of Donatism in Africa, by which Paulus had been personally a sufferer. By letters, two years later, it appears that Paulus had been delayed in going to Rome by the prefect of Africa, who brought similar counter charges against him. The chancellor, whom the prefect had sent to Rome, however, refused to go into these charges before Gregory, and the latter permitted Paulus to go to the emperor at Constantinople. The next year Paulus returned to Africa, taking Rome on the way, and bringing with him letters of commendation from Gregory to three African bishops. (*Epp.* iv. 34, 35; vi. 63, 65; vii. 2; viii. 12, 13.)

[F. D.]

PAULUS, bishop of Ahwaz, *vid.* num. 44.

PAULUS (5), of Aila (Elath, the modern Akaba), born in the district of Melitene, in the latter half of the fifth century, the uncle of Theodorus, appointed by Sabas the head of his monastery of Castellius, and admitted by him to a chief position in that monastery. He afterwards became bishop of Aila (Cyrill. *Scythop. Vit. S. Sab.* viii. No. 27; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 759.)

[E. V.]

PAULUS (6), patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 538 to 541. A native of Tarsus and a monk of the order of Tabenna. He was appointed patriarch by the emperor Justinian, in place of Theodosius, deposed for his opposition to the

synod of Chalcedon. [THEODOSIUS.] He was consecrated by Mennas patriarch of Constantinople, this being the first instance of such a consecration. Justinian sent him to Alexandria, armed with ample power to suppress by force the Monophysite party. Through the influence, however, of the empress Theodora, who was in secret a Monophysite, Paul was deposed by the council of Gaza when he had held his see about two years. The story of his fall is involved in much confusion, cf. Procopii *Hist. Arcan.* c. 27; Theophan. *Chronograph.* i. 345, ed. Bonn. He was succeeded by Zoilus. Le Quien identifies him with a Paulus mentioned by Timotheus C. P. *de Haeret. Recipiend.* as the founder of the Paulianists. [ZOILUS.] (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 433; Liberati *Diac. Breviar.* c. xxiii.; Asseman. *Bib. Orient.* ii. 331; John of Ephesus, *Hist. Eccles.* ed. Payne Smith, p. 250; Neale's *Hist. Alex. Pat.* ii. 35; Renaudot, p. 143.)

[G. T. S.]

PAULUS (7), bishop of Alexandria Minor in Cilicia Secunda (the modern Scanderoon), a Monophysite at the time of Severus of Antioch, deposed by Justin in 518 (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 904; Asseman. *Dissert. de Monophys.*) [E. V.]

PAULUS (8), Nestorian bishop of Anbara in Chaldea, flourished A.D. 740 and wrote epistles, paracletic addresses, and a disputation. (Assem. *Bib. Or.* ii. 431, 486, iii. 172, 342.) A homily of his for Pentecost is extant in MS. [J. G.]

PAULUS (9) OF SAMOSATA, patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 260-270. A celebrated Monarchian heresiarch, "the Socinus of the third century" (Bishop Wordsworth), deposed and excommunicated for his heretical teaching with respect to the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, A.D. 269. Of the early life of Paulus we are totally ignorant. We may conclude from his designation that he was a native of Samosata, the royal city of Syria, where he may not improbably have become known to Zenobia, the celebrated and brilliant Queen of Palmyra, to whom his quick and ready intellect would recommend him, and through whom Cave and others ascribe his advancement to the highest post in the Syrian church. Dr. Newman calls attention to the fact, that the beginning of Paul's episcopate synchronizes with the commencement of the successes of Zenobia's husband Odenathus against Sapor (*Arians of the Fourth Cent.* p. 4, note 6). Athanasius distinctly calls her Paul's patroness—*Παύλου πρόεστη τοῦ Σαμοσάτῃως* (Athan. *Hist. Ar.* c. 71). To Zenobia we may certainly attribute his appointment to the civil office of "Procurator Ducenarius" (so called from the holder receiving a salary of 200 sesteritia), on which we are told he prided himself much more than on his office as bishop. At Antioch he would form one of the brilliant intellectual circle, of which Longinus the rhetorician was one of the most distinguished members, the influence of which could not fail to be injurious to the maintenance of rigid orthodoxy. Zenobia was herself a Jewess, and Paul's divergences from the orthodox faith may be partly attributable to his desire to make the doctrines of Christianity more palatable to his patroness and to the professors of the neo-Pla-

tonic philosophy by whom she was surrounded. Although the influence of his imperial protectress was insufficient to prevent the condemnation of Paul's heresies or ultimately to secure him from deposition, yet through her means, after his excommunication, he remained in possession of the cathedral and the episcopal residence and the temporalities of his see, until Zenobia's defeat by Aurelian deprived him of her powerful support (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30).

Our only knowledge of the career and character of Paul of Samosata is derived from the encyclical letter of the bishops and clergy by whom he was condemned. We may perhaps be warranted in making some deduction from the passionate language of heated polemical opponents, but the charges made are too definite, and, as Neander remarks, unhappily accord too well with what we learn from other sources concerning the bishops and leading clergy of the chief cities of the Eastern world at that time, to allow us to set them wholly aside or even to look upon them as seriously exaggerated. Besides, it cannot be regarded as probable that circular letters addressed by the leading prelates of the East to all the churches of the Empire would contain ungrounded calumnies against a brother bishop; a conclusion to which even Gibbon has remarked, we should be "driven," if we were desirous of "extenuating the vices of Paul."

The picture drawn of Paul in this synodical epistle is a most unfavourable one. He is described as haughty, ostentatious, vainglorious, worldly-minded, a lover of pomp and parade, avaricious and rapacious, self-indulgent and luxurious, and one whose manner of life laid him open to grave suspicions of immorality. He is set before us as a person originally of humble birth and extreme poverty, who having neither inherited anything from his parents nor gained anything by honest industry in any trade or profession, had adopted the ecclesiastical career as a lucrative speculation, and by the abuse of its opportunities and the secular office he had obtained by the favour of Zenobia, had amassed a large fortune. He harassed his flock by extortionate demands, brought unfounded charges against them by the unscrupulous use of his authority, and obtained verdicts against them to his own advantage. He received money from suitors for the promise of his aid, and then left them in the lurch. "His ecclesiastical jurisdiction," writes Gibbon, "was venal and rapacious; he extorted frequent contributions from the most opulent of the faithful, and converted to his own use a considerable part of the public revenue." He was charged also with the sacrilegious diversion of religious funds to his own use. When he appeared in public, he affected the pomp and parade of a secular magistrate rather than the grave and modest bearing of a Christian bishop. He stalked through the forum preceded and followed by a band of attendants, making a way for him through a crowd of petitioners whose memorials he made a display of despatching with the most celerity, dictating the replies without halting a moment. In his ecclesiastical assemblies he adopted an almost imperial dignity. He sat on a throne raised on a lofty tribunal (*βῆμα*), with a cabinet (*σῆκηριον*) for private conferences screened from the public gaze. His bombastic harangues, more like those of a rhetorician or a mounte-

bank than of a Christian bishop, were delivered with extravagant action, striking his thigh and stamping his feet. When preaching, his gestures were equally offensive to the sober-minded, who incurred his displeasure and laid themselves open to his persecutions if they refused to join in the unseemly tokens of admiration—the waving the handkerchief, the starting up from the seat, and the shouts of applause, as in a theatre, which at a later date were so indignantly reprobated by Chrysostom. He was also charged with depreciating the departed teachers of Antioch, and contrasting with them his own superior spiritual insight. He is said to have suppressed the psalms which were sung to Christ as God, which had ever proved a great bulwark to the orthodox faith, as modern novelties, not half a century old (cf. Caius apud Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii. 129), and to have introduced others in praise of himself, which were sung in full church on Easterday by a choir of women, causing the hearts of the faithful to shudder at the impious language in which Paul was extolled as an angel come down from heaven. By his flatteries and gifts, as well as by the fear the unscrupulous use of his power inspired, he induced the bishops and presbyters of neighbouring churches to adopt his form of teaching and other novelties. His private life is described in equally dark colours. He indulged freely in the pleasures of the table, and enjoyed the society of two beautiful young women, as spiritual sisters, "subintroductæ," and encouraged other clergymen to follow his example to the scandal of all and the moral ruin of not a few. However, disgraceful as his life was, he had contrived to lay so many under obligations and to intimidate others by his threats and violence, that it was with the utmost difficulty that any person could be found to venture to appear as witnesses against him (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30).

But however great the scandals attaching to Paul's administration of his episcopal office may have been, it was his unsoundness in the faith which, chiefly by the untiring exertions of the venerable Dionysius of Alexandria, led to the assembling of the synods through which his name and character have chiefly become known to us. These synods were three in number,* all

* This has been called in question, and the number of synods reduced to two. But the synodical letter distinctly tells us that Firmilian went twice (*δὶς*) to Antioch to attend a synod in the matter of Paul, while it is certain that he died on his way to the synod of 269, at which Paul was condemned. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* iv. 296.)

The letter of Dionysius to Paul containing his answers to the ten queries propounded by the latter, embracing most of the passages of the New Testament in which Christ is spoken of according to his humanity, given in Labbe (*Concil.* i. 850-893), was not known to any ancient writers, and though accepted by Tillemont and Burton (*Bampton Lectures*, note 102) may safely be rejected, together with the letter of the Bishops of the first Synod (*ibid.* 843-850). (See Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, vol. i. p. 119, note 5, p. 120, note 4.) Their genuineness is also rejected by Valesius (in Euseb. p. 155), Harduin, Dupin (i. 214), Pagi, Mosheim, Cave, Routh, Ceillier (iii. 607), and Lumper (*Hist. Theol. Crit.* xiii. 711); cf. Möhler, *Patrol.* i. 632; Walch, *Ketzengesch.* ii. 71, 83; Newman's *Select Treatises of Athanas.* p. 176.

held at Antioch. The first was held in A.D. 264, of which Firmilian, of the Cappadocian Caesarea, was the president. Dionysius was prevented being present by age and infirmity; but a few days before his death (Hieron. *de Vir.* III. 69), he wrote an elaborate letter in defence of the orthodox faith to the church of Antioch, in which he abstained from sending any salutation to Paul, as bishop, but urged him to adopt the course duty dictated (*παρήνεσε τὰ προσήκοντα*, Theod. *Haer. Fab.* ii. 9), and sharpened the orthodox zeal of the assembled bishops (*ibid.*; Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 27). The second synod, the date of which is not precisely known, was also presided over by Firmilian, who, when on his way to the third synod, in 269, was suddenly taken ill and died at Tarsus, the bishop of that city, Helenus, taking his place as president. In the first two synods Paul, through his dialectical subtleness and crafty concealment of his real opinions, (*κρυψίνουον ὄντα καὶ ἀπατηλόν*, Euseb. *H. E.* 29) managed to elude condemnation. At the former synod, after the assembled prelates in many protracted discussions had sought to demonstrate Paul's errors, *ἀπογυμνοῦν καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἄγειν τὴν αἵρεσιν* (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 28) and to bring him back to orthodoxy, he asserted that he had been misunderstood, and that his language bore a perfectly orthodox meaning, and that as for himself he had never entertained the erroneous opinions attributed to him, but had consistently followed the doctrine of the apostles. His protestations were accepted by his judges, who after having united in a solemn act of praise to God for the unanimity of their belief returned to their flocks. Before long, however, they learned that they had been deceived, and that Paul was promulgating the same errors as to the mere humanity of Christ as those with which he had been previously charged. Accordingly they made a second attempt to bring back their erring brother to the truth. They first, as before, made trial of correspondence, but to no effect. They then met a second time in synod, and passed an explicit condemnation of Paul's new doctrine. But as Paul promised to renounce his errors (*μεταθέσθαι ἐπαγγελαμένον*) (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30) they condoned them a second time and abstained from any decisive measure (Euseb. *u.s.*; Theod. *Haeret. Fab.* ii. 8). Paul, however, kept this new promise as ill as he had done his previous ones. It reached the ears of the members of the synod from all quarters that his teaching was unaltered, and that there would be no want of testimony to prove it if the opportunity of bringing it forward were granted. The matter had now reached too great importance to admit of any half measures. Nothing less than the orthodoxy of one of the chief chairs in Christendom was involved in it. A synod, therefore, was convened a third time at Antioch, towards the close of the year 269. Of this, as we have said, Firmilian having died *en route*, Helenus, of Tarsus, was the nominal president. The leading part, however, was taken by Malchion, a presbyter of Antioch, who had at one time been the president of the school of rhetoric in that city. Athanasius sets the number of bishops assembled at seventy (Athanas. *de Synod.* vol. i. p. ii. p. 605, ed. Patav.), Hilary at eighty (Hilar. *de Synod.* p. 1200). Malchion, as a skilled dialectician, was chosen by them to conduct the

discussion. The result proved the choice a wise one. Hitherto Paul had been examined as to what he held, and by his adroit selection of ambiguous phrases and the use of vague generalities he had succeeded in masking his heresy. Malchion's line of examination was directed to discovering what he did not hold, and he succeeded "in exposing the subterfuges of the heretic, pursuing him to his last shifts, and reducing his dogmas to their naked deformity" (Neale, *Patriarchate of Antioch*, p. 52). Some fragments of Malchion's disputation are preserved by Leontius (*de Sectis*, iii. p. 504). His heresy being plainly proved Paul was unanimously condemned, and the synod pronounced his deposition and excommunication, which they notified to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, Maximus, bishop of Alexandria and to the other bishops of the church, in an encyclical letter, probably the work of Malchion, large portions of which are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 30). In the same letter the assembled fathers announced that they had of their own authority appointed Domnus, the son of Paul's predecessor, Demetrianus, to the vacant chair. Such an invasion of the rights of the clergy and the people of the diocese would hardly have been ventured on by the assembled prelates but for an apprehension of the strength of the partisans of the deposed bishop by whom their condemnation would be reversed, either by the re-election of Paul himself or the substitution of an adherent of his. The result proved the justice of their fear. The sentence of deposition was easier to pronounce than to carry into effect. Popular tumults were excited by his partisans. Zenobia supported her favourite in his episcopal position, while the irregularity of Domnus's appointment alienated many of the orthodox party. For two years Paul retained possession of the cathedral, and of the bishop's house of residence attached to it, and asserted his rights as the ruler of the church of Antioch. On the defeat of Zenobia by Aurelian towards the end of 372, the Catholic prelates made a representation to him of what they termed Paul's "audacity" (*τὴν τοῦ Παύλου θρασύτητα*, Theod. *u.s.*). Aurelian, though still a pagan, acknowledged the justice of their plea, "deeming it," writes Theodoret, "only just that one who refused to submit to the decree of those of the same faith with himself should be cut off from their fellowship" (Theod. *H. E.* u.s.). As a safeguard, however, against mistake, Aurelian, conscious of his own ignorance of ecclesiastical law, shrewdly relegated the decision of the point to the bishop of Rome and the Italian prelates, decreeing that the residence should be considered to belong to the person whom they recognised by letters of communion (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30). The remark of Gibbon on this deserves attention. "While we applaud the justice, we should not overlook the policy of Aurelian; who was desirous of restoring and cementing the dependence of the provinces on the capital by every means which could bind the interest or prejudices of any part of his subjects." Aurelian's decision sealed Paul's fate. The Italian bishops were not slow in signifying which of the rival prelates was recognised by them, and Paul was driven with the utmost ignominy (*μετὰ τῆς ἐσχάτης αἰσχύνης*) from the temporalities of the church, and so, in Cyril's words, "came to a most shameful end," and

DOMNUS, in spite of the irregularity of his appointment, was generally recognised as patriarch (Eus. *u. s.*; Cyril Alex. *Hom. de Virg. Deip.*; Routh, iii. 358.)

The teaching of Paul of Samosata was a development of that of Artemon, with whose heresy it is uniformly identified by all early writers.^b Like the Eastern heresiarch Paul held the pure humanity of Christ, "He was not before Mary, but received from her the origin of His being" (Athan. *de Synod.* p. 919, ch. iii. s. 10). His pre-existence was simply in the Divine foreknowledge. He started with the unity of God, denying the existence of a σοφία or λόγος distinct from the Father, and representing the Logos in God as merely that which intelligence or reason is in the human heart, ὡσπερ ἐν ἀνθρώπου καρδίᾳ ὁ ἴδιος λόγος, ἄνθρωπος ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπέκτεινεν ἀνωθεν ὁ λόγος—καὶ ἀνῆλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (Eriphan. *Haer.* 65). He allowed of no difference in kind between the indwelling of the Logos in Christ and in any other human being, only one of degree, the Logos having dwelt and operated in Him after a higher manner than in any other man: ἐνοικῆσαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὴν σοφίαν ὡς ἐν οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ. This indwelling was not that of a person, but of a quality: οὐκ οὐσιωδῶς ἀλλὰ κατὰ ποιότητα. There is no evidence that he denied the supernatural conception of Christ. Athanasius distinctly asserts that he taught Θεὸν ἐκ παρθένου, Θεὸν ἐκ Ναζαρετ ὀφθέντα (Athan. *de salut. adv. Apoll.* tom. i. p. 635); but he laid no particular stress upon it. His inferior Being was ἐκ παρθένου; his superior Being was penetrated by the Logos, whose instrumentality by it was continually advancing itself towards God, until the "Jesus Christ from below" (κάτωθεν) became worthy of union with God (ἐκ προκοπῆς θεοποιήσθαι). Therefore, although he called Christ God it was not as God by His nature, but by progressive development, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γέγονε Θεός. The Deity of Christ grew by gradual progress out of the humanity. He was convicted, according to Eusebius, of asserting that Christ was mere man deemed specially worthy of Divine grace (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 27). He taught also that as the Logos is not a Person, so also the Holy Spirit is impersonal; a Divine virtue belonging to the Father, and distinct from Him only in conception.

It deserves special notice that Paul's misuse "σωματικῶς et crasso sensu," of the term ὁμοούσιος, "consubstantial," which afterwards at Nicaea became the test word of orthodoxy, is stated to have led to its rejection by the Antiochene Council (Athan. *de Synodis*, tom. i. in pp. 917, 922). This is allowed by Athanasius, though with some hesitation, and only on the testimony of his semi-Arian opponents, as he had not seen the original documents, ὡς αὐτοὶ φασί, τὴν γὰρ ἐπιστολὴν οὐκ ἔσχον ἐγώ (de *Synod.* tom. i. pp. 918-920), and by Hilary (de *Synod.* § 81, p. 509; § 86, p. 513), on the ground that it appeared that "per hanc unius essentiae nuncupationem solitarium atque unicum sibi esse Patrem et

Filium praedicabat" (in which words he seems mistakenly to identify the teaching of Paul with that of Sabellius), and still more emphatically by Basil (*Ep.* 52 [30]). According to the clear statement of the last-named writer Paul alleged that if Christ was not made God out of a man, but was consubstantial with the Father, there must have been some common substance of which they both partook, and which consequently was distinct from and prior to the Divine Persons themselves, and that out of it two Beings, the Father and the Son, were produced, like two coins struck out of the same lump of metal. If that term therefore was allowed, it followed that the Father was not eternal, and that there was a pre-existent οὐσία (Athan. *de Synod.* i. 919 sq.). Dr. Newman designates this as "a wretched sophism which of course could not deceive Firmilian and Gregory, but which being adopted to perplex weak minds might decide them on withdrawing the word" (*Arians*, ch. ii. p. 192). "The Council of Antioch abstained from the word because they rejected the heresy that there is One only person in the Godhead; the Council of Nicaea used it because they affirmed the Oneness of Substance in the Persons of the Godhead; and both Councils agreed in the essence of the doctrine." (Bp. Wordsworth, *Ch. Hist.* i. 400; cf. Petav. *de Trin.* lib. iv. c. 5 n. 2; Bull. vol. v. p. 81, 88; *Def. Fid. Nic.* ii. 1, 9-13; Waterland, vol. i. p. 330; Newman, *Select Treatises of Athan.* pp. 165-176.) On the points of correspondence or of difference between the teaching of Paul and that of Nestorius the learned note of Dr. Newman may be consulted (*Select Treatises of Athan.* Library of the Fathers, vol. viii. p. 175). These points are clearly drawn out by the clergy of Constantinople in the "Contestatio adv. Nestorium" (Labbe, iii. 338, cap. xiii.; Baluz. 402.) and in Liberati, *Breviarium*, c. ii. (Labbe, v. 741). The chief distinction was that Paul denied the personality of the Word which the Nestorians held. "Nestorius circa Verbum Dei non ut Paulus sentit, qui non substantivum sed prolativum (προφορικῶς) potentiae Dei efficax Verbum esse definiit" (Mar. Mercator, p. 50; cf. also Facund. vi. 3, iii. 2; Leontius, de *Sectis*, iii. p. 504).

The alleged confession of the Council of Antioch against Paul's teaching (Labbe, ii. 979; Routh. *Rel. Sacr.* iii. 524; ii. 365), though accepted as genuine by Baronius, and Feuerlin, and in later times by Burton (*Testimonies*, pp. 397-399) and Faber (*Trinitarianism*, vol. ii. p. 257), is regarded as of a long subsequent date (probably, according to Dr. Routh, "post lites exortas Nestorianas") by Tillemont, Dupin, Routh, and Newman, whose verdict may safely be accepted. The question is exhaustively discussed in a learned note by Dr. Newman (*Select Treat. of Athan.* Libr. Fath. viii. pp. 163-176), and by Dr. Routh (*Rel. Sacr.* iii. 365).

Fragments of Paul's writings are to be met with in the *Contestatio adv. Nestorium*, in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (Labbe, iii. 338), in Leontius Byzantinus (*Contr. Nest. et Eutyech.* lib. iii.); and in Justinian (*Lib. contr. Monophys.* Maii *Nov. Collect.* vii. i. 299.) Fragments of his sermons, πρὸς Σαβίνον, are also given by Mai (*ibid.* 68). Many of these are also to be found in Gieseler's *Ecol. Hist.* vol. i. p. 222, Clark's Translation.

^b The synodical letter of the bishops who condemned Paul closes, in Eusebius, with the request that the orthodox bishops would exchange letters of communion with Domnus, adding the ironical observation that Paul if he wished might do the same with Artemon (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 30).

Dr. Newman regards Paul of Samosata as "the founder of a school rather than of a sect" (*Arians*, p. 6). A body was called by his name Paulianists, or Pauliani, or Samosatensians, who existed in sufficient numbers at the time of the Council of Nicaea for the enactment of a canon requiring them to be rebaptized and their clergy to be reordained on their return to the Catholic Church, on the ground that orthodox formulas were used with a heterodox meaning (*Canon. Nic. xix. Hefele*, i. 43). The learned presbyter Lucian, who may be considered almost the parent of Arianism, was a friend and disciple of Paul, and, as being infected with his errors, was refused communion by each of the three bishops who succeeded the heresiarch. We see from many references to them in the writings of Athanasius, that for a considerable period after the Nicene Council it was felt necessary for Catholics to controvert the Samosatene's errors, and for semi-Arians to disown complicity in them (*Athan. de Synod.* 918-920). The Paulinians are mentioned by St. Augustine as still existing (*Aug. de Haeres.*), though Pope Innocent spoke of the heresy as a thing of the past in 414 (*Labbe*, ii. 1275), and when Theodoret wrote, c. 450, there did not exist the smallest remnant of the sect. (*Theod. Haer. Fab.* ii. 11; *Epiph. Haer.* 65; *August. Haer.* 44; *Tillemont, Mém. Eccles.* tom. iv. pp. 289-303; *Cave, Hist. Lit.* i. 134; *Neander, Ch. Hist.* vol. ii. pp. 362-367, *Clark's Transl.*; *Dorner, Person of Christ*, div. i. vol. ii. pp. 10-15, *Clark's transl.*; *Newman, Arians of the Fourth Century*, pp. 3, 27, 192, ed. 1876; *Select Treatises of Athanasius*, *Libr. of Councils*, vol. i. pp. 118-126; *Neale, Hist. of Patr. of Antioch*, pp. 45-54; *Schwab, de Paul. Samos. vit. atque doct.* 1839; *Feuerlin, Disp. de Haeres. P. S.*; *Walch, Ketzergesch.* ii. 64-126; *Ehrlich, de Error. P. S. Lips.* 1745; *Routh, Rel. Sacr.* vol. iii. pp. 288-367; *Bp. Wordsworth, Ch. Hist.* vol. i. pp. 396-398; *Bright, Notes on Canons of Four General Councils*, p. 65.)

[E. V.]

PAULUS (10) II., patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 519-521 (*Clinton, F. R.*). On the expulsion of the Monophysite Severus by Justin after wearisome negotiations with pope Hormisdas extending over a whole year, Paulus, a presbyter of Constantinople, warden of the hospice of Eubulus, was nominated by the emperor to the vacant see, and was canonically ordained at Antioch. He strictly attended to Justin's commands to enforce the decrees of Chalcedon, and by his excessive zeal in inserting in the diptychs the names of the orthodox bishops of that synod he caused a schism in his church, many of the Antiochenes regarding the council with suspicion, as tending to Nestorianism. His conduct rendered him so unpopular that the whole body of the Antiochenes, clergy, laity, and resident foreigners, joined in laying an accusation against him of conduct unbecoming a bishop before the papal legates, who were at that time in Constantinople. On their departure without coming to any conclusion in the matter, they repeated the charge before Justin. Paul, being unable to clear himself, asked leave of the emperor to retire from his bishopric, A.D. 521. This was granted. He was succeeded by Euphrasius, and,

in the words of Evagrius, "he went the way of all flesh by a natural death" (*Evagr. H. E.* iv. 4; *Theophan.* p. 141; *Joann. Malal. lib. xvii.* p. 411; *Eutyech. ii.* 152; *Epistola Justinii, Labbe*, iv. 1555; *Le Quien, Or. Christ.* ii. 732).

[E. V.]

PAULUS (11), surnamed THE BLACK, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch from about the middle of the sixth century to 578. He was by birth an Alexandrian (*Assem. B. O.* ii. 331), and like most other Egyptians in faith a Monophysite. His monastery, Guba Baraja, placed in Egypt by Le Quien (*Or. Chr.* ii. 1358), is shown by Assemani (ii. 74, 75) to have been in Mesopotamia on the Euphrates. Before his elevation to the episcopate we find him at Constantinople maintaining a successful public disputation in the patriarchal palace with the Tritheites Conon and Eugenius (*Assem. ii.* 329). Either Mennas or Eutychius must then have been patriarch. He was at some time, probably then, syncellus to Theodosius, the Jacobite patriarch of Alexandria, who was residing in nominal exile at Constantinople, but exercising full authority over the Jacobite congregations there and in Egypt. Paulus's connection with Theodosius, and his success as a disputant, were sufficient to mark him out for the titular see of Antioch and the patriarchate of the whole Monophysite body, then beginning to be called Jacobites, and it was by Jacob Baradaeus himself, who originated the name, that he was consecrated. But the exact date cannot be determined. It was in succession to Sergius, but (as John of Ephesus states, p. 81, *u. inf.*), "after an interval"; nor is the date of Sergius's death settled [SERGIUS of Antioch]. We cannot feel sure that he was consecrated before 550. Paul, notwithstanding that he was the ecclesiastical chief of the whole Jacobite body, aspired to succeed Theodosius in the see of Alexandria, and thither he went accordingly to make interest for himself, but how soon after Theodosius's death, which occurred in 567, cannot be ascertained exactly within two or three years. He failed, however, through the opposition of Athanasius, a son of the empress Theodora's daughter, a man of great wealth and influence, and a Tritheite (*Assem. ii.* 331). Retiring from Egypt he visited the Arab Monophysite king Aretas or Harith (ob. 572). In a list of celebrities who were flourishing in 571 occurs the name of Paul. All that we hear of him afterwards is disastrous. The great persecution of the Monophysites by the patriarch John Scholasticus broke out at Constantinople, if the year is right, on March 20, 571, and our Paul was one of four bishops who were subjected together to the most barbarous treatment at his hands, the others being Elisha of Sardis, John of Ephesus, Stephen of Cyprus, besides Paul of Aphrodisias who suffered earlier, and under whose name [PAULUS (13)] some general particulars of the persecution will be found. Our Paul was inveigled out of the monastery of the Acoemetæ in Constantinople into the patriarch's palace, whither the others also were brought, under pretence of conferring on the unity of the church. Here the *History* of John of Ephesus, from which we draw (*Dr. R. Payne Smith's trans.*, p. 33) gives us an opportunity of

verifying the date A.D. 571. The patriarch, remonstrating with the four bishops, says:—"It is you who hinder the unity of the church; after all our efforts for fifty years, you are still driving it away." He was probably reckoning the fifty years from the early part of Justin I.'s reign, in and about 520, when great efforts were made for the peace of the church and the maintenance of the Chalcedonian decrees. [HORMISDAS, p. 159.] The four bishops were kept in close custody, and the cruelties they underwent overcame their patience so far, that they agreed to communicate with the persecutor on condition of his ejecting the synod of Chalcedon from the church (John of Eph., p. 42). They then twice received the communion with him, loudly anathematizing the obnoxious synod; but when they looked to the patriarch to fulfil his part of the compact he put them off with the excuse, that he must first obtain the consent of the bishop of Rome. Thus they unawares "fell into communion" with the deceitful "synodite," and on their loading him with reproaches the severity of their treatment was increased, and they were thrown into prison in the monastery of Beth Abraham in Constantinople, where their sufferings were protracted further. After a time Paul was allowed to escape, and made his way to Syria, where he was received with great displeasure by Jacob Baradaeus, who, after keeping him three years in suspense, on his humble submission, and on the intercession of Mondir, the son and successor of Aretas, restored him to communion. This was, as far as can be determined, in 575. In that year occurred the unfortunate double election among the Jacobites of Alexandria [THEODORUS], in which Paul's complicity was asserted; then followed, A.D. 576, in consequence, the sentence of Peter of Alexandria, deposing Paul, so strangely acquiesced in by Jacob, and the convulsion of the Jacobite sect all over the East [JACOBUS BARADAUS, p. 331]. In 578, a new patriarch of Antioch, Peter of Callinicus, was appointed, and Paul withdrew into concealment at Constantinople, where he died in 582, as detailed by John of Ephesus (pp. 327-333). Paul is mentioned by Timotheus, the presbyter of Constantinople, in his *De Recept. Haeret.*, in the section on the *Διακρινόμενοι* or *Haesitantes*, num. 7, 8, 9. (*Pat. Gr.* lxxxvi. 57-60.) Here it is stated that Paul had the surname of BLACK, which serves to identify him with a Paul occurring in the enumeration of Sophronius (*Hard.* iii. 1289 c), who calls him Black, not only in name, but in very truth. [C. H.]

PAULUS (12), bishop of Apamea and metropolitan of Syria Secunda, after the deposition of Peter by Justin for his Monophysite tenets, A.D. 513. He attended the synod summoned by Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 536, at which, in the name of the bishops of his province he presented to Justinian a confession of the orthodox faith as set forth by the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and in the tome of Leo; and an anathema pronounced on Anthimus, Severus, and his predecessor Peter, and on all tainted with the same Monophysite views, which had been previously laid before pope Agapetus on his recent visit to Constantinople. (*Labbe, Concil.* v. 22.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (13), surnamed OF ASIA, Jacobite bishop of Aphrodisias and metropolitan of Caria in the reign of Justin II. We are indebted for our knowledge of him to the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus (Dr. R. Payne Smith's translation). As his persecution by John Scholasticus, patriarch of Constantinople, marks a period in the history of the Monophysite body, it is important to fix its date. John of Ephesus says (p. 3) that, having brought down the second part of his history to the sixth year of Justin II., he was induced to enter on a third part by the outbreak of this persecution. The sixth year of Justin II. ended in Nov. 571. The outbreak, therefore, was in or after that year, and circumstances lead us to conclude that it was in that year. The congregations of the "orthodox," writes the Monophysite historian, had for more than forty years (from about 530 therefore) enjoyed peace and tranquillity, both in Constantinople and the suburbs, when, suddenly, "in the holy days of the Lenten fast, on Saturday before Palm Sunday" the emperor, at the instigation of the patriarch John, issued an angry decree commanding their churches to be closed, their altars to be razed, their priests and bishops to be imprisoned, and the worshippers to be dispersed; and this decree was followed by others like it (p. 4). If 571 was the year, the Saturday was March 20. The persecution fell chiefly on the numerous Monophysite monasteries, of both sexes, which had sprung up, in and around Constantinople while the empress Theodora lived. These were burst into to give admission to the "synodite" clergy bearing the consecrated bread, which the inmates were compelled to partake of, though it might be necessary to bind their hands and force it into their mouths. When a monastery had been reduced to obedience by personal visits from the patriarch himself and his clergy, and the recalcitrants imprisoned, the emperor and empress would go and carry gifts to all who had been submissive (p. 8). The Jacobite clergy had their orders annulled, and if they submitted to be reordained they might be received into the dominant church, but in numerous instances they were reduced to the ranks of the laity. While the violence of the persecution was felt chiefly at the capital, the provinces were not overlooked. The chief difficulty was with the bishops, and Paul of Aphrodisias was singled out for the first example (p. 13). The historian describes him as an honest and simple-minded old man, dwelling quietly in his monastery in Caria, when the patriarch had him brought to Constantinople and imprisoned in his own palace, until overcome by harsh treatment he was compelled to receive the communion at his hands, besides signing an act of submission, which he was not allowed to read (given by the historian), to the effect that he accepted the decrees of Chalcedon, and the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. He was then sent back, but the "synodite" bishop of Aphrodisias had instructions to depose him from the episcopal office and consecrate him afresh to the see of the Carian Antioch, on the Maeander, at the far east of the province and not very distant from Aphrodisias. All this was done, to the extreme grief and indignation of the venerable bishop, and it could not have been long after-

wards that "death overtook him, and his old age descended in affliction and misery to the grave" (p. 16). For other bishops who suffered in this persecution see JOANNES (160), PAULUS (11), STEPHANUS of Cyprus. [C. H.]

PAULUS (14) CALLINICENSIS, Monophysite bishop of Callinicus in Osrhoëne; flourished circ. 503, according to Dionysius (*Ch. on.*, ap. *Assem. B. O. ii.* p. 46), who also relates that he was one of the bishops expelled by Justin in 519 for refusing to accept the council of Chalcedon. He fled to Edessa, where he translated some of the writings of Severus of Antioch into Syriac. A MS. in the Vatican Library (Cod. Nitr. 29) contains his version of the controversial letters that passed between Severus and Julian of Halicarnassus, *Concerning the Corruptibility of the Body of Christ*, of the treatise of Severus *Against Julian* (also in Cod. Nitr. 30), his *Questions and Answers*, his *Letter to the Monks of the East*, and his other tracts on the same controversy (including Julian's ten *Anathemas*, with the *Reply of Severus*); also his treatise *Against the Manicheans*, and his *Apology for his Philalethes*. To these is prefixed a *Preface* by Paul. The subscription to the MS. describes him as Mar Paulus Callinicensis (**ܡܘܠܘܢ**), but not expressly as bishop; and assigns Edessa, A. Gr. 839 (= A.D. 528), as the place and time of the translation. Assemani takes this to be the date of the MS., which no doubt is a mistake. He is wrong also in attributing to him the translations made by PAUL OF EDESSA. Portions of the above translations are to be found in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 12158 (6th century), 17200 (7th century). The *Homilies of Severus*, in a version older than that of Jacob of Edessa, contained in Add. MS. 14,599, and in Codd. Nitr. (Vat.) 32-34, are probably also translated by him. See Wright's *Catal.*, pp. 336, 546, 554, 555; *Assem. i.* pp. 569, 571. [J. Gw.]

PAULUS (15), bishop of Cataqua in Numidia (Böcking, *Not. i.* 644), concerning whom St. Augustine wrote to Olympius. Augustine wrote to him a letter of grave but severe rebuke for his misconduct and neglect of duty, A.D. 405. (*Aug. Epp.* 85, 96; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr. i.* 131.) [OLYMPIUS.] [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (16) II., third in the list of the bishops of Châlon-sur-Saône in the latter half of the 5th century. From the circumstance of Sidonius Apollinaris, who mentions the consecration of his successor Johannes I. by Patiens, archbishop of Lyons, calling him junior episcopus, it has been conjectured by some that he was the second of the name at Châlon, but nothing is known of his predecessor. (*Sid. Apoll. Epist. iv.* 25, Migne, *Patr. Lat. lvi.* 531; *Gall. Christ. iv.* 862.) [S. A. B.]

PAULUS (17), bishop of Cirta, A.D. 303, during the persecution under Diocletian. Being interrogated by the inquisitors as to sacred books and implements, he endeavoured, but without success, to parry the enquiry, of which the result was to fix both upon him and upon Silvanus the charge of "tradition." The question was discussed in the enquiry held by Zeno-

philus, A.D. 320. (*Aug. c. Cresc. iii.* 29, 33; *Ep. cliii.* 4; *Mon. Vet. Don. iv.* p. 169, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS, of Constantina; *vid.* of Tella.

PAULUS (18) I., sixth bishop of Constantinople, elected A.D. 336 (or 340), died after three exiles and two restorations about the year 351, four or five years after the council of Sardica. He was a native of Thessalonica, a presbyter of Constantinople, and secretary to the aged bishop Alexander, his predecessor in the see. Alexander died in the twenty-fourth year of his episcopate and the ninety-ninth of his life. For his parting advice of a choice between Paulus and Macedonius, see MACEDONIUS (2). No sooner had he breathed his last, than the two parties came into open conflict. The orthodox party prevailed; Paulus was elected, and he was consecrated by bishops happening to be at Constantinople in the Church of Peace, close to what was afterwards the Great Church of St. Sophia. The consecrating bishops should have been Eusebius of Nicodemia and Theodorus of Heraclea, who were the nearest neighbours; but it is said that they would take no part in the matter.

The emperor Constantine had been away while all this was going forward. On his return he was angry at not having been consulted. He summoned a synod of Arian bishops, declared that Paulus was quite unfit for the bishopric, banished him, and translated Eusebius from Nicomedia to Constantinople. This is thought to have been in A.D. 338. Eusebius died in 341. Paulus was at once restored by the people to his see. But the Arians seized the occasion; Theognis of Nicaea, Theodorus of Heraclea, and other heterodox bishops, consecrated Macedonius in the church of St. Paul; and again, the city became the prey of a civil war amongst Christians, as Socrates calls it with mournful emphasis; violence and tumults blazed forth, and many lives were lost. The emperor was at Antioch. He was greatly exasperated, and ordered Hermogenes, his general of cavalry, to see that Paulus was again expelled. Hermogenes was on a mission to Thrace, and could take Constantinople on the way. The people would not hear of violence being done to their bishop; they met force by force, rushed upon the house where the general had taken up his quarters, set fire to it, killed him on the spot, tied a rope round his feet, pulled him out from the burning building, and dragged him in triumph round the city.

The emperor Constantine was not likely to pass over this rebellion against his authority. He rode on horseback at full speed to Constantinople, determined to make the people of that capital suffer heavily for their revolt. They met him, however, on their knees with tears and entreaties, and he contented himself with depriving them of half their allowance of corn. He turned his anger on Paulus, and ordered him to be driven from the city. He was also highly indignant with Macedonius, as the origin of the death of his general and of so much trouble, and because he had been consecrated without his leave. Without either confirming or annulling the election, he returned to Antioch.

Athanasius was at this time in exile from Alexandria, Marcellus from Ancyra, and Asclepas from Gaza; with them Paulus betook himself to Rome, and consulted Julius the bishop. Julius examined into their cases severally, found them all staunch to the creed of Nicaea, admitted them to communion, espoused their cause, and wrote strongly to the bishops of the East. Athanasius and Paulus recovered their sees; the eastern bishops returned to bishop Julius an answer altogether declining to act on his advice.

The emperor Constantinus was again at Antioch, and was as resolute as ever against the choice of the people of Constantinople. Philippus, prefect of the East, was then at that city; to him was entrusted the task of once more expelling Paulus. This time Macedonius was definitely to be put in his place. Philippus was not ready to incur the risks and fate of Hermogenes; he said nothing about the imperial order. By the shore of the Hellespont was a palace, and joining the palace was a splendid public bath, called Zeuxippus. He asked the bishop to meet him here, as if to discuss some matter of public business. The bishop came; Philippus showed him the emperor's letter, and ordered him to be quietly taken through the palace to the water-side, placed on board ship, and carried off to Thessalonica, his native town. He allowed him to visit Illyricum, and the remoter provinces, and only forbade him to set foot again in the East. The disastrous restoration of Macedonius belongs to the story of that prelate. Paulus was afterwards loaded with chains and taken to Singara in Mesopotamia, afterwards to Emesa, and finally to Cucusus in Armenia, and there died. Sozomenus is not certain of the particulars of his end, but he mentioned the report that he was strangled by the adherents of Macedonius. The same account is given by Athanasius. His followers suffered grievously at the hands of the heresiarch. First he drove them from their churches, then he forced them to communicate with him; many who refused were beaten to death; some were deprived of their property, others of their rights as citizens; some were branded on the forehead, to be the sport of the Arian mob. It is due to Constantinus to record that he blamed Macedonius for this cruel treatment of the defeated friends of the unfortunate Paulus.

The emperor Theodosius afterwards ordered his remains to be brought back from Ancyra, where they were lying. The emperor himself received the corpse with the greatest honour and reverence, and buried it in the church of St. Paul, which had been in the hands of the party of Macedonius, and in which Macedonius had himself been consecrated. (Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 6, etc.; Soz. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 3, etc.; Athanas. *Hist. Arian. ad Monach.* 275; Mansi, *Concil.* i. 1275; *L'Art de vérifier les dates*, iv. 66; Theoph. *Chronogr.* 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 59, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* cviii.) [W. M. S.]

PAULUS (19) II., patriarch of Constantinople, thirty-eighth in the succession of the see, Monothelite, successor of Pyrrhus in Oct., A.D. 641, and himself succeeded by Pyrrhus again.

The emperor Heraclius died in 641, leaving the empire jointly to Constantinus, son of his first marriage, and Heraclionas, son of his

second by his niece Martina. In about three months' time Constantinus was dead, and the popular verdict declared his stepmother guilty of poisoning him. She and Heraclionas were deposed by the senate, and Constans, son of the dead Constantinus and grandson of Heraclionas, was placed on the throne. Pyrrhus the patriarch was regarded as the accomplice of Martina, relinquished his dignity, and fled to Africa. Paul, his successor, was a presbyter at Constantinople, and treasurer of the great church. He sent the usual synodal letters, together with letters from the bishops who had consecrated him, to pope Theodore I. There was nothing in these letters contrary to the orthodox faith; but the bishops happened to call Pyrrhus very holy, saying that he had only left his see on account of the revolution and the popular animosity. The pope replied to the patriarch that revolution and popular animosity could not deprive a man of his bishopric; that to make the patriarch's consecration valid, it was necessary that Pyrrhus should be deposed in a council after his cause had been canonically examined by the nearest bishops; that the presence of Pyrrhus was not at all necessary, as his excesses were notorious and his writings at hand; and that if his partisans tried to delay his condemnation, it would be easy to counteract their plots by getting an order from the emperor for sending Pyrrhus to Rome, there to be judged by a council. Pope Theodore wrote in the same strain to the bishops who had ordained Paulus, and sent a decree to Constantinople, which was to be publicly read, in which he rejected all that Pyrrhus had taught contrary to the orthodox faith, and without naming it anathematised the *Ecthesis* of Heraclius. In the letter to Paulus the pope quotes a letter which he had written to the emperor asking him to send Pyrrhus to Rome.

In A.D. 645 Pyrrhus came to Rome with Maximus, a monk of noble birth, and the ablest of all the opponents of Monothelism, with whom he had been for some time discussing the question, and by whom he professed to have been convinced. Pope Theodore admitted him to communion, and treated him as patriarch, ignoring the position of Paulus. But Pyrrhus soon after went to Ravenna, and there retracted his recantation, on which pope Theodore called a synod, obtained the condemnation and excommunication of Pyrrhus, and to give all solemnity to the sentence, subscribed it in the wine of the eucharist cup, and laid it on the tomb of St. Peter.

Pope John IV. and pope Theodore had both urged the different emperors to withdraw the *Ecthesis*, which was still displayed by authority. In 648 the emperor Constans put forth a new formulary, intended to supersede the *Ecthesis*; it was called the *Typus*, or Model of Faith, and was the composition of the patriarch Paulus. The gist of it was that to talk either of one will or of two wills in the person of Christ was quite a modern invention, and perfectly unnecessary; no indication was betrayed to either party, and all controversy on the subject or mention of the terms was strictly forbidden.

Paulus had carried on some unsatisfactory correspondence with Rome on the subject of the controversy, when at length pope Theodore in formal synod declared him excommunicate. When the Roman decree arrived at Constanti-

nople Paulus was evidently extremely angry. He overthrew the altar of the papal chapel in the palace of the papal envoy Martin (himself to be the next pope), called Placidia, forbade the Roman envoys to celebrate the eucharist, treated them with harshness, and persecuted their partizans. He could hardly have submitted to the mere authority of the Roman pope in an opinion which he held conscientiously, but the retaliation only made matters worse. It was at this time that the *Typus* appeared; in spite of it the controversy raged even with greater fierceness.

Pope Theodore died in May, 649, and Martin, who had been envoy at Constantinople, was chosen to succeed him. He immediately held a council at Rome, known as the first Lateran; the council was intended to dispose of the Monothelite controversy. The history of the council belongs rather to the life of pope Martin than to that of the patriarch Paulus; it is enough to say that the expression "*one theandric operation*" was denounced, and anathemas were passed against Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paulus of Constantinople, together with "the most impious Ecthesis" and "the most impious Typus" which Sergius and Paulus respectively had persuaded Heraclius and Constans to issue. While the council was sitting the exarch Olympius arrived to enforce subscription to the Typus, and to carry pope Martin to Constantinople. Olympius did not perform this office, but in 633 the exarch Theodore Calliopas seized the pope and despatched him towards the East. The tedious journey, the public mockery, the imprisonment, exile, starving and death of the unhappy pope belong to his own biography. It was owing to the intercession of the patriarch Paul that he was not executed. The patriarch was dying, and the emperor came to tell him what had happened to his old opponent. Paul in deep grief turned round towards the wall, and said: "It is to increase my condemnation." The emperor was surprised at this remark; when the dying patriarch added, "Is it not a deplorable thing thus to treat a bishop?" He died the day after Christmas, A.D. 654. What followed the death of Paulus belongs to the biography of Pyrrhus. The letters of Paulus to pope Theodore remain. (S. Theodori et Martini *Epist.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 75-99, 106, &c.; Theoph. *Chronogr.* 275, 283, in *Patr. Graec.* cviii.; S. Niceph. Patriarch C. P. *De rebus post Mauric.* 36, in *Patr. Graec.* c; Baron. *Ann. Eccl.* 641, vii; Pagi, 642, i., 643, iv. 648, ii. iii. iv. xiv.; Mansi, *Concil.* x. 609, 610, 673, 678, 696, 777, 787, 863.) [W. M. S.]

PAULUS (20) III., patriarch of Constantinople, 45th in the succession of the see, successor of Theodore I., and followed by Callinicus; elected in A.D. 686; died in 693, having held the episcopate six years and eight months. On the death of Theodore, Paulus, a layman, who had distinguished himself as one of the secretaries of the sixth council eleven years before, was elected in his place. Nothing is known about him, except that he presided at the council of Constantinople called in Irullo and Quinisext. This council has been placed in 686, 692, and 706; the most probable date is 692. It was summoned by the young

emperor Justinian, who had succeeded his father Constantine Pogonatus in 685, for the purpose of passing canons on matters of practice, as the fifth and sixth general councils had enacted canons only on matters of faith. The discussion of its hundred and two canons belongs to the account of the Trullan council. As illustrating the position of Paulus III., it must be stated that we gather that the eastern bishops were bent, as at Chalcedon, on moderating the late doctrinal triumphs of Rome by legislating on other matters which would be unpalatable to the pope; and that the recognition of these canons by the east only, where they were quoted as the work of the sixth general council, was the first manifest step towards the separation of the Greek and Latin churches. (Mansi, *Concil.* ii. 922-1018; Baron. *Ann. Eccl.* 684. xiv. 691. iv.; S. Niceph. Patriarch. *Chronogr. Brevis.* viii. in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* t. c 1048.) [W. M. S.]

PAULUS (21) IV., patriarch of Constantinople, fifty-third in the succession of the see, successor of Nicetas I., and followed by Tarasius; elected Feb. 20, 780 (*L'Art de vérifier les dates*), and died 784. His short episcopate occurred amidst the distractions of the Iconoclast controversy. Like his predecessor, he belonged to the Iconoclast party. He was consecrated on the second Sunday in Lent. He is described as an honoured and venerable reader, born at Salamis in Cyprus, distinguished for learning and high character. He had a secret leaning towards the cause of Image-worship, but feared the emperor Leo IV. At length on August 31st, 784, after the death of Leo, having fallen into bad health, he suddenly resigned his see, retired to the monastery of Florus, and took the cowl of a monk. As soon as the empress Irene heard the news, she hurried to him with her son Constantine VI., a boy of ten years old, and complained with no assumed grief of the step which he had taken: "Oh, why did you do this?" Bursting into tears, the old man answered, "Would that I had never sat on the sacred throne of Constantinople! The church of God has been tyrannically governed; for that reason she is cut off from the other thrones of Christendom, and heaped with dire anathemas!" The empress proceeded to summon to her palace the patricians and the principal men of the senate. She commissioned them to go to the monastery and hear what Paulus had to say. "Unless," he admonished them, "you call a general council and correct the error which prevails amongst you, there is no salvation for you." They asked him why, when he was elected patriarch, he had declared amidst the solemnities of his consecration that he intended never to worship images? "Ah, that," said he, "is the cause of my tears! That has driven me to repent and entreat my God that He would not punish me as a priest who had till now been silent, and who had refrained from fear of your madness from preaching the truth." Not long after he died, deeply lamented by the empress and by the pious men of the empire. He was highly esteemed, generous beyond measure to the poor, and had won the confidence both of Irene and of the public. (Theoph. *Chronogr.* 382, 385, 386, Migne, *Patr. Graec.* cviii.; Baron. *Ann. Eccl.* 780. ii. 784. i. iv.) [W. M. S.]

PAULUS (22), Novatian bishop of Constantinople. He had been a teacher of oratory before his ordination. He founded a Novatian monastery, and was noted for his ascetic life. Socrates (*H. E.* vii. 17) describes him as a typical recluse "in continued fastings, silence, abstinence from animal food, and a very sparing use of oil and wine." [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (23), bishop of Crateia, one of the forty friendly prelates who threatened the empress Eudoxia with the wrath of heaven on her children for her treatment of Chrysostom. (Pallad. p. 83, v.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (24), bishop of Crete, a contemporary of pope Vitalian, who in A.D. 668 revoked in a Roman council the decision that Paulus had pronounced in a Cretan council upon Joannes bishop of Lappa in Crete [JOANNES (227)]. Vitalian addressed two letters to Paulus, especially directing him to restore the bishop of Lappa, and reproaching him for not sending a legate to plead in the appeal at Rome. Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* ii. 260) dates the second letter Jan. 27, A.D. 669. (Vitalianus, *Epp.* 1 and 3, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxxvii. 999, 1003; Mansi, xi. 16, 99; *Jaffé, R.P.* num. 1614, 1616.) [J. G.]

PAULUS (25), Jacobite bishop of Cyprus A.D. 624; translated many Homilies of Gregory Naz. into Syriac. (Assem. i. 171.) Many copies of this work survive in MS.; e.g. Br. Mus. Add. 12153, 14549. (Wright, *Catal.*, pp. 423, 428.) [J. G.]

PAULUS (26), bishop of Doclea (in what is now Montenegro), mentioned in two letters of Gregory the Great to Constantinus and JOANNES (328), bishops of Scodra and Prima Justiniana in A.D. 602. He had been accused among other offences of incontinence, had been convicted, and had confessed himself guilty, and had then been deposed, and Nemesion appointed in his place. Paulus, however, had with the aid of the civil authorities forcibly entered the bishop's house, had carried off various things, and treated Nemesion with great violence. Gregory ordered Joannes to inquire into the matter, and compel Paulus to restore any of the property in question that belonged to the church. What was his own, however, he was to be allowed to retain on condition of making good thereout any dilapidations. If contumacious, he was to be confined in a monastery. If it was true that he had tried to reassume his office, he was to be deprived of communion for the rest of his life, and confined in a monastery (*Epp.* xii. 30, 31.) [F. D.]

PAULUS (27), Jacobite, 9th maphrian of the East, appointed by Athanasius III., the patriarch, A.D. 724. He "reconciled the people at Tagrit, and other Orientals, with one another and with the Westerns," and died A.D. 757. (Gregory Barh. *Chron. Eccl.* ii. p. 155 (ed. Abbel. and Lamy); Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* ii. 430, iii. 111.) [J. G.]

PAULUS (28) EDESSENUM, Monophysite bishop of Edessa; consecrated A.D. 510 in succession to Peter. In the first year of his episcopate he took part with Gamalinus, bishop

of Perrha,* against certain sectarians who refused the use of bread, water, and wine, except in the Eucharist. When Justin, on his accession to the empire, undertook to force the decrees of Chalcedon on Severus of Antioch and his followers, he committed the task to Patricius, who came in due course to Edessa (November, 519), and put before Paul the alternatives, to subscribe the council or resign. Paul refused, and took sanctuary in his baptistery; whence he was dragged by Patricius and sentenced to go into exile to Seleucia. Justin, however, hoping to overcome the bishop's resistance, reinstated him after forty-four days; acting under the advice of the patriarch Paul who occupied the seat of the deposed Severus: the design being, as Dionysius (writing in the Monophysite interest, circ. 775) alleges in his *Chronicon*, to induce Paul of Edessa to conform inwardly to the Chalcedonian doctrine, while making an outward show of opposing it. But when he proved to be sincere and persistent in refusing submission, he was at length deposed and banished to Euchaita in Pontus, in July, 522. Dionysius adds that this was brought about by Asclepius, a presbyter of Edessa, who, when disappointed in his expectation of being raised by Paul to the vacant see of Charrae, revenged himself by reporting the bishop's persistency (through his brother who was Praefectus Praetorio at Constantinople) to the emperor. The result was an imperial order to Pharesmanes, military prefect, to expel Paul and place Asclepius in the see.

It was no doubt in his days of exile that he translated the Greek hymns of Severus and other Monophysite writers, and arranged them so as to form a Syriac hymnal. A MS. of this collection as corrected by Jacob his famous successor in this see—dated in the lifetime of that prelate (A.D. 675), and probably written by his hand—is in the British Museum (Add. MS. 17134). Of the hymns it contains, one (the second *On the Holy Chrism*) is noted by Jacob as an original composition of Paul's. A subscription (in the same hand) informs us that "Paul bishop of Edessa" executed the work "when he was in the island of Cyprus in his flight from the Persians." The reference is apparently to the troubles mentioned by Procopius, *De B. P.* (i. 12), and by Theophanes, *Chronogr.* (pp. 143, 144), which arose in the years 521-3 in the territory of the Lazi, formerly called Colchis, bordering on Pontus. A few years before, Macedonius Patriarch of Constantinople had in like manner been forced by an irruption of the Huns to fly from Euchaita, to which place he too, and his predecessor Euphemius, had been banished by the emperor Anastasius (Theoph. pp. 120, 134, 138). On the death of Asclepius (June 525), Paul "repented" (as the orthodox author of the *Chronicon Edessenum* states), and made submis-

* So Assem. i. 409 n. (quoting the *Chron.* of Dionysius). But a letter against this sect is extant (Wright, *Catal.* p. 1061; Overbeck, *S. Ephr., Rabulae, &c., Opera*, p. 230) addressed to "Gamalinus, bishop of Perrha," by Rabula, who died 435. It follows therefore that Assem. wrongly understands Dionysius to mean that Paul and Gamalinus were contemporary. His words must be taken merely to convey that each had in his time opposed the error in question.

sion to Justinian, then acting for Justin. From him he obtained a letter in support of the petition he then addressed to Euphrasius, then patriarch, praying to be restored to his see. He was accordingly permitted to return to Edessa as bishop in March 526. He survived this his third inauguration less than eight months, dying on 30th October of the same year, less than a year before the death of Justin. The Jacobites, however, cannot have regarded him as a renegade, for he is commemorated in their calendar on 23rd August, as "Mar Paulus, bishop of Edessa, Interpreter of Books," a title likewise given to Jacob of Edessa. J. S. Assemani (*B. O. ii. p. 46*) falls into the natural mistake of supposing the Paul thus commemorated to be PAUL OF CALLINICUS, his contemporary, suffragan, and fellow-sufferer, who he thinks may have been called "of Edessa," not as bishop, but as residing there; and of ascribing to him the translation of the hymns as well as of the prose writings of Severus. But he overlooks the title "*Bishop of Edessa*," expressly given in the calendar to the person commemorated, and likewise in the MS. above described, and in two Bodleian MSS. (see below) to the translator of the hymns. Paul of Callinicus was alive in 528, whereas Paul of Edessa died in 526. These two Pauls have so much in common that one feels tempted to reverse Assemani's conjecture, to suppose an error of a few years in one of the Chronicles, and to assign the translation of all the works of Severus, prose as well as verse, to Paul of Edessa,—with the explanation that he may have been also designated "of Callinicus," as born in that city, or resident in one of its monasteries, or possibly as having occupied the two sees together simultaneously (as Thomas of Harkel is supposed to have held Germanicia along with Mabug its metropolis). But the dates seem too well authenticated to admit of this identification; and, moreover, it is plain from Assemani's extracts (cp. *B. O. i. p. 409 n. 1*, with *ii. p. 46*) that Dionysius in his *Chron.* treated of them as distinct persons.

The hymnal above mentioned consists of 365 hymns; 295 being by Severus, the rest by his contemporary John Bar-Aphtunaya, abbat of Kinnesrin, John Psaltes his successor there, and others. Though the translation is no doubt in the main the work of Paul, it comprises a few hymns of obviously later date. Among its commemorations of "Holy Fathers" we find not only some in praise of his contemporaries,—as of Severus by John Bar-Aphtunaya, and of this John by John Psaltes,—but also one "concerning Peter the Patriarch, called the Callinicene" (d. 591), and one "concerning Julian the Patriarch" (d. 596), both by John Psaltes. These of course were inserted by Jacob when he revised the collection. A few which contain interesting reference to events early in the 6th century may well be regarded as composed by Severus and translated by Paul;—as *e.g.* three "On the War with the Persians" (probably that of 502-506); six "On the Earthquakes of the year 562" (A.D. 514); two "On the Invasion of the Huns" (516). That "On the Himyarite Martyrs" (523) is assigned to John Psaltes. The collection concludes with a version by Paul of the *Gloria in Excelsis*. There are among the Add. MSS. of the British Museum

many copies complete or otherwise of this hymnal, ranging in date from the 7th to the 13th century (Wright, *Catal. pp. 330-374*). A similar collection, ancient but undated, with a subscription to the like effect with that above cited from Add. 17134, is in the Bodleian [Hunt. 586]; and another MS. in the same library [Poc. 10] contains Paul's version of the *Gloria*, amplified and embodying the Trisagion with its Monophysite interpolation (Payne Smith, *Catal. pp. 513, 63*). Assemani, *B. O. i. p. 613* (cp. 487) describes a copy of the same in the Vatican Library, No. xv., made about the year 1000.

Bishop Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, vol. i. p. 185) gives the hymns of this collection "On Ignatius" at length, with a translation.

See, on the question of identity, Wright's *Catal. i. p. 336*; Payne Smith's *Catal. p. 63*.

The extracts from the Edessene *Chronicle*, and that of Dionysius, above referred to, are given by Assem. *B. O. i. pp. 407-414*. [J. Gw.]

PAULUS (29), a bishop (as must be understood from his "sacerdotium") in Egypt, whom the patriarch Theophilus, while an Origenist (*i.e.* not later than 395), deposed for his opposition to the party. Paulus found refuge at Bethlehem with Jerome, who describes the bitter sufferings his guest had undergone. He afterwards obtained reinstatement by an order from the emperor, but was yet in Palestine when the Origenist monks expelled by Theophilus (now become their opponent) arrived there in 401, and in vain sought to attach him to them (Hieron. *Apol. adv. Lib. Rufin.* lib. iii. 17, 18 in *Pat. Lat. xxiii. 469*; Tillem. xi. 459, 476, xii. 648.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (30), bishop of Emesa, one of the most deservedly respected of the prelates of the period of the Nestorian controversy, the contemporary of Cyril and John of Antioch, the peacemaker between the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch after the disastrous close of the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. On his way to Ephesus Paul visited the aged Acacius, bishop of Beroea, by whom, being prevented by his years from attending the council, he was commissioned to act as his representative (Labbe, iii. 724). He reached Ephesus together with John of Antioch and the other Oriental bishops, and joined in the act of deposition of Cyril and Memnon (*ibid.* 597) and in all the other proceedings of the Oriental party. He was one of the eight Oriental deputies despatched to the emperor with plenipotentiary powers (*ibid.* 724). The moderation he displayed in these difficult and delicate negotiations was condemned by the uncompromising Alexander of Hierapolis as proceeding from a mean desire for reconciliation at the cost of the truth (Baluz. *Concil. Nov. Collect.* 800). The subsequent proceedings have been so fully narrated in other articles that it is needless to detail them here at any length. [CYRILLUS OF ALEXANDRIA, i. 769, 770; JOANNES OF ANTIOCH, iii. 354.] Paul was a sincere lover of peace, and above all things anxious to put an end to the disputes on points of faith, the mutual violence of which was a disgrace to the church, a scandal to the faithful, and a stumbling-block to unbelievers. He was a man of vast experience in ecclesiastical

matters, an accomplished theologian, possessed of great tact and courtesy, and one who—for the unblemished holiness of his life, and his conspicuous piety, as well as for his advanced age—enjoyed the confidence and reverence of both of the contending parties. Weary of conflict and anxious to obtain peace, John of Antioch, after consultation with the aged Acacius of Beroea, despatched Paul as his ambassador to Alexandria to confer with Cyril on the terms of mutual concord, A.D. 432. The selection of one so moderate and of such high reputation, as mediator, was greatly pleasing to Cyril, who accorded a reception to Paul the friendly and pacific character of which surprised him (Labbe, iii. 1106, 1090). After appeasing Cyril's irritation at the tone of John's letter to him, Paul presented in his own name and John's a confession of faith originally drawn up by Theodoret. The formulary was accepted by Cyril as orthodox, and he in his turn exhibited a formulary of faith which Paul approved as consonant with the creed of the Orientals (*ibid.* 1090). Paul was then received into communion by Cyril, on his exhibiting a written document in which he expressed his acquiescence in the deposition of Nestorius, anathematized his writings, and recognized his successor Maximian (Cyrill. *Epp.* 32, 40, tom. ii. pp. 100–102, 152). On this, Paul was permitted by Cyril to attend the services of the church, and was invited by him to preach. The first occasion was the Sunday before Christmas Day, the second, Christmas Day itself. On the festival the chief church of the city was crowded, who when Paul, having commenced with the "Gloria in excelsis Deo" and passed on to Is. vii. 14, concluded his exordium with words decisive of the whole controversy, "Mary the mother of God brings forth Emmanuel," *τίκτει οὖν ἡ Θεοτόκος Μαρία δὲ Ἐμμανουήλ*. The test title was received with loud acclamations by the congregation, "This is the true faith; This is the gift of God," which were repeated when he proceeded to enunciate the doctrine of "the combination of two perfect natures in the one Christ," with shouts of, "Welcome orthodox bishop, the worthy to the worthy" (Labbe, iii. 1095). Paul preached a third time the following Sunday, New Year's Day, 433, with equal acceptance. Portions of all these sermons are still extant (*ibid.* 1091, 1095, 1097). Referring for the details to the articles already mentioned, it is sufficient to state here, that to quicken John's delay in accepting the terms of peace proposed by Cyril, Paul accompanied Aristolaus and a deputation of two of Cyril's clergy to Antioch, to lay before John for his signature a document recognising Nestorius's deposition and the anathematizing of his teaching. This, eventually, was signed by John, and brought back with great joy, by Paul, to Alexandria in the following April (*ibid.* 1091). The happy reunion of the long divided parties was published by Cyril, in the chief church of Alexandria, Ap. 23, 433. Cyril acknowledged the receipt of John's formulary in a well-known letter—conveyed to him by the aged and successful peacemaker—commencing with the words of Ps. xvi. 11: "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad," "*Laetentur caeli*," &c., by which it was subsequently known (*ibid.* 1106. Baluz. 786).

The period of Paul's death is uncertain. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xiv. (index); Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 419; Coteler. *Mon. Eccl. Graec.* i. 48; Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* ii. 240; Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. 1433; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, Clark's Trans. iii. 127–137.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (31), bishop of Ephesus, in succession probably to Stephen when deposed in the synod of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. He was at some date afterwards ejected. But Timotheus Aelurus, patriarch of Antioch, returning to his see from exile in 476 under the protection of Basiliscus, called at Ephesus, and there held a Eutychian synod at which Paul was reinstated. On that occasion the *jus patriarchicum* was restored to Ephesus, giving Paul the title of archbishop (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 5, 6; Baron. *A. E.* ann. 476, xl, xiv; Pagi, ann. 476, xv, xviii). Valesius, in his note on Evagrius, explains the *jus patriarchicum* here spoken of as the right of consecrating metropolitans, a right which the synod of Chalcedon in its sixteenth action (Hard. ii. 628) took away from the Asian diocese and bestowed on Constantinople. On the original patriarchate of Ephesus see the *Canones Arabici* (xxxvii, xxxviii) of the Council of Nicaea (Hard. i. 484) and Wiltsch's *Handbook* (i. 162). After Zeno had, in 477, displaced Basiliscus pope Simplicius wrote to him (Oct. 8, 477) to press that certain bishops whom Basiliscus and Aelurus had supported, Paul of Ephesus among them, might be condemned by a synod at Constantinople (Pagi, 477, xiii; Jaffé, *R. P.* 344). The synod was held, as Valesius shows, in 478; and we find from a letter of Simplicius in 478, the patriarch Acacius (Pagi, 477, xiv; Jaffé, 345), as also from a statement of Evagrius (iii 8), which Baronius (477, xi) quotes, that Paul had been then expelled (Tillem. xvi. 294, 299, 300, 305). [C. H.]

PAULUS (32), bishop of Epiphania in Cilicia, deposed and banished by Justin in 518, at the same time as Philoxenus and Peter of Apamea, for Monophysitism. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 893.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (33), a bishop of Erythrum in the Libyan Pentapolis, mentioned in the Paschal letter of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, in 402, as successor to Sabbatius. (Jerome, *Ep.* xcvi. 26, ed. Vall.) Palladius, describing him as a "wretched young bishop," relates that he was sent with Dioscorus, by Theophilus, to summon Chrysostom to the Council of the Oak (Pallad. p. 70; Theoph. Alex. *Ep.* 1, p. 94). He was again deputed by Theophilus (*ibid.* 75, 76), with his former companions, and a third unnamed bishop, to produce the canons of Antioch, forbidding the return of a bishop after deposition (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 618).

[E. V. and W. H. F.]

PAULUS, of Gandisapor, *vid.* num. 44.

PAULUS (34), bishop of Heraclea, one of the leaders of the party opposed to Chrysostom. Tillemont gives weighty reasons against his see being Heraclea in Thrace, the metropolitanical see of Constantinople (Tillem. tom. xi. p. 597–8, *Note* lxi., tom. xv. 701). Paulus at one time enjoyed the confidence of Chrysostom, who made use of his offices to endeavour to reconcile

Antoninus of Ephesus with Eusebius of Valentinianopolis, who had accused the former of simony and other crimes at the commencement of Chrysostom's Asiatic troubles (Pallad. p. 128). When at a later stage of those troubles Chrysostom personally visited Asia, Paul was one of the three bishops who received him on his landing at Apamea and whom he took as his companions in his visitation (*ibid.* p. 134). Three years afterwards we find Paul in the ranks of the enemies of Chrysostom, and at the Council of the Oak he was the first to give his vote for his deposition (Phot. *Cod.* 59, p. 60). He also joined in the letters to pope Innocent conveyed by Paternus, charging Chrysostom with having set his church on fire (Pallad. p. 25). [E. V.]

PAULUS (35), ST. (S. POL de Léon in Brittany), born of noble parents in Cornwall, and a cousin of St. Sampson, bishop of Pol. They are said to have been fellow disciples under the charge of St. Iltutus at Laniltid in Glamorganshire. Armorica, from whence a large number of saints had emigrated in the past generation, now received help from the greater Britain. Sampson's successor in the see of Dol was St. Maglorius, who had come with him from Wales. Machutus or Maclovius, also from Wales, became bishop of Aleth (St. Malo). To the number may be added Paulus and Leonorius, the former of whom became bishop of Leon (Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 256). Sampson is said to have died in 565, and Paulus on 12th March 573, at the age of 100 (*Acta Sanctorum*, 12th March, ii. 108-120). The MSS. of the life of St. Paulus, written by a monk of Fleury, are enumerated in Hardy's *Catalogue of Materials*, i. 157-158. Usher 290 quotes from Aymoyn that Paulus lived as a hermit "on the isle of Osa, which is separated in a direct passage from the continent of Armorica, called Cornu Galliae, by a sea of sixteen paces." Whitaker (*Cathedral of Cornwall*, i. 15) would identify Osa with the island of Saintes, a little south of the opening into Brest harbour, and "Cornouailles" (Cornu Galliae) is the peninsular projection of the coast south of Brest. The parish of Paul in Mount's Bay in Cornwall is probably named from him and not from St. Paulinus of York, but the names were early confused. Bishop Grandisson dedicated the church to St. Paulinus in 1336, and the parish feast of Paul is now on the nearest Sunday to Oct. 10, which is St. Paulinus' day. The day of St. Pol de Léon was March 12. There was always a close connection with the opposite coast, and this is even shown in the names of the parishes. Mont St. Michel on the opposite side of the bay to Pol de Léon is in the parish of St. Hilaire, and St. Michael's Mount in Cornwall (on the opposite side of the bay to the parish of Paul) is in the parish of St. Hilary. [C. W. B.]

PAULUS (36), bishop of Merida, known only by *De Vita et Miraculis Patrum Emeritensium*, c. 4, 5, attributed to Paulus Diaconus (in *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 345), is placed by Florez between A.D. 530 and 560. According to the above-mentioned work he was a Greek, and a physician by profession. He came from the East to Merida, and after living there many years, he was chosen bishop. Thereupon all the troubles from which

the church had suffered vanished. A long story is told of his curing the wife of a rich nobleman, who gave him in return the whole of his property, reserving only the life interest in a moiety during his wife's life and his own. For the adoption of his nephew and successor FIDELIS (6) see that article. After resigning his bishopric in his old age, he lived for some time a devotional life in a cell by the basilica of St. Eulalia (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 170; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. 1, 421. [F. D.]

PAULUS (37), Mar. 22, bishop of Narbonne, one of the seven bishops said by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i. c. 28, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 175) to have been ordained and sent from Rome to preach in Gaul in the reign of Decius c. A.D. 250 [MARTIALIS (1)] (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 6; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, i. pt. 304-6, ii. 689-690; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 442, 443, 469, 724). His acts (Boll. A. SS. Mart. iii. 369 sq.), which are very fabulous, assert that he was at Bourges before going to Narbonne. The Martyrologies say that the first bishop of Narbonne was Sergius Paulus, the proconsul whom St. Paul converted. [J. G.]

PAULUS (38), bishop of Neocaesarea, a military station on the banks of the Euphrates, and confessor, who in the persecution under Licinius had been deprived of the use of his hands by the application of red-hot iron to the muscles of the fingers (*Theod. H. E.* i. 7). He attended the Council of Nicaea in 325 (*ibid.*; Labbe, ii. 51). His name also appears among those present at the Council of Antioch in 341 (Labbe, ii. 560). [E. V.]

PAULUS (39), bishop of Nepi, sent by Gregory the Great at the end of A.D. 591, to administer the see of Naples, vacant by the deposition of Demetrius. Paulus found his post a troublesome one, and was anxious to return, which was at first refused by Gregory. At last, after some gross outrage had been perpetrated upon him, Gregory in May 593, allowed him to return to Nepi, ordered him to be paid a hundred solidi, and permitted him to choose one orphan boy as his servant. Paulus' name appears among the signatures to the decrees of the Council of Rome in A.D. 595 (*Epp.* ii. 9, 10, 15, 26; iii. 1, 2, 35; *Appendix ad Epp.* 5). [F. D.]

PAULUS (40), of NISIBIS, Nestorian metropolitan of Nisibis in the middle of the sixth century. In the article JUNILIUS it has been stated that that writer acknowledges, that the work by which he is known to us is translated from a work by a certain Paul whom he had met with, "A Persian by nation, who had been instructed in the school of the Syrians, in the city of Nisibis." Kihn, in his work *Theodor von Mopsuestia*, cited in the article just mentioned, has carefully discussed the few notices that can be found concerning this Paulus, and has arrived at the following results.

There are but two Pauls whose claims to have been the instructor of Junilius deserve to be taken into consideration. The first, known as Paul the Persian, was the author of a treatise on the Aristotelic Logic. The knowledge of his history is exclusively derived from a notice in the chronicle of Barhebraeus (Assemani *Bibl. Or.* III. i. 439). "At this time (viz. about

A.D. 570) Paul the Persian became celebrated for his knowledge, both of ecclesiastical science and of heathen philosophy; from whom we possess an admirable introduction to Logic. He wished to become metropolitan of Persis; but when the people would not agree, he made common cause with the Magians, and went over to them." This treatise on Logic has been recovered, being found in one of the Nitrian MSS. brought to the British Museum. It contains a dedication to king Chosroes I. (A.D. 531-581), which was translated into French and commented on by Renan (*Journal Asiatique*, ser. iv. vol. xix. 310, 1852). The whole compendium has been published with a Latin translation and notes by Land (*Anecdota Syriaca*, iv.). The MS. gives the birthplace of this Paul, and though the name has been disfigured by transcribers' errors, Kihn has no hesitation in identifying it with Ardeschir, the seat of the metropolitan of the province of Persis, the dignity to which we are told this Paul had aspired. He would have received his instruction in Greek philosophy at Nisibis. A little before the end of the fifth century, orthodox zeal had closed, on account of its Nestorianism, the celebrated school of Edessa, and banished the professors. On political grounds, the expelled Nestorians naturally found a welcome in the Persian dominions, and the theological school of Nisibis rose on the ruins of that of Edessa.

Against the identification of this Paul the Persian with the instructor of Junilius the date is a serious objection. We have every reason to think that the work of Junilius was published about 550, if not earlier; and we should expect his instructor to have gained celebrity some time before that. But, as has been already mentioned, 570 is given by Barhebraeus as the time when Paul the Persian flourished. But there is another Paul, whom Assemani (III. ii. 92) had already identified with the Junilian Paul. This Paul, the subject of the present article, was born at Bassora, a commercial town a little below the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates. He was instructed at Nisibis by Mar Abas,* and on the elevation of the latter to the Nestorian patriarchate about 535, Paul succeeded to the presidency of the school. We find Paul in 553 taking part as bishop of Nisibis in a Nestorian Council held by Joseph, who, in 552, had succeeded Mar Abas as patriarch. Of the bishops who joined with Joseph in that council, Paul's is the only name thought worthy of being recorded; and we are told that on that occasion the see of Nisibis was elevated to the second place after Seleucia. Paul was known as a writer, and Ebed Jesu, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, names Paul of Nisibis as the author of a commentary on scripture, of a disputation with Caesar, and of various epistles. The "Commentary on Scripture" may be identified with the work translated by Junilius, and light is thrown on what is meant by the "disputation with Caesar" by an independent statement by the Egyptian priest Abulbacatus, in his book *Declaratio officiorum*, &c., that Paul, the metropolitan of Nisibis, had written a letter containing an account of a theological discussion

* Concerning this Nestorian patriarch see the article THOMAS OF EDESSA.

on the principles of the faith, held by him with the Emperor Justinian, who had summoned him to an interview. This agrees well with the well-known fondness of this emperor for theological discussions. The time might possibly have been 533, when we know that Mar Abas, who might have been accompanied by Paul, was summoned to Constantinople; but it is much more probable that Paul's discussion with the emperor took place on a later visit. Kihn conjectures the date to have been 543. On this visit to Constantinople he would naturally meet Junilius, who held high office at the Court, and who took much interest in theology. The authorities for the foregoing statements will be found in Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* II. 412, 458: III. 87, 435, 632; ii. 928).

The facts which have been stated agree so well with the hypothesis, that Paul of Nisibis was the Junilian Paul that it only remains to notice a conjecture thrown out by Nestle (*Theol. Literaturzeit.* 1876, p. 668) that Paul of Nisibis, and Paul the Persian, may have been the same person. But for the identification there is only the common name Paul (on which much cannot be built, the name being a usual one), and the fact that the Junilian Paul exhibits familiarity with logic; but this was a common accomplishment with those educated in the school of Nisibis. Against the identification is the twenty years difference of date already mentioned, the fact that no theological writing is ascribed to Paul the Persian, whose name does not occur in Ebed Jesu's catalogue; that the birthplace of the two was different, Paul the Persian really belonging to that nation, having been born in Ardeschir, Paul of Nisibis having been born at Bassora and only called by Junilius a Persian because residing in Persian territory; but what decisively distinguishes Paul of Nisibis from the Paul who apostatized to Parsism is the honour in which the memory of the former was preserved among the Nestorians. A commemoration of this Paul is made in a Nestorian Lectionary contained in a Syriac MS. at the British Museum (see Wright's Catalogue of Syriac MSS. I. 182-188). [G. S.]

PAULUS (41), an African bishop in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. iv. de Basilide, A.D. 254, Cyp. Ep. 67. He is possibly the same as bishop of Obba in Mauritania, 47th suffrage at Syn. vii. sub Cyp. de Bap. 3, A.D. 256. [E. W. B.]

PAULUS (42), bishop of Paracelus, one of the Palestinian bishops who attended the council summoned by Juvenal at Jerusalem, in 453, after the expulsion of the intruder Theodosius, and signed the synodic epistle addressed by Juvenal to the presbyters, abbats and monks of his diocese, contradicting the calumnious statements of Theodosius respecting the council of Chalcedon. (Labbe, iv. 889.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (43), bishop of Rome after Stephanus II. (commonly called Stephanus III.), from May A.D. 757 to June A.D. 767. He was a native of Rome, the son of one Constantine, and younger brother of his predecessor, both having been educated together in the Lateran palace under pope Gregory II., and ordained deacons together by Zacharias. It

was often the case that the archdeacons of Rome were commended by their position and influence as successors to the popedom; and in this case also, after the death of Stephen, the archdeacon Theophylact was selected by one party of the Roman people, who assembled at his house in his support; but the choice of a larger and more influential party fell upon Paul, who does not seem to have courted promotion, having remained in the Lateran, where he attended his brother during his illness. He is said to have been preferred to the archdeacon as being a stronger man (probably less advanced in years), and he was elected and ordained (probably May 29) without opposition from the other party. (*Anastas. in Vit. Pauli.*)

At the time of his accession two main subjects had lately occupied the attention of the popes:—the Iconoclastic controversy (see under GREGORIUS II. and III.), and the temporal jurisdiction of the Roman see over the exarchate of Ravenna. With respect to the first, the emperor Constantine Copronymus had in 754 assembled a council at Constantinople, which had condemned and forbidden the use of images; and cruel persecution of the monks there who would not give them up was going on during Paul's pontificate. He is said by Anastasius to have sent frequent remonstrances to the emperor, which are alluded to also by pope Hadrian in his letter on the same subject to the empress Irene and her son Constantine, and also by Paul himself in one of his letters to king Pippin (*Ep.* 20, *Cod. Carol.*);—"Nequaquam siluimus ei predicandum ob constitutionem sanctorum imaginum et fidei orthodoxae integritatem." But no such letters of his have been preserved. They were not likely to be of any avail in the then state of the relations between Rome and the Greek empire, which the Iconoclastic disputes themselves had helped to bring about.

It will be seen under GREGORIUS III., how that pope had appealed to Charles Martel for aid against the Lombards, thus taking the first step towards breaking off the old political dependence of Rome on the Eastern empire, and transferring it to the rising kingdom of the Franks. Then pope Zacharias had (A.D. 752) given the sanction of the apostolic see to Pippin's consecration as king of the Franks, and the latter had in return (A.D. 755) bestowed on Stephen II. the temporal government of the exarchate, which, at the pope's request, he had in two campaigns recovered from the Lombard king Aistulph. When Paul became pope, Aistulph was dead, having failed to give up to Stephen all the territories that he had been bound by treaty to concede; and Desiderius, who through the intervention of Pippin and the pope had been elected to succeed him, still delayed to do so. Such was the state of things: and what we principally know of the activity of Paul during his popedom is derived from his correspondence on this subject, and on that of his temporal power over the exarchate generally under the protection of Pippin. Thirty-one letters of his, bearing mainly on these questions, are preserved in the *Codex Carolinus*, so called from Charlemagne, who is said to have first collected the letters it contains. The headings and purport of these letters are given also by Baronius from a Vatican Codex (*ad ann. 767 l.*)

Immediately after his election, and before his ordination, Paul lost no time in writing to Pippin a letter expressing his devotion to him as being after God his helper and defender, and his earnest desire ever to maintain, even to the shedding of blood, the terms of peace and amity that had been established between him and the late pope (*Ep.* 13, *Cod. Carolin.*). He wrote also in similar strain to the Franks generally, thanking them warmly for their support (*Ep.* 22). Pippin replied in a similar spirit of cordiality, expressing his intention to maintain St. Peter and his successors in full and undisturbed possession of what had been granted to them.

Desiderius meanwhile was acting a double part. He not only delayed giving up the cities that had been ceded by treaty to the pope; he had also invaded the Pentapolis, and the duchies of Spoletum and Beneventum; he had imprisoned the duke and others of Spoletum, who had submitted to the pope; and had even made overtures to the Greek emperor, inviting him to send an army and fleet for recovering the exarchate, promising on certain conditions to assist him. But notwithstanding this he had gone to Rome, and in reply to the demand that he should cede at once the territories he retained had declared his earnest wish to come to friendly terms with the pope, but desired that time should be allowed him, and that the hostages who had been given to Pippin should first be restored to him.

Paul despatched two epistles successively to the king to represent the state of things, in which he recommended the rendering of the hostages as desired by Desiderius; but afterwards sent a third letter by special legates accompanied by Pippin's own emissary Robert, in which he implored the king to retain the hostages, and also to come to his aid against the Lombards. He explains in this last letter that his former ones had been written as they were for fear of their being intercepted by the Lombards, and not allowed to reach their destination if otherwise expressed. As is usual with him in all his letters, he abounds in laudation of Pippin as being, after God, the great bulwark of himself and of the church, and invokes the blessing of heaven on all his warfares. In a postscript he begs his acceptance of a sword and belt set with gems, a cloak adorned with peacocks, and three hyacinth rings, for himself and his two sons, Charles and Carloman (*Ep.* 15, *Cod. Carol.*) The main drift of most of his other letters is similar;—to court the continued favour of the king of the Franks for securing to the see of Rome the full possession and retention of the territories that had been granted to it against the unfaithfulness of the Lombard king and the Greek emperor's schemes for reconquest. By letters and embassies he kept Pippin informed of the doings and designs of both, and again and again appealed to him as the champion of God and St. Peter, complaining often of the failure of Desiderius to fulfil his promises, and in still stronger language of the machinations of those "most wicked Greeks," which he attributes to heretical pravity in the matter of image-worship. In one letter (*Ep.* 34, *Cod. Carol.*) he informs Pippin of a plan of the Greeks to attack

Ravenna, with the design (he says) of destroying and trampling on the holy orthodox faith, and the pious tradition of the fathers, and asks for an ambassador to be sent to him from France for the purpose of compelling Desiderius and the dukes of Beneventum, Spoletum, and Tuscany, to help in resisting the anticipated attack. Many mutual courtesies were, in the course of these negotiations, exchanged between the pope and Pippin. For instance, the latter had sent a table as a present to pope Stephen II., and this Paul informs the king he had himself conveyed with solemn litanies to St. Peter's shrine, had celebrated the holy mysteries upon it for the benefit of the king's soul and the stability of his kingdom, and dedicated it to remain there for ever as a witness and memorial. On another occasion Pippin had sent the pope a baptismal robe (*sabannum*) which had been used at the baptism of his daughter Gisla, and this Paul had deposited with religious ceremonies in the oratory of St. Petronilla.* (*Ep.* 27.) One Simeon had been sent into France for teaching the Franks church music, but had been recalled to Rome, to preside over the Roman song-school. Pippin's brother Remedius had been chagrined at this, and had sent some monks to Rome to complete their musical education. Thereupon Paul wrote to Pippin apologizing with regret for having been obliged to recal Simeon, expressing his earnest desire to accede in all ways to the wishes of the king and his brother, and promising that the monks should be well taken care of, and fully instructed in Simeon's song-school. (*Ep.* 43, *Cod. Carolin.*) In the year 762, Paul, at the request of Pippin, granted to him perpetually the monastery of St. Sylvester on Mount Soracte together with the three dependent ones of St. Stephen, St. Andrew, St. Victor, for the reception of strangers, the relief of the poor, and the maintenance of the monks there abiding (*Ep.* 12, *Cod. Carol.*) A further special favour accorded by Paul to France was the gift of certain relics of saints. He had been piously active in collecting the bodies of various saints and martyrs from the cemeteries about Rome, which had been profaned and ravaged by the Lombards; and he had founded on the site of his own private patrimony within the walls a monastery dedicated (A.D. 761) to St. Stephen and Sylvester for the honourable custody of these remains, which included those of the said saints. (*Pauli Ep.* xii. *ap.* Labbe.) Sigebert, in his chronicle, states that in the year 764 a bishop Grodogand was sent to Rome from Gaul to ask for some of the precious relics, and that Paul granted the bodies of the martyrs Gorgonius, Nabor, and Nazarius, which were transferred (probably in the following year) to Gaul, and deposited in three several monasteries. Baronius (*ad ann.* 764, 1.) is at pains to explain that it could have been only little bits of these bodies that were thus translated, inasmuch as the bodies themselves, whole or divided, were known to be elsewhere, that of Gorgonius especially

* The chapel, or oratory of St. Petronilla (believed to be the daughter of St. Peter) appears from Anastasius (*in vit. Pauli*) to have been constructed by Paul within the Church of St. Peter on the Vatican. In the letter referred to in the text, the pope declares it to be now dedicated in perpetual memory of king Pippin.

being in his own day preserved and venerated in the Vatican basilica. It may have been as he supposed, though the supposed preservation of the same relics in different places is not in fact so uncommon a marvel as to excite surprise. All Paul's letters to Pippin are marked by exuberant laudation of the king, and expressions of gratitude to him, showing an earnest desire to please him in all possible ways, so as to secure his continued protection, and prevent any alliance with the Greek emperor. He wrote also three letters in a similar strain to the princes Charles and Carloman, who had been anointed with their father, exhorting them to follow his example, and that of their grandfather, Charles Martel.

On the other hand the emperor Constantine Copronymus also made overtures to Pippin. Einhard and other annalists of the Franks speak of his having sent him on one occasion an organ, which was an instrument previously unknown in France: and legations appear to have been sent more than once between the two courts. One of these was from the emperor for proposing a marriage between his son Leo and Pippin's daughter Gisla. This proposal is referred to in a letter from the next pope Stephen III. (or IV.), written after Pippin's death to Charles and Carloman, which is preserved in the *Codex Carolinus*. "Constantinus Imp. nitentur persuadere sanctae memoriae mitissimo vestro genitori ad accipiendam conjugio filii sui germanam vestram, nobilissimam Gisilam." It may have been on the occasion of this embassy that a council was held by Pippin at Gentilli, a royal villa near Paris (A.D. 766 or 767), at which the emissaries of the pope and of the emperor disputed on the two questions of image worship and the procession of the Holy Ghost (Einhard *in Chron.*, *Annal. Franc. Bert. ad ann.* 767; Ado Vienn. l. 4, c. 37). It would seem that the Greeks being accused, on the pope's behalf, of heresy in the matter of images, they retorted by similarly accusing the Latins for their addition of *Filioque* to the creed, and that the king wished the arguments on both sides to be heard and considered. There is no record of the decision of the council on the disputed questions. Maimbourg concludes, but with no sufficient reason, that it was in favour of the adoration of images. It is more likely that the views already prevailed which found expression afterwards at the council of Frankfort (A.D. 794), under Charlemagne, and afterwards (A.D. 824) at that of Paris; which were to the effect that the retention of images was lawful, but not the adoration. However that might be, no breach ensued of the friendship, mutually advantageous, between the popes and the Frank kings, which was notably continued and cemented by Charlemagne. Of course any matrimonial alliance with the Greek emperor was inconsistent with this policy; and nothing came of the proposal made by Constantine. One of pope Paul's letters to king Pippin (*Ep.* 20, *Cod. Carolin.*) is supposed, with probability, to have been written on the occasion above referred to. From it we learn that legates having been sent to France from the emperor, Pippin had refused to give them an audience except in the presence of those who had been sent by Paul—that they had disputed in the king's presence on "the observance of the orthodox faith and the

pious tradition of the fathers"—and that Pippin had sent to the pope a full account of what had taken place, together with a copy of the letter which he had thereupon sent to the emperor. Paul died in June, A.D. 767, in the church of St. Paul (according to Anastasius), having been seized with sickness while lingering there during the extreme heat of summer, and was there buried. But his body was removed within three months to the oratory of the B. Virgin which he had himself constructed in St. Peter's on the Vatican, and there finally laid. He is described by Anastasius as a man mild and merciful, and rendering no one evil for evil, as having been in the habit of visiting prisons and the abodes of the poor in the silence of night, redeeming debtors, and relieving the distressed. He is commemorated as a saint in the Roman Martyrology on the 28th of June. [J. B.—Y.]

PAULUS (44), a Nestorian, is first mentioned as one of those who at the death of Silas the catholicus joined in opposing both the claimants who thus competed for the succession. At the termination of the schism which ensued, he was chosen catholicus (535 or 538). He had been Archdeacon of Seleucia under Silas, but is stated to have been raised to the episcopate in the interval as bishop of the Huzites (= Ahwaz), or (according to another account) metropolitan of Gandisapor. It is uncertain whether we are to understand that these are but two different descriptions of one and the same preferment, the designations of the sees being imperfectly fixed at the time (see *Assem.* iv. 421); or that Paulus was first made bishop of the suffragan see when vacated by Jozachus, and afterwards promoted to the metropolitan rank as successor to Jacob. (See for these persons and circumstances, SILAS, Catholicus.) Such translations, though uncanonical, appear to have been permitted in the Nestorian Church (ib. 638): and in the exceptional case of Seleucia, the elevation of an inferior prelate to the throne of the catholicate was usual. This Paulus, like his predecessors, was married, and had children; and his daughter's husband, Ezekiel, became catholicus in 567. He died within the year of his final promotion, which (according to some authorities) he enjoyed for but two months; and was succeeded by Mar Abas (see under THOMAS OF EDESSA. (Greg. Barh., *Chron. Eccl.* ii. 89; *Assem.* ii. 409, 410; iii. 615; iv. 746, 758.) Le Quien (*O. C.* ii. 1116) confuses Paulus with his successor, Mar Abas. [J. Gw.]

PAULUS (45), bishop of Sidon, after the Arabian invasion. He had previously been a monk at Antioch, and is mentioned by Abraham Ecchellensis, *De Origine Nominis Papae*, as the author of many books of no contemptible learning, especially a defence of the Christian religion, written in Arabic at the request of a Mohammedan friend (see No. 3), which is stated to exist among the MSS. of the Vatican, and those of the Oratoire at Paris. Assemani gives the following list of his works, all still in MS. (1) *Epitome Theologiae*, in twenty-two chapters; (2) *de Adventu Messiae ad Judaeos*; (3) *Epistola ad quemdam Mahometanensem quid Christiani sentiant de Mahometo et de Christianae Religionis veritate*, (4) *de Haeresibus pro fide Melchitarum adversus*

Nestorianos, &c. (5) *De Trinitate et Incarnatione ad Abuscurum Taniotam* (*Asseman. Bibl. Orient.* tom. ii. 511). He is to be identified with the "Saidensis Episcopus" surnamed "Anthaki," i.e. the Antiochene, mentioned by D'Herbelot *Bibl. Orientale*, as defending Christianity against the Mussulmans. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 813.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (46), bishop of Sinnara in Africa, of eminent virtue, whose vision premonitory of Hunneric's persecution in 484 is recorded by Victor Vitensis. He seemed to behold a magnificent tree reaching to heaven and shading nearly all Africa brought to the ground by the violence of an ass. He was one of three bishops left out of one hundred and sixty-four belonging to Zeugitana and the Proconsular when Victor was writing, c. 487. (*Vict. Vit.* i. 9, ii. 6, in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 193, 208; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 282; Tillem. xvi. 527, 546.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (47), a Spanish bishop, always mentioned in connection with Eutropius, but neither of him nor of Eutropius are the sees known. They joined in a warning treatise (*commonitorium*) against heresies in general, about 414, which has not survived, but which appears to have been presented to Augustine, and to which he replied in his book addressed to them, entitled *de Perfectione Justitiae Hominis*, a treatise on Pelagian doctrine. (*Aug. Opp.* tit. x. 292, ed. Migne.) Their treatise is mentioned by Orosius in his *commonitorium* or *consultatio*, and the work of Augustine, as being addressed to them, by Prosper of Aquitaine. (*Aug. Opp.* lviii. 666; Prosper, *c. Coll.* xxi. 3.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (48) TELLENSIS, Jacobite bishop of Tella in Mesopotamia. He is mentioned as the translator of the Septuagint into Syriac, by Gregory Barhebraeus in a well-known passage (*Prooem. in Horr. Mystt.*); and the same statement is found in a much earlier author, Moses Barcephas* (d. 903) apparently on the authority of Jacob of Edessa (d. 708). A MS. *Catena Patrum*, in the British Museum, containing extracts from several books of the Old Testament in the version known as Syro-Hexaplar (see above, vol. iii. p. 31), names "the reverend Father Mar Paulus, Bishop of the Faithful" as the author of that version, thus identifying it with that indicated by the writers above referred to; and further assigns Alexandria as the place where it was made, and A. Gr. 928 (= A.D. 616-7) as its date,—the *Catena* itself being almost contemporary, having been compiled before 651 (Wright, *Catal. of Add. MSS.*, p. 905, no. 12168; the MS. itself seems to be of 8th century). Another MS., in the National Library, Paris (no. v., *Catal. of 1739*), of 4th Kings in the same version, has a subscription, naming and describing Paul in the same terms, with the date A. Gr. 928; and adding other important circumstances, of which the first is, that the work was done "by the command of the holy Mar Athanasius Patriarch of the Faithful." The date distinguishes this Paul from PAUL OF CALLINICUS, and PAUL OF EDESSA, with one or other of whom J. S. Assemani conjectured that

* *Comm. in Hexaëmeron*, cited by the Abbé Martin, (*Introd. à la Critique du N. T.*, tom. i. p. 101), from MS. 241, Nat. Libr., Paris.

he might be identical (*Bibl. Or.*, i. p. 409); and it farther determines that the Patriarch named is Athanasius I. (Camelarius) of Antioch, who presided over the Jacobite Churches of that patriarchate 595-631^b (*Greg. Barh. Chron. Eccl.* i. 50), and who in 616 and for some years previous must have been a fugitive, Syria being overrun by the Persians (*Greg. Barh. Chron. Syr.*, p. 98; *Theophan., Chronogr.*, p. 250). This Athanasius, with five of his bishops, went to Egypt to visit the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Anastasius Apozygatus, in response to his overtures towards a reconciliation of their Churches [see COPTIC CHURCH, in Vol. I. p. 667] between which, under their predecessors Peter and Damian, a breach had occurred. This visit is dated by Gregory Barhebraeus (*Chr. Eccl.*, l. 1.) 615-6, but must have taken place two or three years earlier; for Anastasius died, according to Severus of Ashmunin, in December 613.^c Of the Bishops who accompanied Athanasius, it may safely be assumed that Paul was one. Another perhaps was THOMAS OF HARKEL. He is apparently the "Mar Thomas" mentioned in the subsequent part of the subscription to 4th Kings, as chief of those who "gave their labour and care" with Paul in his work. Dr. Ceriani questions this identification, but on grounds which seem hardly sufficient (*Monum. S. & P.*, I. i. p. v.) Thomas of Harkel is known to have completed his cognate version of the New Testament into Syriac, A. Gr. 927—the year before that mentioned in this subscription: indeed, the subscription of another Syro-Hexaplar MS., containing 3rd Kings, now in the British Museum (Add. MS. 14437b), assigns the completion of that book to this very year 927. This latter subscription moreover brings the two translators together in place, as well as in time; for it tells us that 3rd Kings was "translated at the Enaton^d [انطون] or "Anton" of Alexandria, in the monastery of the Antonines,"—the same house which similar subscriptions appended to the Harklensian New Testament name as the scene of the literary labours of Thomas. This version of the New Testament is in fact one in

^b Dionysius in *Chron.* (ap. *Assem.* ii. pp. 102, 103) dates him 604-644.

^c *Assem.* ii. p. 332, also p. 70; Renaudot, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 152. He says: "22 Kobiac, anno 330 Diocletian," but wrongly makes it Dec. 614, forgetting that the era of Diocletian is reckoned from 29th August. Le Quien (*Or. Chr.* ii. p. 444) says "circa annum 614." See for the life of this patriarch, note k, p. 268, below.

^d Evidently the name of a ward of the city: probably the *ενατων* ("Ninth") ward, in which the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Severus, found refuge nearly a century before (Leont. *De Sectis*, Act. 5, p. 470). That the word is a numeral is proved by the mention of the "Eighteenth" in another account of Severus (*Anast. Sin., Hodeg.*, Schol. in c. 22, p. 152). Cp. *Liberat., Breviar.* c. 19. Both "Ninth" and "Eighteenth" are spoken of repeatedly as the abodes of monks by Joann. Moschus (*Prat. Spirit.* 146, 162, 176, 177, 184), from whom it appears that the "Eighteenth" extended 20 (? 15) miles outside the city proper. See also like instances from the *Apophthegm. Pp.* in Coteller's *Monum. Eccl. Gr.* i. pp. 460, 520; and cp. p. 809. See also Wright, *Catal.* pp. 34, 586, 641. Some have understood "Ninth [Milestone]." The name has been usually written *Anton*, as if derived from that of the convent. For other explanations see *Assem.* i. p. 41 n.; and Cave, *Hist. Litt.* p. 499 (ed. 1740).

style and method with the Syro-Hexaplar Old Testament: together they form a retranslated, and Graecised Syriac Bible.^e The manner in which Gregory Barhebraeus (*l. c.*) mentions them together indicates that he regarded them as one work. The time, place, and circumstances, show that a desire for assimilation between the newly reconciled Syrians and Egyptian branches of the Monophysite Communion, was the common motive of Paul and Thomas in executing (as of Athanasius in enjoining), the laborious task of producing such a version,—if not to supersede, yet to take co-ordinate place beside the Peshitto.

Athanasius was received by Anastasius "in a monastery by the Eastern seashore" (his host being excluded from his metropolis); spent with him but one month, and "afterwards returned to his own city": according to the narrative of Severus (Renaud. *ut supr.*) But the subscription to 4th Kings represents Athanasius and Paul as still "dwelling in Alexandria" in A. Gr. 928, (A.D. 616-7); which implies a sojourn of some three years. It thus appears that Paul may have entered on his task as early as 613 and the extant MSS. enable us to trace his progress. The date of 3rd Kings in the MS. already referred to is "Shebat, A. Gr. 927" (February 616). No month is specified in the case of 4th Kings; its year, A. Gr. 928, allows us to assign it to the autumn of 616: but in the great Milan Syro-Hexapla (see below), the Minor Prophets and Daniel alike bear date "Canun the latter, A. Gr. 928 (January 617)."^f Ezekiel and Isaiah (which as arranged in this MS. follow Daniel and close the book) are undated. But he must have completed them within that year, if Gregory Barhebraeus is right in assigning it as the date of the sack of Alexandria by the Persians (*Chron. Syr.*, p. 99). Others (as Le Quien, ii. p. 450) date this event in 619 or 620, which would give Paul longer time. The work of translation could not possibly have been carried on in the face of this calamity, in which 600 monasteries in Alexandria and its neighbourhood were destroyed, and 700 monks with 80,000 citizens fell victims to the savage captors (Renaudot, p. 154, from Severus);—a havoc which might seem incredible, if it were not paralleled by the well attested account of their butcheries in Palestine, after the capture of Jerusalem a few years before (Antioch. Monach. *Ad Eustath.* p. 1022; *Hom.* 107, p. 1266). We may assume that this undertaking, if broken off at Alexandria, could not have been completed elsewhere. All the evidence concurs in fixing on that city as the scene of his labours; and there alone were to be found the necessary Greek MSS. of the Hexaplar LXX. Thus the years 613 and 617 (or possibly 620) define the limits of the time within which the version must have been executed, a space of

^e (Cp. Adler, *N. T. Verss. Syr.*, p. 50.) Björnstähl, writing of the Milan Syro-Hexaplar MS. before the name of Paul had been learned from that of Paris, acutely conjectured that Thomas of Harkel was the translator of the Old Testament as well as of the New. (See in Eichhorn's *Repert.* iii. p. 172.)

^f The dates given by these subscriptions, themselves written in the 8th century, may be relied on; and prove that Theophanes (l. l.) is wrong in dating the capture of Alexandria A.M. 6107 (= A.D. 615); as also Severus Ashm. (ap. Ren.) Gibbon follows these (*Decl. and F.* c. xlv.). also Lebeau (*Hist. du Bas Emp.* t. xi. p. 13).

four, or at the utmost seven years:—at most, not more than sufficient for so great a work.

Concerning his previous or subsequent life, we have no information. Gregory Barh. (*Chron. Eccl.* i. 50) mentions that, in the time of Athanasius, Isaiah was intruded into Edessa, Samuel into Amid, and a third into Tella, by Chosroes II., the Persian king; but that all three were rejected as having been irregularly consecrated by the Maphrian of the East. Assemani (ii. 334, and *De Monoph.*, s. v. *Tella*) dates this occurrence, as regards Tella, A.D. 616. But this date can hardly be correct. If it were, the intruder must have been a usurper as well; for the see of Tella was full in that year, Paul (as we have seen) being then Bishop; and thus a still graver defect would attach to the title of his rival, which Gregory Barh. could not well have omitted to notice. Besides, the expatriated Athanasius cannot have had in 616, nor is it probable that he ever recovered, such control over the Mesopotamian churches as Gregory here ascribes to him. The true date is probably 10 or 12 years earlier, when Chosroes II. (Phocas being Emperor) first attacked the eastern cities of the empire, about 603 (Dionys. ap. Assem. ii. p. 102; Theoph., pp. 245 ff.). In that year Edessa was taken, and its Bishop stoned to death; and the consequent intrusion of Isaiah is assigned by Assemani (*De Monoph.*, s. v. *Edessa*) to 604. It is natural to suppose that the intrusion of the bishop, whom Assemani names Jonas, into Tella, took place under like circumstances, and about the same time as Gregory implies. Paul may well have been appointed by Athanasius in the room of Jonas; and we thus arrive at 604 as the earliest probable date of his consecration.⁵ Like Athanasius, he must have been driven from his see when the Persians overran the country. It is to be noted that in MS. subscriptions Paul is not described by the name of his see, but only as "Bishop of the Faithful"; likewise Athanasius (in the Paris MS.) is "Patriarch of the Faithful, in the convent of Mar Zachai of Callinicus."⁶ The latter words no doubt mean that Athanasius had fixed his seat, perhaps from the first, in that city and convent, as two of his successors are said to have done, Dionysius I. in 818 and John III. in 846 (Assem. ii., *De Monoph.* s.v. *Monast. S. Zachae.*). So another of them, Cyriacus (798), is described as "Patriarch of the convent of Astuna (= the Column) of Callinicus" (Wright, *Catal.*, p. 418). It is not likely that either prelate was ever able to re-establish himself in his

⁵ The maphrian Kamjesu (578-609) is recorded by Greg. Barh. (*Chr. Eccl.* ii. 25) to have "consecrated many bishops in divers places." His date shows that he was the consecrator of Isaiah for Edessa. But Gregory conveys that the same Maphrian consecrated all the three. It follows therefore that 609 is the latest admissible date for Jonas's consecration, and it was probably much earlier.

⁶ The following words of the subscription, "In the days of Theodore, head of the convent," appear merely to date the version with reference to the succession in that convent; but it is possible that they rather give us the name of the head of the house in Alexandria where Paul was lodged. A Theodore is one of the visitors of the convent of the Antonines of Alexandria, addressed in a letter by Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, who died 591 (Wright, *Catal.* p. 952).

see. As to Athanasius, we know that the rest of his life was spent in vain efforts to recover his position. So he is shown to us in the hostile declamation of Antiochus (*Hom.* 130, p. 1244) written while Palestine was beginning to recover from the Persian invasion, as "the forerunner of Antichrist by name Athanasius, but more justly Undying Death (*Θάνατον ἀθάνατον*), desiring to occupy the throne of Antioch." And so late as 629-30, close on the end of his life, we find him still seeking restoration in a remarkable interview with the Emperor Heraclius, who (according to Theoph., *Chron.*, p. 274) offered "to make him Patriarch" (no successor having been appointed to the orthodox Patriarch Anastasius II., who died 607), if he would acknowledge the decrees of Chalcedon. Athanasius consented to admit the Two Natures of Christ; but "with a Syrian's cunning" raised the question of the *Two-fold Operation or Will*, whence arose the Monothelite controversy [*PERSON OF CHRIST*, p. 320]. The account of this interview, however, given by Gregory (*Chr. Eccl.* l. 1.) is very different. And the death of Athanasius the year after prevented the carrying out of this compact, if compact there was. Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in his Synodical Letter (*Patrol. Gr.* lxxxvii. p. 3193) written soon after, pursues him and his brother of Alexandria, with the vigorous but untranslatable denunciation; "Be Athanasius the Syrian and Anastasius Apozygarius, Anathema and Catathema, they and all who have entered ignorantly and ἀσυμβάτως into their ἀσύμβατον σύμβασιον."⁷

Grave as was the doctrinal error of the

⁷ Of the early history of this prelate we learn from Gregory Barh. (*Chron. Eccl.* i. 50) that he was a monk of Kennesrin (or of Samosata). As he was driving the camels (whence his appellation) of the convent with a supply of salt, he was stopped by the assembled bishops, in consequence of a vision sent in answer to their prayers, and was chosen by them Patriarch in succession to Julian (595 or 597), and forthwith consecrated, in spite of his struggles and tears, at Kennesrin. He prevailed on them however to conceal the fact and suffer him to remain a monk for a year. At the end of that time the bishop proceeded to his convent, where they found him as before occupied with the camels, and summoned him to enter on his high office, to the amazement of the fraternity, from whom (even from his own brother who was one of them) he had concealed his elevation. As a crowning instance of his humility, it is related that he used to go secretly by night, clean out the latrine to which the brethren resorted, carry away the filth in a basket, and empty it into the Euphrates. Of his moderation and wisdom he gave proof afterwards, in a form more satisfactory to our notions, by his success in winning back the bishops "of the East" (i.e. of the regions beyond the boundary of the empire) into communion with the patriarchate, through the mission (629) of his deacon John of Beth-elala to the monastery of Mar Mathai (Nineveh);—and again by his scrupulous fidelity to the Nicene decrees when he declined the request, preferred on behalf of these bishops by Christopher, Metropolitan of Mar Mathai, and four others, that he should consecrate bishops for the vacant sees of the East, and urged them instead to consecrate for themselves a Maphrian. They accordingly chose Maruthas, and consecrated him as Maphrian of the East and Chief Metropolitan, with Tagrit for his see. Thus Athanasius shows himself in this matter as rigid in respecting the rights of the Maphrianate, as formerly (see above) in re-istig the encroachment of a former Maphrian on those of the Patriarchate.

Monophysites, it is impossible for us now to sympathise with these bitter utterances of theologic hatred against the men who live for us mainly in the scholarly and laborious works they have left behind. Theology and biblical literature owe a deep debt to the Jacobites for their zeal in translating from the Greek; but to none of them so much as to Paul of Tella. His few years of shelter in the Alexandrian monastery were but a brief breathing time between the invasion that drove him from Syria and the invasion that well-nigh overtook him in Egypt; and one cannot too much admire the diligence of the refugee Bishop who employed his enforced leisure in seeking out the best MSS. of the Greek Old Testament in the libraries of his city of refuge, and rendering their contents with conscientious accuracy into his native tongue. A few years later such a work would have been no longer possible, when all that the Persian had spared in Alexandria perished in the more sweeping and utter ruin brought by the Saracens (640). His version, as well as the Harklensian N. T., though little suited for public use by reason of its Graecised and artificial diction (contrasting unfavourably with the idiomatic or "simple" Peshitto), appears to have been welcomed by the Jacobites in Syria, and even read in their churches; as is proved by the extant MSS. of portions of it, some of the 7th and more of the 8th century, many of them arranged for ecclesiastical lessons after the Jacobite use,—as well as by several Lectionaries of the same (from 8th to 10th century) in which Hexaplar Lessons are mixed with Lessons from the Peshitto (Wright, *Catal.* pp. 146 ff.). In one (Add. MSS. 12139, *ib.* p. 154), which is mainly from the Peshitto, the few Hexaplar Lessons from the O. T., and the equally few Harklensian Lessons from the N. T., are paired together. In these Lectionaries, the Hexaplar portions are often superscribed "according to the Seventy." Gregory Barh. frequently cites the version he ascribes to Paul, in *Horreum Mystt.*, usually as "the Greek;" and his citations are found to agree accurately with the text found in the existing Syro-Hexaplar MSS., thus confirming the identification of that text as Paul's.

The first European scholar who called attention to this version was Andreas Masius, who in his edition of the Greek text of Joshua, published some 300 years ago, used a MS. of the O. T. in Syriac bearing a subscription to the effect that its contents were "translated in Alexandria A. Gr. 927, from a copy made by Eusebius with the help of Pamphilus from Origen's books in the library of Caesarea" (*Josuae Historia*, Antw. 1574; pp. 6, 123). He possibly obtained it, as he obtained his copy of the *Paradise of Moses* bar-Cephas, from his Syrian teacher, Moses of Marden (see his *De Paradiso*, p. 3, and cp. p. 9), but it has not been forthcoming since his death. He describes it as containing "Joshua, Judges, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Esther, Judith, and part of Tobit, also part of Deuteronomy." It must therefore have been a copy, mutilated at the beginning and end, which, when perfect, contained all the historical books of the O. T.; no doubt including Ruth with Judges, Nehemiah (and probably 3 (1) Esdras) with Ezra, and perhaps also Maccabees at the close. Thus it was the exact complement of the

MS. already referred to (which may even be the second volume of the same Syro-Greek O. T.), still happily extant at Milan in the Ambrosian Library (C. 313, *inf.*), where it was placed early in the 17th century by Cardinal Borromeo (having been "purchased from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara, at Scete," in the Nitrian desert); containing all the poetical and prophetic books, apocryphal included. The two subscriptions which give the date of its text agreeing with that given in the MS. of Masius, have been already noticed: it contains many others which claim as that MS. does, and sometimes almost in the same words, the great names of Eusebius, Pamphilus, and Origen as its authorities.* Of late years, the loss of the Masian MS. has been in some measure compensated by the recovery (in various degrees of completeness) of several portions of the historical books of the Syro-Hexaplar O. T. (including some which that MS. lacked), among the MS. acquired for the British Museum in 1841-51, from the same Nitrian collection; namely, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges with Ruth, 3 Kings,—with two copies of the Psalms, and sundry fragments of other books. Thus the only canonical book of this version not extant or known to have been extant in European libraries, is Leviticus; and of it a fragment is forthcoming in the Lectionary above referred to (Add. MS. 12139). From other Lectionaries, especially 14485, 14486, other parts of books now lost may be recovered. In the Catena, 12168,¹ already noticed, considerable fragments of 1 and 2 Chron., and of Nehemiah, are preserved. It also contains large extracts from 3 (1) Esdras, which on examination prove, what the internal evidence of diction^m had previously suggested as probable, that the 3 (1) Esdras, found in late MSS. and first printed in Walton's Polyglott (headed "according to the LXX.;" this book never having been included in the Peshitto), is of Paul's version. Dr. Ceriani has shown (*Le Verss. Sir.* p. 22), by comparison with citations in the *Syrorum Peculium* of Masius, that the early chapters of Tobit in this Polyglott are likewise due to Paul. So also is the apocryphal Psalm 151.

None of the extant MSS. of this version is later than the 8th century. That of Exodus is dated A. Gr. 1008 (A.D. 697), that of 3 Kings six years later; Judges belongs to the same set with the latter, as does also 4 Kings (Paris); and that of Genesis appears to be oldest of them all;—all being written within 100 years of the date of the version. Many of these last named

* There is a like note at the end of the Syro-Hex. Isaiah in the Parham (Lord de la Zouche's) Library, which is also a Nitrian copy.

¹ This MS., which appears hitherto to have attracted little notice, has been found by the writer of this article to contain the following Hexaplar extracts:—From 1 Chron., i. 1-4, 17-23, 34; ii. 1-17; iii. 1-20; vi. 1-15, 31-40; xxxiii. 15-17. From 2 Chron., xxvii. 16-21; xxix. 30-xxx. 5, 13-20; xxxii. 30-xxxiii. 16; xxxvi. 20-25. From Nehemiah, i. 1-4; ii. 1-8; iv. 7-9, 15-22; vii. 15, 16; viii. 1-ix. 3. From 3 Esdr., ii. 1-16, 24, 25; iv. 38-40, 49-57; v. 47-vi. 2; vii. 6-viii. 29, 69-73; 93-ix. 10, and 46, 47.

^m *E.g.*, cp. 3 Esdr. i. 41, ii. 10, with the parallel Daniel i. 2 (Hexaplar), especially noting the unusual $\chi\theta\theta\theta$ for $\iota\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}$ (never in Pesh.); also 3 Esdr. vi. 18, viii. 18 (see Payne Smith's *Thesaur.* s.v.).

contain evidence like that of the Masian and Ambrosian MSS., that they derive through the autograph copies of Eusebius and Pamphilus from the original work of Origen in the Caesarean Library. Comparing all the extant subscriptions, we find that Judges and Ruth, Job, the Twelve Prophets, and Daniel are from the Tetrapla; from the Hexapla, Exodus ("colated with the Samaritan"), Joshua ("colated with Tetrapla"), 3 Kings, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (apparently), Canticles, Jeremiah and Baruch (apparently), and Lamentations; 4 Kings alone refers to two Heptaplar MSS. Of the rest the subscriptions are wanting, or fail to give like information; but all the canonical books abound with the characteristic obeli and asterisks of the Origenian text, and all (except Judges) have their margins more or less thickly set with renderings from the "Three Interpreters," the "Fifth" also appearing on that of 4 Kings; while both "Fifth" and "Sixth" occur on that of the Psalms, which implies the presence in this instance of an Octaplar copy. They also are furnished with some scholia, and have Introductions prefixed in many cases, from the writings of various divines:—the whole forming an *apparatus criticus* far more complete than exists in any known Greek MS. of the LXX. Accordingly, the Syro-Hexapla has been now for a century prized as the best surviving representative of Origen's vast work, and as yielding the amplest materials towards its reconstruction;—since Branca of Milan, about 1767, first invited scholars to examine the MS. there preserved. From it, Norberg, a Swede, transcribed many books, of which he published Jeremiah and Ezekiel in 1787 (at Lund); Bugati of Milan followed (in 1788) with Daniel,^a and the Psalms (posthumously in 1820); and Middeldorpf (in 1835) with the rest of the canonical books from Norberg's transcript, together with 4 Kings from the Paris MS. Since then, the text of Judges and Ruth (from the British Museum copy) has been edited by Skat-Rördam (Copenhagen, 1861). Dr. Ceriani has undertaken to bring out the whole in his *Monumenta Sacra et Profana*; in the first series of which Baruch and Lamentations have appeared; in the second, Genesis and most of Exodus (Milan, 1861-68): while (as the 7th volume of the same) he has given an admirable reproduction in photolithography of the entire Ambrosian MS. (1874). A glance at its pages is enough to shew how large was the bulk of material accumulated by Paul's industry; but the laborious fidelity of his translation cannot be appreciated without examination of it. It reproduces its original word for word, so exactly, that by its aid the Greek can readily be restored with approximate certainty; as has actually been done by some editors in parts,—notably by Skat-Rördam for the whole of Judges and Ruth. But this accuracy has been attained

^a Special value attaches to this version of Daniel as representing not the usual Greek which is that of Theodotion, but that received by Origen as the LXX. version; else only known from the Greek Cod. Chistianus whence it was published at Rome in 1782. This MS. and the Syro-Hex. version must come from a near common archetype, for they coincide (inter alia) in the remarkable order in which they arrange the Prophets; and the subscriptions, &c., attached to Daniel agree verbatim.

by Paul at the cost of violence done to the Syriac idiom, naturally so widely distant from the Greek,—so great that one cannot but wonder how such a version could have been used as it was in public reading. Skat-Rördam doubts not unreasonably concerning some passages of it whether they could be intelligible to one who was not acquainted with the Greek. He has actually drawn up a grammar of the Syriac as remodelled by Paul after the Greek: and he justly pronounces this version to be, by reason of its servile manner of rendering, at once the worst as regards literary style and the best as regards critical value, of all existing versions. This criticism may be taken as applying in hardly less degree to the work of Thomas on the N. T. Both these men seem to have aimed at constraining their Syriac to represent the Greek, with the same painful exactness as that with which Aquila forced his Greek into conformity with Hebrew.

The unity of style throughout the translation marks it as the work of one mind; and we are therefore to understand the statement of the Paris subscription concerning assistance given in the work by Thomas and others, in a limited way, as referring to the minor matters of colating, correcting, and copying. But a note extant in two MSS., ascribing to Paul the version (as ordinarily printed) of John vii. 53—viii. 12, makes it probable that Paul assisted Thomas in his translation of the N. T. (See THOMAS HARKL.) It is a question how far Paul's work may have been executed independently of previous translators, and not (like that of Thomas) a recension of an earlier version. We have evidence that Syrian divines had not failed to notice the many discrepancies between their Peshitto O. T. and the Greek text, and that in consequence sundry translations of the Septuagint into Syriac were attempted from time to time. Notably, the Philoxenian version, on which the Harklensian N. T. is founded, included the Psalms, and apparently other O. T. books, "from the Greek;" and it appears that the Isaiah of this version was in Paul's hands, for a verse of it (ix. 5) is cited *in loc.* on the margin of the Ambrosian MS. And Paul's Isaiah bears internal evidence of having been wrought on the basis of an earlier one of which some ten chapters are extant, and which is probably the Philoxenian. But it is not known whether this version extended to the whole O. T.; and we have no reason to think that Paul used any other;—least of all that which is said to have been made by Mar Abas, a Nestorian. Further information concerning these earlier versions will be found in the article POLYCARPUS (5).

Paul also translated an Order of Baptism from the Greek of Severus (Add. MSS. 14495, 14499).

Most of the authorities for the subject of this article have been referred to above. Farther discussion of it will be found in the Introductions prefixed to the editions of the Syro-Hexaplar above mentioned, especially in Ceriani's *Monumenta*, vols. I. and II.: while the earlier essays on the Milan and Paris MSS., of P. J. Brunns, J. G. Eichhorn, and J. B. de Rossi (in Eichhorn's *Repertorium*, 1778-1782) are still worth reading. See also Field, *Prolegg. in Hexapla Orig.*

ch. vii. (appx. 2); ch. xi.; Ceriani, *Le Versione Siriache del V. T.*, Lagarde, *V. T. Fragmenta apud Syros servata*; and Plüschke, *De Psalt. Syr. Mediol. Usu*; also Nestle's article, *Syrische Bibelübersetzung*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* The editions of Gregory Barh. cited are, for the *Chron. Syr.*, that of Bruns, 1789; for the *Chron. Eccl.*, that of Abbeloos and Lamy, 1872. Many of the citations are to be found in Assemani, *B. O. ii.* [J. Gw.]

PAULUS (49), bishop of Thessalonica, deposed for Monothelitism in 649 by pope Martin [MARTINUS (3), iii. 853] (Martinus, *Epist.* 12, 13; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 40; Jaffé, *R. P. num.* 1605). [J. G.]

PAULUS (50), bishop of Tibur, was the consecrator of the anti-pope Ursinus (Marcellinus and Faustinus, *Lib. Prec.* preface in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 82). Rufinus (*H. E.* ii. 10 in *Patr. Lat.* xxi. 521) calls him "satis imperitus et agrestis." [DAMASUS.] [F. D.]

PAULUS (51), bishop of Tyre, who identified the living Arsenius at the council held at Tyre to investigate the charges against Athanasius, in 335. (Soer. *H. E.* i. 29; Athanas. *Apol.* ii. p. 783; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 805.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (52), ST., Feb. 8, bishop of Verdun, according to tradition a Belgian of high birth, who, after being liberally educated, adopted a hermit's life on the Mons Cebenna or Gebenna (afterwards Paulsberg or Bulisberg), opposite Trèves, on the other side of the Mosel. Attracted thence to the neighbouring monastery of Theolegium, Tholey) he was set over the monastery school, and is said to have become in time the second abbat. By the influence probably of one of his scholars Grimo, also called Adalgisus, a grandson of king Dagobert, he was made bishop of Verdun against his will. This diocese he found in the most necessitous condition. Even the bishop's own church at Verdun had no funds for the support of its clergy, and was dependent for curtailed services on the casual offices of itinerant priests. Grimo here came to his help by himself presenting the see with an estate, and obtaining further endowments from Dagobert. Henceforth Verdun was closely connected with Tholey, from whose abbats many of its bishops were drawn. Paulus died in 647 or 648, and was buried in the suburban church of St. Saturninus, which he had built (Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. ii. 169 seqq.; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 562, 1169; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 528).

A letter is extant from St. Desiderius of Cahors to Paulus, inviting him to be present at the dedication of a monastery church, and hoping to renew former conversations on the happiness of the life to come. Two epistles also from Paulus to Desiderius of small interest, and written in the most barbarous Latin of the period, are published with the correspondence of Desiderius (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 254, 260, 261). Their date is about 641.

The anonymous biography of Paulus to be found in the *Acta SS.* (*ibid.* 175-178) was probably written about the middle of the 11th century (*Hist. Litt.* vii. 504), certainly not before the 10th, from internal evidence.

[S. A. B.]

Presbyters.

PAULUS (53), one of four presbyters of Alexandria, banished through the machinations of the Eusebians, probably about the time of Athanasius's first exile, 336 (*Ath. Ap. c. Ar.* § 40; Tillem. viii. 64, 105). [C. H.]

PAULUS (54), a presbyter of Rome, sent to Athanasius in 352. [LUCIUS (20).] [C. H.]

PAULUS (55), a presbyter by whom Basil sent letters to Eusebius of Samosata in 378 (Basil, *Ep.* 268 [9]). [E. V.]

PAULUS (56), presbyter and archimandrite in conjunction with Acacius, asked Epiphanius to write against heresies. [ACACIUS (3).] [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (57), a presbyter and monk of Dalmatia, sent by Melania the younger, in her twentieth year (*i. e. c.* 403), to the East, with her munificent gifts in gold and silver, for the churches there, ten thousand solidi for Egypt and Thebais, fifteen thousand for Palestine, ten thousand for Antioch and its neighbourhood (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 119; Tillem. xiv. 238). [C. H.]

PAULUS (58), presbyter, perhaps of Pan- nonia, author of *De Virginitate servanda et contemptu mundi, ac vitæ institutione vel morum correctione*, addressed to a virgin of rank named Constantia. He flourished *c. A.D.* 430, but his works are lost (Gennadius, *De Vir. Illust.* c. lxxv.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 414; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 469). [J. G.]

PAULUS (59), a priest of Beneventum, A.D. 448. [EPICARPIUS.] [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (60), probably Roman priest, commissioned by Marcian the emperor, A.D. 453, privately to request pope Leo I. (*Ep.* 117 al. 88; *Pat. Lat.* liv. 1038, cap. 3) to induce the empress EUDOCIA (4), widow of Theodosius II., who was then in Palestine, to withdraw her countenance from the heretical faction there. [J. G.]

Deacons.

PAULUS (61), a deacon, who flourished at the end of the 4th century. To him Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, addressed his nineteenth discourse, in the form of a letter, expounding against the Arians the passage, "My Father is greater than I." He speaks of Paulus as "frater, carnis ac spiritus germanitate clarissimus" (*Pat. Lat.* xx. 981-2). It is inferred from this, and the general tone of the letter, that he was actually the brother of Gaudentius. [G. W. D.]

PAULUS (62), deacon in Egypt, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (*lib. i. ep.* 475), who begs him to bestow one of his superfluous tunics on Isidore's friend Simon, then visiting Egypt. [C. H.]

PAULUS (63), the deacon of Aemilius bishop of Beneventum, one of the Western deputies to Constantinople in the cause of Chrysostom (Pallad. p. 33.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (64), one of Chrysostom's deacons, who accompanied the deputation which conveyed his letters to pope Innocent in the spring of 404 (Pallad. p. 11). His faithful service exposed the deacon to the risk of persecutions, which he sought to avoid by joining the Joannite bishops Cyriacus, Demetrius, &c., who had remained at Rome, towards the end of 405, in company with John the presbyter (Chrys. *Ep.* 148). Their departure seems to have been postponed till the following year, when they were the bearers of another letter from Chrysostom to pope Innocent (Chrys. *Ep. Innocentio*, ii.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (65), a deacon of the Anastasia at Constantinople, who took refuge at Jerusalem during the Joannite troubles in 406. (Pallad. p. 196.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (66), a deacon of Constantinople, assistant to the oconomus. During the Joannite troubles in 406 he took refuge in Africa. (Pallad. p. 196; Tillem. xi. 329.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (67), a deacon, bearer of a letter from St. Augustine to count Boniface, A.D. 427. (Aug. *Ep.* 220.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (68) deacon. Gregory the Great in a letter to JOANNES (130) in A.D. 595 pardons him for having been induced to desist from accusing the deposed bishop Anastasius, and directs that he should be restored to the rights and privileges of his position and repaid the three pounds of gold and whatever else he had spent for the benefit of the church of Corinth. (*Ep.* v. 52.) [F. D.]

PAULUS (69), deacon of Merida, author, c. 610, of *De Vita Patrum Emeritensium*, his object being, he says, to give an account, from what he has heard, of the great characters and saints of his church, and to do for Merida what Gregory the Great did for the church in Italy in his *Dialogues*. The work was first printed at Madrid, A.D. 1631, and afterwards at Antwerp, in 1638, edited by Thomas Tamains de Vargas, historiographer of Philip IV. of Spain, with notes and comments. This edition has been reproduced by Migne, occupying fifty columns of his *Patrologia Latina* (lxxx. 111). What little is known of the author will be found there. He treats copiously of some of the bishops of Merida, and especially of Paulus, Fidelis, and Masona. [FIDELIS (6), MASONA.] [G. W. D.]

PAULUS (70) DIACONUS, (so called in his Homily on St. Benedict, and in the letters of Charles prefixed to the Collection of Homilies. There is no authority for calling him "Paul Warnefrid"), monk, historian, and ecclesiastical writer.

Authorities.—Almost the only sources for his life are his own writings, and the poems addressed to him by Peter of Pisa. His epitaph by his scholar Hildric, which is not free from mistakes, is preserved by the monk of Salerno (*L.* 23)*. For nearly two centuries after his

* The references will be to Waitz's edition of the *Historia Langobardorum* (*L.*), to Droysen's of the *Historia Romana* (*R.*), and to Dümmler's of the Poems (*P.*).

death only two short notices of him are found (Erchempert, *Hist. Lang.* i., and Joannes Diaconus, *Gesta Ep. Neap.* 42 in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 234, 425). For all modern researches Bethmann's exhaustive article (*Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, x. 247-334 cited as *A. x.*) is the starting-point. Dahn (*Des P. D. Leben und Schriften*) has gone over the same ground, and come to different conclusions on some points. A short but useful life by Waitz is prefixed to his edition of *L.*, and he gives a full account of the MSS. of *L.*, and of the grammatical peculiarities of Paulus in *Neues Archiv* (*N. A.*) i. 535. As to separate works Bauch (*Ueber die H. R. des P. D.*) has endeavoured to trace the sources of *R.* and Jacobi (*Die Quellen der L. des P. D.*), and Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 53) those of *L.* Dümmler (*N. A.* iv. 102) gives an account of *P.* and their MSS. A short summary of recent researches on the life and *L.* is given by Professor del Giudice (*Lo Storico dei Langobardi*). The collected works are published in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcv. Special editions of separate works will be mentioned under each.

Life.—Paulus sprang from a Lombard family, probably noble, of Friuli. His great-great-grandfather, Leupchis, was one of Alboin's host. His five sons were carried off prisoners by the Avars, when they invaded Friuli, c. 610. One of them, Lopichis, escaped, and after many adventures got back to Italy. His grandson Warnefrid and his wife Theudelinda had three children, Arichis, a daughter who became a nun (*P.* 10), and Paulus (*L.* iv. 37). Paulus was born c. 720-725, as between 781-786 he speaks of himself "jam gravante senio" (*P.* 12). His master's name was Flavian (*L.* vi. 7); and he learnt Latin thoroughly, and a very little Greek and Hebrew (*P.* 12). He was at the royal court during the reign of Ratchis; but the statements that he was educated there, and that he was notary or chancellor to Desiderius, though not absolutely impossible, rest only by late authority, the earliest for the latter being Leo of Ostia (c. 1100), and are mixed up with a good deal of certainly legendary matter. It is certain, however, that he was on intimate terms with Adelperga, Desiderius' daughter, duchess of Beneventum, whose studies he assisted, and her husband Arichis; and this fact points to a residence at the court, either of Pavia or Beneventum. To her, probably, his first poem, that on the six ages of the world, (*P.* 1, *L.* 13) was addressed in A.D. 763. The conquest of the Lombards by Charles, in A.D. 774, and the overthrow of Rodgaud, the rebel duke of Friuli (before Easter, A.D. 776), closely affected Paulus and his family. His brother had been captured in one of these wars, probably the second, had been sent a prisoner across the Alps and his property confiscated. Though we have no positive evidence for the date of Paulus becoming a monk, it was probably after, and in consequence of these events (c. 774-776) (Dahn, 21-27), though it has been supposed, we think erroneously, that he followed King Ratchis to the cloister. Evidence is also wanting as to what monastery he entered, though in all probability it was his beloved Monte Cassino. We next find him at the court of Charles, whom he had probably gone to sue for his brother's pardon, who was now in the seventh

year of his imprisonment (P. 10). The date of this poem was therefore probably the second half of A.D. 782. A letter to the abbat of Monte Cassino shows that on January 10th, probably of 783, he was on the Moselle, and he had then been absent for some time from M. Cassino (L. 16). Probably the letter to Adalhard (L. 21) the abbat of Corbei, in which he regrets having been unable to visit him the preceding summer, and mentions that he had been confined to his bed by illness from September to December, was also written about this time (Dahn, 36). It was prefixed to a collection of fifty-three letters of Gregory the Great, of which Paulus had himself corrected thirty-four.^b He was for some years one of the group of scholars at the court of Charles, with whom he was on intimate terms. There are several poems, which passed between Paulus and Peter of Pisa, the grammarian who wrote in the king's name. One of them (P. 11) compliments Paulus on his learning, and requests him to teach some Greek to the clerics, who were to accompany the king's daughter Rothrud, who had been betrothed to the emperor (c. 781), a task for which he modestly declares himself incompetent, but promises to do his best (P. 12). He visited various parts of Gaul, amongst which Diedenhofen and Poitiers are mentioned (L. i. 5, ii. 13). After some years, probably accompanying Charles, when he went to Italy in A.D. 786, and visited Rome and M. Cassino early in the following year, he returned to Italy. It was at Rome that he composed his *Life of Gregory the Great*, but most of his remaining life was passed at M. Cassino. His epitaph on Arichis (P. 33) shows that his intimacy with Charles had not diminished his affection for his old friends at Beneventum. He spent part of his time in teaching (*Gesta, Ep. Neap.* 42 in *Script. Her. Lang.* 425), but he was chiefly occupied on his principal work, the *History of the Lombards*. The necrology of Monte Cassino gives April 13th as the day of his death; the year is uncertain, but he apparently died before the coronation of Charles as emperor, and therefore not later than A.D. 800. The epitaph by his pupil Hildric is given in L. 23, and Dahn. From an incidental observation (L. i. 5) it appears that he was a tall man, nearly six feet high.

Works.—1. *Historia Romana*.—Its nature and origin are described in the prefixed letter to Adelperga, which shews it was composed after A.D. 765, and probably before November 774, when Arichis assumed the title of Princeps (Hirsch, *Herz. Benevent.* 47 n.), as she is addressed as duchess—at any rate it was written before his journey to the court of Charles. In the course of her studies he had given her Eutropius to read. She complained of its brevity, and also of the absence of any notices of sacred history and Christianity, the author having been a heathen. These defects, Paulus undertook to correct by adding—(i.) some of the events of sacred history at their proper chronological places; (ii.) additional details; (iii.) by prefixing an epitome of events in Italy from Janus to Romulus; (iv.) by adding six

^b Ewald (*N. A.* iii. 474) argues that the letter and collection were the work of another Paulus.

books, which continued the history to the death of Totila. Paulus simply added his new matter, in Mommsen's opinion placing it in the margin of his MS., and then having the whole copied out, without altering the words of Eutropius, except where the insertion made it absolutely necessary, which was seldom the case. The authors from whom Paulus borrowed were, in the first six books, chiefly Orosius, Jerome and Jordanes (*Rom.*); in the remaining four in which the additions are few, chiefly the epitome known as Victor's, and here also Orosius, Jerome, and Jordanes are each used twice. From Solinus and Frontinus there are a few extracts. The book from which the historical summary from Janus to Romulus was taken had also been used by Jerome. The sources of a few additions cannot be traced. In books xi. and xii. and xiii. ch. 1 and 2, Paulus takes Orosius as his groundwork, treating him as he had treated Eutropius, occasionally abridging him, and supplementing him with extracts from Jerome, Victor and Jordanes. From a lost ecclesiastical writer he makes three extracts. The groundwork of the remainder of book xiii. was a chronicle closely akin to the two recensions of Prosper, but yet differing from both. Droysen therefore considers that Paulus had before him the full chronicle of Prosper, which is now lost. The chronicle of Bede is for the first time cited, and also Jordanes (*Get.*). The sources of the last three books are a more difficult problem. They contain, like the former, passages more or less resembling parts of Bede, Jordanes (*Rom.*), Prosper, and Isidore; but we cannot, as in the former books, name one author as the groundwork in which extracts from others are inserted. It has been generally supposed that Paulus in these books made a patchwork from various authors, altering and adding freely; but Droysen argues that this is quite inconsistent with his method elsewhere. He therefore considers that the groundwork of these three books was sources now lost. Of these the principal was a work closely resembling Jordanes (*Get.*); and in book xvi., one like the *Liber Pontificalis*, while certain passages seem to be extracts from lost annals. He therefore considers that Paulus either had before him recensions of Jordanes and the *Liber Pontificalis*, different from ours, or else that he added to them from sources now lost.

By a singular accident the treatment that Paulus had applied to Eutropius was applied to his own work by Landolf the Wise, a person only known by the mention of him in MSS. as the author, who lived c. 1000. He largely interpolated from various sources the sixteen books of Paulus, and made them into eighteen, by dividing the seventh and sixteenth into two. Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 100) supposes that Landolf's additions were partly made from unused materials collected by Paulus himself, either for the original work or for a new edition of it. To these he added eight more, bringing the history down to the year A.D. 813. To the whole compilation in modern times the name of *Historia Miscella* has been given. It has been several times edited, but the first complete edition, in twenty-six books, is that of Eysenhardt in 1869, all preceding ones being taken from MSS., which, omitting book

sixteen and parts of fifteen and seventeen, leave only twenty-four, but the omission was supplied by Gruter, and following editors, in the notes. It will be seen that a critical edition of the work of Paulus was much needed. The want has been supplied by the edition of Droysen in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Ant.* ii., from the preface of which the preceding account is taken. At the end of book sixteen Paulus promises to add a book relating the remaining events of Justinian's reign, and in the letter to Adelperga to continue the history to his own times. This design he never executed, but in some MSS. a seventeenth book is added, going down to the reign of Leo the Isaurian. It is a cento of unknown authorship, taken from *L.*

2. The *Historia Langobardorum* extends from the mythical origin of the Lombards to the death of King Luitprand, in A.D. 744, thus unfortunately breaking off just where Paulus became a contemporary. It was written at Monte Cassino (i. 26, vi. 40), and was probably left unfinished, as in the last chapter Paulus declares his intention of narrating in the proper place a miracle of the bishop of Pavia. It also lacks a preface and dedication. It is divided into six books, of which (i.) goes down to the conquest of the Gepidae by the Lombards; of (ii.) ch. 1-5 describe the victories of Narses over the Goths and Franks, and his government of Italy (c. 552-568), ch. 6-12 narrate the Lombard invasion, ch. 13 is a digression about Venantius Fortunatus, ch. 14-24 contain a description of Italy, while the remaining chapters contain the rest of Alboin's reign, and that of his successor Cleph (c. 574); (iii.) (c. 574-591) narrates the wars with the Franks, and the reign of Authari; iv. ch. 1-40 (591-616) the reign of Agilulf, and ch. 41-51 (c. 616-661) the reigns of Adeloald, Arioald, Rothari, Rodoald, Aripert I. and the joint reign of Godepert and Perctarit, ending with the usurpation of Grimoald; (v.) goes down to the death of the usurper Alahis (c. 661-688); and (vi.) to the death of Luitprand (c. 688-744).

We have seen that Paulus concluded *R.* with a promise to narrate in the next book the remaining events of Justinian's reign, and in the dedication to Adelperga declared his intention of continuing the history to his own time. He was, however, interrupted, perhaps by the fall of the Lombard kingdom; then followed his sojourn beyond the Alps, and when he resumed the work, probably c. 790, he changed the plan, and substituted for a universal history one of his own nation, inserting in it, however, many notices of events in general; but he so far carried out his intention, that, after narrating in (i.) the early Lombard history, he begins (ii.) just where *R.* concludes. The last event recorded in *R.*, the destruction of Totila and the Gothic kingdom is the first in (ii.), and then follow the other exploits of Narses, while after just referring to the Persian war and the conquests of Italy and Africa, which are narrated in *R.*, he mentions the victory over the Moorish king, Antalas, and Justinian's achievements in architecture and legislation (i. 25).

In examining the sources of *L.* it will be convenient to consider first those of books i.-iii. and iv. 1-40, omitting the description of Italy (ii. 14-24), and a few other passages such as

the digression about St. Benedict (i. 26). In the texture of the remainder three strands are apparent; a Frankish (A), a Lombard (B), and a Romano-Byzantine (C).

A. This comes almost entirely from Gregory of Tours, who is first used in ii. 6. Thence to A.D. 591, where his history ends, Paulus uses him very freely, in fact most of (iii.) consists of extracts from him. For his period he seems to be Paulus' sole authority for Frankish affairs, excepting the legend of GUNTRAM (2) (iii. 34), which Paulus had probably heard during his travels in Gaul.

B. The source of the Lombard element is by no means so simple. In three MSS. there is prefixed to the edict of King Rothari an abstract of previous Lombard history, known as the *Origo Gentis Langobardorum*, beginning like *L.* with the legend of Gambara and her sons, and ending with the accession of Perctarit; the fifty-five years from Agilulf to Perctarit being given very shortly indeed, and in one MS. another recension of the same is found continued to A.D. 807 (*Mon. Ger. Hist., Script. Rer. Lang.* 1, 7). As the *Origo* contains incidents not found in *L.*, e.g. in the legend of Gambara Freya's trick of turning round Woden's bed, it cannot be, as was at first supposed, merely an epitome of *L.*, while the close connection between the two shows that Paulus had the *Origo* in some form before him, and he twice expressly refers to the prologue found in most MSS. to the edict of Rothari (i. 21, iv. 42). Further, Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 60, etc.) by a comparison of parallel passages of the *Origo* and *L.* proves that the *Origo*, as we now have it, is an abridgment.

Abbat SECUNDUS of Trent (died 612) wrote a short history *De Gestis Langobardorum*, which came down to his own times (iv. 40), and which went back at least to A.D. 588 (iii. 29), which Paulus once expressly refers to (iii. 29), but though he says of him, "de quo saepe jam diximus," he mentions him only three times in all. But the above summary of *L.* shows strikingly his obligations to Secundus. The sudden change after iv. 40, from comparative fulness to absolute baldness coincides with the death of Secundus. Paulus himself owns his ignorance of the reign of Arioald (626-638). Further, there is a great mass of matter in *L.* relating to subjects which would be personally interesting to Secundus, e.g. his sponsorship of Theodelinda's son (iv. 27), the numerous notices about Trent and its neighbourhood, and the events that happened there (iii. 9, 10, 31, iv. 1, 2, 10), whereas after A.D. 612 Trent is only once mentioned (v. 36); above all the notices of the patriarchs of Aquileia, and of the controversy about the Three Chapters, of which we know that Secundus was a zealous champion. The paradox that Paulus, the admirer of Gregory the Great, in one passage (iii. 26) writes as a strong partisan of the schismatic defenders of the Three Chapters, is solved at once, if we suppose the passage to be an extract from Secundus. What then is the relation, if any, between the *Origo* and Paulus? The close connexion between the *Origo* and Paulus continues as before between A.D. 588 and 612, for which he certainly had Secundus before him. It has been generally supposed, e.g. by Waitz (*L.* 25), that the *Origo* and Secundus are inde-

pendent sources, but Mommsen is of opinion that the *Origo* is neither more nor less than an epitome of Secundus shortly continued to A.D. 688, and that it was probably the abridged or unabridged work of Secundus with a short continuation that was prefixed to the edict, so that finally the Lombard element in *L.*, down to iv. 40, comes wholly from the lost work of Secundus; that, in fact, in that part of *L.* Secundus takes the place that we have seen Eutropius and Orosius occupy in parts of *R.* The chief objection to Mommsen's view is that Paulus, who cites both works, gives no hint of any connection between them; one he calls the *Prologus Edicti*, the other *De Gestis Langobardorum*. Subtracting, says Mommsen from *L.* down to iv. 40 all that comes from Roman, Byzantine, or Frankish sources, and adding the additional matter of the *Origo*, the result will be a Lombard chronicle, resembling in character Gregory of Tours. He further notices the close resemblance of the legendary origin and wanderings of the Lombards with those of the Goths as described by Jordanes. Both came from Scandia (Scandinavia) described as a thickly-peopled island, the first enemies both encounter are the Vandals, in the history of both the Amazons figure. Are both stories fragments from a primitive legend common to the Teutonic tribes, or are the common incidents borrowed from Jordanes by an author who wished to emulate the glory of the Goths?

C. A few historical passages remain relating to the Eastern emperors, which show close affinity with the Copenhagen continuation of Prosper, and above all with Bede's *Chronicle*, making in some cases the same mistakes as the last, while here and there notices are found that apart from Paulus exist only in Byzantine sources (e.g. the name of Antalas i. 25, the notice of Aming ii. 2, the first found only in Procopius and Corippus, the second only in Menander, Bonn edd. 345). In one passage a few lines coincide, word for word, with the Chronicle of Isidore, which is used nowhere else. The same phenomenon of passages agreeing with, yet differing from, Bede's *Chronicle* (Isidore and the Continuation having ended), and of others with the *Liber Pontificalis* (which is apparently used in books ii.-iv. very sparingly, and very largely used in v., vi.) presents itself in the two remaining books, e.g.:

His diebus Domnus, papa Romanae ecclesiae, locum qui Paradisus dicitur ante basilicam beati apostoli Petri candidis et magnis marmoribus mirifice stravit. v. 31.

Hic (Donus) atrium beati Petri apostoli superius, quod est ante ecclesiam in quadriporticum, magnis marmoribus stravit. *Lib. Pont. Donus.*

Again we observed the same phenomena in the last three books of *R.* The usual explanation as to Paulus and the three chroniclers is that one copied from another. Mommsen, however, considers this unsatisfactory, and supposes they all borrowed from a common source, namely, a chronicle or annals composed in Byzantine Italy. Possibly the same explanation may apply to the passages which appear to be taken from the *Liber Pontificalis*, but it is impossible here to examine this question fully. With regard to the part of *L.* after iv. 40, almost the only sources (if they are really

sources) which can be recognised are the *Liber Pontificalis* and Bede's *Chronicle*. For the concluding chapters of iv. the *Origo* is used as far as it goes. The narrative of the conversion of the Persian king and queen (iv. 50) comes from Fredegarius or a common source; the pilgrimage of CAEDWALLA (2) to Rome (vi. 15), from Bede, *H. E.* v. 7; the foundation of the monastery of St. Vincent (vi. 40), from Autpert's life of the founders. The considerable notices in vi. relating to the duchies of Friuli and Benevento probably came from local records. Isidore's Etymologiae are frequently used in the earlier books, the Dialogues, Letters, and Homily on Ezekiel of Gregory the Great are cited; Pliny is twice referred to, and Virgil and Eegyppius' *Life of Severinus* each once. In ii. 14-24 Paulus gives a description of Italy and its provinces. The list is identical with the seventeen provinces of the *Notitia Dignitatum*; except that Paulus by a mistake, whose origin Mommsen indicates (87), adds an 18th "Alpes Apenninae." This he amplified with short geographical and etymological notices. The origin of the former is apparently a map of Italy; of the latter, twelve come from Isidore's Etymologiae, seven from Festus, and two from Jordanes (*Get.*). He quotes Justin for the invasion of Italy by the Gauls.

The large number of extant MSS. (of which Waitz enumerates about 100), shows the great popularity of the work during the middle ages.

3. *Life of Gregory the Great*, composed at Rome (1, 8, &c.). The date is uncertain, but it was written some years before *L.* (iii. 24). Dahn (56) not improbably supposes that he accompanied Charles in 786, who kept Christmas at Florence, went on to Rome and thence to Monte Cassino, and that the life was written during his short stay in Rome early in 787. It is composed from the works of Gregory himself, and from Bede, *H. E.* ii. The account of the miracles (§§ 23-28 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxv. 52-58) is considered by Bethmann (*A. x.* 305) to be an interpolation from the life written in England.

4. *Gesta Episcoporum Mettensium*, which he wrote at the request of bishop Angilram (*L.* vi. 16) probably at Metz, after October 783, the date of the marriage of Charles and Fastrada, but before they had a child (265). His model was the *Liber Pontificalis*. With a few exceptions the lives are very meagre. The skeleton of the work was apparently a list of the bishops which he supplemented with extracts from Gregory of Tours, Fredegarius, a life of Bishop Arnulf, and with oral information from Charles and others. The chief interest of the work is its account of the rise of the Carolingian house, whose founder was Arnulf, bishop of Metz. It likewise contains the epitaphs composed by Paulus at the request of Charles on his queen, Hildegard, his two sisters and his two infant daughters. The latest edition is in Pertz, *S. S.* ii. 260.

5. *An epitome*, or extracts from Sextus Pompeius Festus *De Significatione Verborum*, dedicated to Charles, and written probably at the beginning of their acquaintance (*L.* 19 n. Exc. 1). Bethmann indeed (*A. x.* 320) and others have considered the work to be unworthy of Paulus from its carelessness and mistakes, and

also because he is called "Pontifex" in the title, and have assigned it to some other Paulus. The oldest MS., however, omits the word "Pontifex," the dedicatory letter in its style and in certain phrases, e.g. "urbs Romulea," for Rome resembles known works of Paulus, and Paulus was acquainted with the work of Festus, and, as we have seen, used it freely in *L.* By the "*Glossae Pauli Diaconi*," mentioned in a catalogue of the library at Lorsch (Mai, *Spic.* v. 193), probably this epitome is meant. Further, no other known author of the name lived in the reign of Charles. Waitz, therefore (*L.* 19), and Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 58, 59) both consider this a genuine work of Paulus. He had before him the complete work of Festus, of which only fragments from *M.*, onwards, now remain. The best edition is that of K. O. Müller.

6. *A Book of Homilies.*—This work was compiled at the request of Charles, perhaps commenced before, but certainly completed after his return to Monte Cassino (*P.* 34. *L.* 20. Cf. Dahn, 52). It consists, in its present form, of 298 sermons in all. For each Sunday there is one, and for most two. One or more is appointed for each feast, and there are also sermons for each day in Lent, for each day in Easter and Whitsun week, and for special occasions, such as the dedication of a church, or the commemoration of an apostle or a martyr. The sermons are selected from those of various fathers, SS. Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory, Jerome, and Leo being the largest contributors. As was natural with a work of the kind, additional sermons were afterwards added, so that in its present form it includes some by writers such as Eric and Haymon, who lived after Paulus Diaconus.

7. In addition to this collection, three Homilies of Paulus himself are preserved, on the Assumption of the Virgin, on Martha and Mary, and on St. Benedict, which in preparing Bede's homilies for use at Monte Cassino, he substituted for the last, which was on Benedict Biscop.

8. *Poems.*—Of these several have already been noticed. Of the rest, the most remarkable are the elegiacs and iambs in honour of St. Benedict (*P.* 2, 3), the praises of the Lake of Como, and the verses interchanged between Paulus and Petrus of Pisa. The hymn in honour of St. John Baptist, from which the names of the musical notes were taken,

"Ut queant laxis resonare fibris,"

has been attributed to Paulus, but probably wrongly. His verses show a thorough acquaintance with Virgil and Ovid, and abound with imitations of them. They have been recently edited by Dümmler in the *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica, Poetarum Latinorum Mediæ Aevi* i.

9. *Letters.*—Those to Adelperga, Theudemar, Adelhard and Charles have already been noticed. The letter prefixed to the copy of the Rule of St. Benedict sent by abbat Theudemar to Charles (c. 791, Dahn, 62) was written by Paulus. Whether the Exposition of the Rule of St. Benedict is correctly ascribed to him is at least doubtful. (Dahn, 62.)

From the previous account it will be seen that while Paulus was, for his time, a man of considerable learning and industry, he has no

pretensions to rank as a scientific or philosophical historian, his only merit is that of a compiler. Though he makes occasional mistakes, such as setting down, side by side, independent and divergent narratives of the same events, e.g. making the battle of the Colline Gate into two, one before and one after Sulla's entry into Rome (*R.* v. 8), he generally copied faithfully what he found in his authorities, and we are indebted to him for many fragments from authors now lost, above all from Secundus. Though he loved and admired his own race, he writes, on the whole, impartially. Though he is by no means free from grammatical mistakes, e.g. accusative absolute (especially in *L.*, perhaps because it never received his finishing touches), his style is decidedly good for his age. Take for instance, the passage from Gregory of Tours, cited by Mommsen (*N. A.* v. 54) and compare it with the form it takes in *L.* The one is rude and bald, the other has some pretensions to style, and reads like very tolerable Latin. His poems show that he had diligently studied the classical poets, especially Virgil, and his imitations are often by no means infelicitous. [F. D.]

Reader and Cleric.

PAULUS (71), a reader of the church of Constantinople, summoned along with Chrysostom to the Council of the Oak, according to Socrates and Sozomen, but not mentioned by Palladius. (*Socr. H. E.* vi. 15; *Soz. H. E.* viii. 17.) [E. V.]

PAULUS (72), cleric of Sardinia, who, having been convicted of practising magical arts, and assuming the dress of a layman, had fled to Africa. Gregory the Great in a letter to JANUARIUS (25) in A.D. 594, directed he should receive corporal punishment and be obliged to do penance (*Ep.* iv. 27). [F. D.]

Monks.

For monks who were priests or martyrs, see under those heads.

PAULUS (73), ST. (called THEBAEUS; δ Θήβαϊον, Niceph.), Jan. 10. He is called by Jerome the founder of the monastic life ("auctor vitae monasticae," *Ep.* 22, ad Eustoch. "princeps vitae monasticae," *Vit. S. Pauli*, Prol.). He is said to have been the first, in Egypt at least, to lead the life of a hermit, preceding even the celebrated Antony (Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 105 and notes). He lived in the desert of the Thebaid, whither he fled in youth from the terrors of the Decian persecution, and where he died, at an extraordinary age, hale and hearty to the last (*Hieron. Ep.* 21, ad *Paul. Concordiens.*). The palm-tree at the mouth of his cave supplied him with food and clothing (*Hieron. Vita Pauli*, cap. 6). Miracles are recorded of him as of other solitaries. The ravens are said to have brought him bread, and two lions dug his grave (*Hieron. v. s. cc.* 9, 13). Antony is said to have paid a visit to his venerable brother in asceticism, shortly before the death of Paulus, and ever afterwards to have worn his tunic, made of palm leaves stitched together, on great festivals. Jerome adds (c. 13), with characteristic fervour, that

such a garment, the legacy of so great a saint, was more glorious than the purple of a king (Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ix. 14; Boll. *Acta SS.* 10 Jan. 1, 603; Butler, Jan. 15). [I. G. S.]

PAULUS (74), Mar. 7, surnamed **SIMPLEX**, a disciple of Antony, and, like his master, a hermit, in Lower Egypt. He was memorable, as his name imports, for the childlike docility, of which several instances are related by his biographer, Euffinus (*De Vitis Patrum*, c. 31, ap. Rosweyd. *Vit. Patr.*). When he first sought admission into the cave of Antony, he had to wait three days and nights at the mouth of it before receiving any reply at all. Then came a voice from the cave, bidding him remain there, standing and praying, for twenty-four hours more. All this he bore without a murmur. On another occasion, having asked, in the presence of some saints of the desert, the foolish question, whether Christ or the prophets lived first, he was ordered by his teacher to go and be silent. He obeyed literally, and stayed apart, in silence, several days, till he was set free from his self-imposed penance. His patience and submission were tried, on other occasions, by his being ordered to pour water all day through a sieve, and to unweave the mats, which he had been busy in weaving (*ib.*). He was famous for his prolonged fasts, and for other austerities; and, notwithstanding his dulness of intellect, was reputed to have a strange insight into the hearts of those who worshipped with him (Gr. Inc. c. 20, ap. Rosw. *Vit. Patr.*; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 13; Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, and Heraclides, *Paradisus*, apud Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*; Boll. *Acta SS.* 7 Mart. i. 635). [I. G. S.]

PAULUS (75), of Oxyrinchus in Egypt, a monk who headed, about A.D. 360, a secession from the communion of the local bishop Theodorus, because of his connexion with the Arian George of Alexandria. His followers belonged to the Luciferian party. We only know of them from the *Libellus Precum* [FAUSTINUS (33)] whence we learn that they formed a presbyterian community, and possessed no bishop (cf. Ceill. v. 154). [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (76), one of the Syrian monks to whom Basil wrote in 376 to express his sympathy in the destruction of their cells by fire at the hands of the enemies of the truth (Basil, *Ep.* 256 [200]). [E. V.]

PAULUS (77), an Egyptian monk of the 4th century. In company with two others, Syrus and Isaias, he was on his way to visit a famous solitary, when the latter met them, and by divine revelation, as he alleged, told them their respective merits. Paulus, alleging a similar revelation, predicted that the solitary would go to heaven in three days and requested him to say, for their future profit, by what good works he had pleased God. A full reply followed. (Ruf. *Hist. Mon.* 10 in *Pat. Lat.* xxi. 428; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 55-7.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (78), a solitary of Mount Perme in Scetis, late in the 4th century. Abstaining entirely from manual labour and depending upon charity for his food, he spent each day in reciting three hundred prayers, regulating the

number by means of as many pebbles in his bosom, one of which he cast away at each prayer. Owing to the various readings of *ἐχων* (agreeing with *Παῦλος*) and *ἐχον* (with *ὄρος*), two statements occur, one by Sozomen and Cassiodorus that Paulus had five hundred monks under him, the other (which is more probable) by Palladius and Nicephorus that the mountain was tenanted by that number. Palladius further relates his consulting Macarius of Alexandria in great distress of conscience, for that he, though a man, only made three hundred prayers a day, while he had been told of a woman, an ascetic of thirty years, who made seven hundred, eating only on Saturdays and Sundays. Macarius said he had been serving God sixty years and made but one hundred prayers a day, yet without any self-reproach, employing his time in labour, and he advised Paulus, if his conscience was dissatisfied, to make more prayers or better ones (Soz. vi. 29; Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* c. 23; Cassiod. *Trip. Hist.* lib. viii. c. 1 in *Pat. L.* lxix. 1109; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* lib. ii. c. 36 in *P. G.* cxlvi. 701). Concerning the readings see the notes of Valesius on Sozomen, and Tillem. viii. 813. [C. H.]

PAULUS (79), (called *δ Κοσμήτης*, **COSMETA**) a solitary in Scetis, with Timotheus his brother, in the 4th century. They were called Adorners, as Tillemont thinks, on account of some art they practised among the solitaries. Finding themselves frequently at variance, they provided against an open breach by agreeing that they would tolerate each other's outbreaks and tempers (*Apophth. Pat.* in Cotelier. *Mon. Gr. Ecc.* i. p. 651; Tillem. x. 471). [C. H.]

PAULUS (80), a solitary in the desert of Porphyrio in Egypt, and apparently visited by Cassian (*Inst.* x. 24, 25), near the end of the 4th century. His garden supplied him with food, and he rigorously employed himself each day in fabricating the usual articles out of palm leaves, for the sake however of the employment alone, for being seven "mansiones" or days' journey from a town he could not dispose of what he made, and at the end of the year gave them all to the flames. Where the desert of Porphyrio, also called that of Calamus (*Collat.* xxiv. 4), was is not known. Tillemont (xiv. 170) suggests that if it was in Thebais this Paulus could have been the same as No. 83. See the following. [C. H.]

PAULUS (81), a solitary in the desert adjacent to the city of Panephrisis in the east of Lower Egypt mentioned by Severus to Cassian (*Collat.* vii. 26). He was so resolute in avoiding the very sight of women that once while going with another solitary Archebius to visit an aged father of the desert, and a woman chanced to approach, he fled back with all speed to his cell regardless of the entreaties of his companion. In the last four years of his life when helpless from paralysis in every limb, he was entirely dependent on the assiduous ministrations of women from a neighbouring coenobium. Cassian's commentator Alardus Gazaeus is inclined to identify him with the preceding, but Tillemont (xiv. 168, 169) is of a different opinion. [C. H.]

PAULUS (82), a monk whose coenobium, containing above two hundred brethren in Egypt, was visited by Cassian (*Collat.* xix. 1; *Tillem.* xiv. 163, 164). [C. H.]

PAULUS (83), of Lower Egypt, a solitary in the Thebais in the fourth or fifth century. He would take up serpents, horned serpents, and scorpions with his hand, and nip them in two in the midst unharmed, and when asked how he had obtained such grace replied, "To him who has attained to purity all things are subject." (*Apophth. Pat.* in *Coteler. Mon. Gr. Ecc.* p. 651.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (84), a solitary, c. 400, in the Thebais, a disciple of Hor. (*Apophth. Patr.* in *Coteler. Mon. Gr. Eccl.* i. p. 708; *Tillem.* vii. 600.) Another Paulus (85) [called of Galatia and THE GREAT] is mentioned in the *Apophthymata* (p. 652) and in the *Verba Seniorum*, c. 2 (*Rosweyd, Vit. Patr.* p. 666). [C. H.]

PAULUS (86), the name of two Egyptian solitaries visited by Rufinus in the 4th century, one "in Apeliote," the other "in Focis" (*Rufin. H. E.* ii. 8; *Tillem.* xiv. 169). [C. H.]

PAULUS (87) (called HELLADICUS), a solitary near the Jordan mentioned in Moschus as daily feeding a lion who came to his cave at meal times (*Prat.* c. 163 in *Rosw. V. P.* p. 911). Moschus mentions another PAULUS (88) from Galatia, a solitary of Porphyrites, who handled serpents, at the end of the 6th century (*Prat.* c. 124; *Tillem.* xiv. 171). [C. H.]

Martyrs.

PAULUS (89) *Mart. Carthag.* A.D. 250. [See ARISTO.] It was on his dying request that LUCIAN began the system of dispensations to the Lapsed. *Ep.* 22 *Cyp.* (4) also *Martyr. Carth.* same year. [E. W. B.]

PAULUS (90), May 15, martyr at Lampsacus, a city of the Hellespont, with Peter, Andrew and Dionysia a virgin. They suffered in the Decian persecution under Optimus or Opositimus, a proconsul. The Acts offer an example of the judicial circuit made by the governors through the Roman provinces on which Le Blant lays stress in his work *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 122 et pass.; *Ruinart. AA. Sinc.* p. 146-149. [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (91), March 10, martyr at Corinth in the Decian persecution with Quadratus and several others. His acts in a Greek version have been found by Aubé in an incomplete state in a MS. of the National Library at Paris. Cf. *Rev. Archéol.* 1884, pt. i. p. 222; *Mart. Rom.* [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (92), Mar. 4, Aug. 17, martyr under Aurelian [JULIANA (2)] (*Boll. Acta SS.* 17 Aug. iii. 448; *Tillem.* iv. 354). [C. H.]

PAULUS (93), July 25, martyr at Caesarea in Palestine under the governor Firmilianus during the Diocletian persecution. He was condemned to the sword with two women who were burnt. At the moment of the execution he begged for a few moments' respite, when he prayed aloud for the peace of the Church, for the conversion of the Jews, of the Samaritans,

and of the Gentiles, for the emperor, the judge, and the executioner. (*Euseb. Mart. Palest.* c. viii.) [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (94), June 1, martyr at Caesarea in Palestine, under Firmilian in the Diocletian persecution. He was a layman, of the city of Jamna, and was associated in suffering with Pamphilus and Valens. They were imprisoned for two years before execution. (*Eus. Mart. Palest.* c. xi.) [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (95), an Egyptian martyr in the Diocletian persecution. He is noted in the *Ethiopic Calendar* under Feb. 9 (*Ludolph. Hist. Aethiop. Comment.* p. 403). His acts are given in *Aug. Ant. Georgii Fragm. Evang. Johann.* p. cviii. He was a friend of St. PAEISIS and THECLA. [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (96), abbat of Raithu near the Red Sea, and martyred with forty-three disciples by the Arabs, about A.D. 373. His sufferings are narrated by an eyewitness, one Ammonius, a monk, in *Combefis (Illust. Christ. Martt. lecti triumph)*, p. 88-139. [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (97), Jan. 14, a solitary of Mt. Sinai slain by Arabs A.D. 373, with a priest Theodulus. (*AA. SS. Boll.* 14 Jan. 954-960; *Ceill.* viii. 231.) [G. T. S.]

Miscellaneous.

PAULUS (98) L. SERGIUS, *Cos. Suff.* 147; *Cos. ord.* ii. 168; City prefect under M. Aurelius about 168; descendant of Sergius Paulus proconsul of Cyprus in the Acts. He was proconsul of Asia between 163 and 168, when St. Sagaris suffered under him. (*Eus.* iv. 26, where his name is corrupted in the Greek text into Servilius; *Borghesi, Evv. Comp.* viii. 504-506, ix. 310-313; *Waddington, Fustes des Prov. Asiat.* num. 148; *Lightfoot, Ignatius i.* 494.) [*MELITO, Vol. III.* p. 495 b.] [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (99), a noted heretic and a man of great eloquence, of Antiochene birth, but residing at Alexandria as an adopted son of the wealthy lady who had befriended Origen in his early days. (*Euseb.* vi. 2; *Tillem.* iii. 500.) [C. H.]

PAULUS (100), a confessor in Egypt in the Decian persecution along with DIONYSIUS (6), bishop of Alexandria, CAIUS (11), PETRUS (73), and FAUSTUS (15) (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 40, vii. 11; *Tillem.* iv. 247). [R. J. K.]

PAULUS (101), colleague of Macarius, A.D. 348, said by the Donatists to have been less ferocious than his colleague. (*MACARIUS* (21), *Vol. III.* 774, 775; *Mon. Vet. D.* xxvii. p. 227, ed. Oberthür.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (102), an Egyptian, the disciple of Peter the martyred patriarch of Alexandria, mentioned by Rufinus as one of the learned company of which Didymus was the chief at Alexandria. He was an old man when Rufinus knew him, about the year 374. (*Ruf. Apol.* ii. 12.) [W. H. F.]

PAULUS (103), of Concordia, a town between Aquileia and Altinum, in the fourth century, spoken of by Jerome as Paulus quendam (*De Vir. Illust.* 53). He was a student of scripture and of ecclesiastical writers, and was known to

both Jerome and Rufinus, the latter of whom was a native of Concordia. Jerome probably saw him about the year 370, when returning from Treves and about to settle at Aquileia. He corresponded with Jerome, when in the desert of Chalcis, in the year 374, asking him for a MS. of Tertullian which Rufinus had taken away. Jerome asks him to send him from his copious library Fortunatianus's Commentaries, the History of Aurelius Victor, the Epistles of Novatianus and Cyprian, and in return sends him his Life of Paulus the Hermit, recently composed. He was then enjoying a prolonged but healthy old age. It was from him that Jerome heard the story, which Paulus had heard from a secretary, that Cyprian, in asking for Tertullian's books, would say, "Da magistrum." (Jerome, *Ep.* 5 and 10, and *De Vir.* III. 53; Tillem. xii. 11, 27.) [W. H. F.]

PAULUS (104), a lawyer to whom Nilus of Sinai wrote a letter on the nature and power of habits and of sin. (Nili *Epist.* ii. 239 in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. lxxix. col. 322.) [G. T. S.]

PAULUS (105) a friend of Augustine, the bearer of his second letter to Jerome. (Jerome, *Ep.* lxxvii. end, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

PAULUS (106), bearer of a letter from S. Augustine to Alypius, about the baptism of Gabinianus and the conversion of Dioscorus. (*Aug. Ep.* 227.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (107), according to St. Augustine cured of a disease at the church at Hippo, in which the relics of St. Stephen were deposited. This occurred on Easter-Day, A.D. 425, and three days afterwards his sister Palladia also was cured. (*Aug. Civ. D.* xxii. 8, 21.) [H. W. P.]

PAULUS (108), son of Callinice, born at Samosata in the 4th century. He and his brother John were trained by their mother as followers of Gnosticism or Manichaeism. They laboured in those districts to spread their opinions. Some derived the name and doctrines of the PAULICIANS from them, though probably this connection is simply fiction. (Phot. c. *Man.* i. 1, 16; Pet. Sic. i. 21; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 337-9; Mosheim, ii. 363.) [M. B. C.]

PAULUS (109), THE PERSIAN, or THE CHRISTIAN, the opponent of Photinus the Manichean. [PHOTINUS.] [G. T. S.]

PAULUS THE PERSIAN [PAULUS (40)].

PAULUS (110) SILENTIARIUS, sometimes called "the Silentary," from his position as an officer of Justinian's court. Agathias calls him τὰ πρῶτα τελῶν ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἀμφὶ τὸν βασιλέα σιγῆς ἐπιστάταις, and describes him as of high family and great wealth. It seems most likely from the superscription of his work on the Great Church, that he was son of Cyrus, and grandson of Florus. He wrote several epigrams preserved in the Anthologia Palatina, and some other works of minor importance; but his chief poem was that already mentioned, a poetical account of the buildings and dedication of the Great Church of Constantinople, which, as the evidence of a contemporary, must always be an important authority on the greatest effort of

Byzantine church architecture. The poem, to which is prefixed a dedication in iambic verse, is written in Homeric hexameters. Its vividness is much praised by Agathias, but, from his necessary avoidance of technical terms, it is rather difficult to follow clearly his description of the building.

This work, together with the *ἔκφρασις τοῦ ἁμβωνος*, was edited by Graefe (Lips. 1822). It had previously been edited by Du Fresne, and by Bekker in the *Corpus Scriptorum Byzantinorum*. Some assistance to the better understanding of the poem in its relation to church architecture may be found in Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (Introduction). [H. A. W.]

PAULUS (111) SCHOLASTICUS. Two letters are addressed to him by Gregory the Great, in the first of which, written in 590, shortly after his accession, Gregory deprecates his congratulations; in the second, written thirteen years afterwards, Gregory expresses his joy at Paulus's reconciliation with LEO (38), bishop of Catania. From these letters it appears that Paulus lived in Sicily (*Epp.* i. 3; xiv. 1). [F. D.]

PAULUS (112), a leader in the Severian heresy, who according to a letter of Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, had that interview with the emperor Heraclius in Armenia, which paved the way for Monothelitism. The letter, which was addressed to pope Honorius, was read in Actio XII. of the Sixth Synod, A.D. 680, and may be seen in Mansi (xi. 530), Hardouin (iii. 1311), and other works on the Councils. Baronius gives it under the year 633 (num. xvii.). For the various dates assigned to the interview, the place of it, and the doubt if Paul was the person, see SERGIUS, and PERSON OF CHRIST, subdiv. MONOTHELITISM. [C. H.]

PAULUS (113) the Armenian, an eminent teacher in the sect of PAULICIANS, in the 7th century, about the time of Justinian II. Many traced the name of the sect to him, but this no doubt was of earlier date. He was the father of Gegnaesius and Theodore. (Phot. c. *Man.* i. 19; Pet. Sic. i. 28; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 340-3.) [M. B. C.]

PAULUS (114), surnamed AFIARTA, chamberlain of pope Stephen III., is described by Anastasius (*Hist. de Vit. Rom. Pont.* 285 sq.) as combining with Didier, king of Lombardy, against his master's friends [CHRISTOPHER (7)], killing or driving them into exile. His policy was reversed by pope Hadrian on his accession, A.D. 772 [HADRIANUS (8)]. [J. G.]

PAUSIANUS, bishop in Thessaly, one of three bishops whom pope Boniface I. declared, A.D. 422, separated from his communion [CYRIACUS (14)] (Bonifacius I. *Epp.* no. 13 ap. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 776; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 146). He must be the bishop of Hypata, who, at the council of Ephesus in 431, took the side of John of Antioch, signed the contestatio to Cyril, joined the conciliabulum, and is mentioned in the circular letter of the council with some thirty more separatists under John (Hardouin, i. 1352, 1578 here corruptly called Subanus, 1623; Le Quien, ii. Tillem. xii. 403, xiv. 604). [J. G.]

PAUSICACUS, blind man healed under the invocation of St. Thecla (Basil. Seleuc. *Vit. S. Theclae*, lib. ii. no. 8, ap. Boll. *AA.SS.* Sept. 23, vi. 559; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 168). [J. G.]

PAWL HEN (PAULINUS, PAULENS, POLIN, POULENTUS), Welsh saint, was probably a north Briton, disciple of St. Illtyd, and according to Ricemarch (Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 122), of St. Germanus: seems to have lived in Man, and may have been called Hên or the Aged to distinguish him from St. Paul of Leon. He established a monastery and school at Tygwyn ar Daf, Alba Domus, or Whitland, in Carmarthenshire, where St. David and St. Teilo were among his pupils. (See Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 122; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 13-15.) By later writers he is spoken of as a seeless bishop, but he was probably only abbat of Tygwyn (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 142 sq. Append. c). The tradition embodied in the *Life of S. David* (Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 137; Colgan, *A. SS.* 429, c. 23) is that he was present as a bishop at the synod o. Llandewi-Brefi, Cardiganshire, in A.D. 519 (Ussher) to oppose the Pelagian heresy, and was the special means of having St. David brought forward. Whatever be the date assigned for that synod, Pawl Hên must have flourished in the first half of the 6th century; his feast is Nov. 22. At Dolau Cothi in Caio, Carmarthenshire, an old inscribed stone is believed to be to his memory (Westwood, *Lap. Wall.* 79). [J. G.]

PAYSIO, an Egyptian solitary in the fifth century (Rosweyd, *V. P.*, v. 11, § 23). Tillemont (xv. 151) suggests that he may be the same as Paësis, the brother of Poemen. [C. H.]

PEADA, son of Penda, king of Mercia, by his wife Cyneswitha (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 630, 637), and apparently the eldest of the family. Having been appointed by his father to govern the province of the Middle Angles of which Leicester was the centre, he became a neighbour of Oswy, king of Northumbria, whose daughter Alchflæda he asked in marriage. Oswy consented if Peada would become a Christian, and Peada, under the persuasion o. Alchfrith, Oswy's son, after being instructed in the faith was baptized by Finan, at the place described as *Ad murum*. He brought from Northumbria four missionary priests, Cedd, Adda, Betti, and Diuma, the last of whom was afterwards made a bishop. Peada tolerated the proceedings of his son, which began two years before his death; but continued his usual forays into Oswy's territories, and in 655 fell with his British allies in the battle of Winwaed. His power fell with him: Peada however was allowed by his father-in-law to act as king of the Southern Mercians, south of Trent; a different district apparently from that which he had governed under Penda. His reign was short. He was assassinated, as it was said, with the connivance of his wife, at the following Easter, A.D. 656 (Bede, *H.E.* iii. 21, 24). Peada is reckoned among the founders and benefactors of Medeshamstede, in conjunction with Oswy (*Chr. S.* A.D. 655, *M. H. B.* 312, 320). The authority for the early history of the abbey is very questionable, but it may rest on a true conjecture, for Bede ascribes the foundation to Abbot Sexwlf,

whose work may very well have begun under Peada's auspices (*H. E.* iv. 6), although Wulf here may have completed it. [S.]

PECTHELM, the first English bishop of Candida Casa, or Whitherne, in Galloway. The see must have been re-established (having been unoccupied from the time of Ninian) about the year A.D. 730. Bede ends his history two years later, and mentions Pecthelm as being then at Whitherne, where many had been added to the faith (*H. E.* v. 23). Richard of Hexham (ed. *Swtees Soc.* p. 35) mentions a tradition that Acca, bishop of Hexham, had been helpful in establishing the see of Whitherne, which is probable enough.

Florence places Pecthelm's death in A.D. 735 (i. 54). Among the letters of Boniface there is one addressed to bishop Pecthelm. He sends him a present of a cloak and a towel, and asks his advice on a matrimonial question. The letter is ascribed to the year 736 (i. 89, ed. Giles), but if Pecthelm, bishop of Whitherne, is the correspondent, it must be ante-dated a year or more. [J. R.]

PECTWINE (PEHTWINE, PECHTWIN), the third English bishop of Whitherne (Candida Casa) or Galloway. He was consecrated on July 17, 763, in the district called Aelfete (Elmete), no doubt by the archbishop of York (*S. C. sub anno*). We know nothing further of him, save the fact that he died on Sept. 19, 778 (*S. C.*). Symeon and Florence place his death a year later. [J. R.]

PECUSIUS, pupil and friend of St. Pachomius at Tabenna (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 243; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iii. 358). [J. G.]

PEGA, ST. (PEGAN, PEGE, PEGIA), Jan. 8, an anchoritess, sister of St. Guthlac of Crowland, in whose *Life* by Felix (Boll. *Acta SS.* 11 Apr. ii. 38), the earliest notice of her occurs. Although she resided in his neighbourhood Guthlac, from motives of asceticism, declined ever seeing her, a piece of austerity that can be accounted for by a statement in a metrical life of that saint (W. de Gray Birch, *Saint Guthlac*, Wisbech, 1881, *Introd.* page xxvii.) that the Evil One in the shape of Pega once sought to deceive him. Guthlac, however, held her in true brotherly regard, directing that a secret of his spiritual life revealed by him just before his death in 714 should be imparted to her (*Vit. Guthl.* § 35), and requesting that she should wrap him in his winding sheet and place him in his coffin, which she did (§§ 35, 36). At the end of a year, A.D. 715, she went again to Crowland, and in a great assembly of ecclesiastics re-entombed him in the oratory of his church, and while there is reported to have cured a blind man from Wissa (Wisbech), by the application of some salt consecrated by the deceased saint (§ 40). The spurious *Historia Ingulphi* (Gale's *Scriptores*, i. 5) adds that having bestowed on abbat Kenulph St. Bartholomew's scourge, Guthlac's psalter, and other relics, Pega returned by water to her own cell, which was four leucæ distant westward, and that after spending two years and three months in mourning there (which brings the period to the latter part of 717) she went on a pilgrimage to Rome, where she died

There is nothing unlikely in such a journey, as Pega was probably not above forty years old, and the Roman pilgrimage had begun to be prevalent among all classes and both sexes in Britain. Abbat Ceolfrid had gone out the previous year. The period of her death is not stated; Orderic Vital (*H. E.* iv. 15, t. ii. p. 276 edit. Le Prevost, 1840) gives the day as Jan. 8, and adds that a church was afterwards raised over her remains, of which, however, nothing further is handed down. This author also states (cap. 16, p. 284) that the locality of her cell near Crowland was named from her Pegelanda, and that a monastery afterwards arose there. As Pegia she occurs once in Florence of Worcester (ann. 714, *M. H. B.* 540), who in recording Guthlac to have been her brother seems to attribute to her an almost equal fame. She has no place in the *Roman Martyrology* of Baronius. There is no known *Vita* of St. Pega; but Bolland (*Acta SS.* 8 Jan. i. 532) has collected nearly all the passages of ancient authors referring to her. The spot which Orderic names Pegelanda is without doubt the modern Peykirk or Peakirk in Northamptonshire, called in Camden's time Peagkirke, Pega's church. It lies on the western verge of the great Peterborough Fen, ten miles north of Peterborough and seven or eight (perhaps rather a long "four leucæ") west from Crowland. It is skirted by the Welland, down which stream Pega's boat would have dropped to reach her brother's cell. The monastery which arose there survived the Danes, but disappeared before the Norman Conquest. For modern notices of Pega and Peakirk see *Monast. Anglic.* ii. 95, iii. 203; Tanner's *Notitia*; Camden's *Brit.* ed. Gough, ii. 168, 186; Bridge's *Northamptonshire*, ed. Whalley, ii. 574. The dedication of the church is to St. Pega. Lewis (*Topog. Dict.* 1849) states that some ancient remains exist at Peakirk bearing the name of *The Hermitage*. St. Pega may be accepted as a genuine English saint, and Peakirk as a satisfactory identification. [C. H.]

PEGASIVS (1), bishop of Troas about A.D. 350-360. His name has been found in a previously unknown letter of the emperor Julian, first published in *Hermes*, 1875, pp. 257-266. This letter gives a very interesting description of a visit paid by Julian to Troy before he became emperor. It describes the graves of Hector and Achilles, and the temple of Minerva as being still honoured by the inhabitants with sacrifices; while the bishop of the place Pegasus seems to have acted as custodian of the temple, and of the images which were in their places and in good order. He had evidently discerned Julian's tendency to Paganism. Julian, upon entering the temple, recognised traces of sacrifices, and asked if the people still sacrificed to the gods. The bishop defended the practice on the analogy of the honour paid by Christians to the martyrs. The bishop turned Pagan on the accession of Julian, but does not seem to have gained much by his apostasy, as Julian's letter was written to plead his cause on the special ground that such converts needed encouragement. This letter is of great interest in view of modern explorations of the site of Troy. (Cf. Boissier's art. on Julian in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, July, 1883, p. 106-108.) [G. T. S.]

PAGASIVS (2), an apostate who on visiting the martyr Basilius presbyter of Ancyra in his prison, in the reign of Julian, was severely reproved by him (*Boll. Acta SS.* 22 Mart. iii. 379; Tillem. vii. 377). [ELVIDIVS (36).]

[C. H.]

PEGASIVS (3), sixth bishop of Perigueux, mentioned as a contemporary by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ii. c. 13; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 210); this was before A.D. 595, and probably in 577 [GREGORIUS (32) TURONENSIS] from its place in the history of the Franks. [J. G.]

PEIRIO ap Caw, Welsh saint of the 6th century, patron of Rhospeirio in Llanellian, Anglesey. (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 230, 254; *Myv. Arch.* ii. 51.) [J. G.]

PELAGIA (1), June 9, virgin and martyr at Antioch about A.D. 306. She drowned herself to avoid defilement, according to St. Ambrose, *De Virgin.* lib. iii. cap. 7, and *Epist.* 37 ad Simplicianum. Chrysostom in his homilies (Migne, *P. G.* t. i. 579) on her feast, says she committed suicide by flinging herself from the roof of her house. Her mother's name is supposed by some to have been Domnina, who also drowned herself with her daughter; see the acts of both in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* pp. 520 and 576. There was a church at C. P. dedicated to St. Pelagia, which Constantinus Copronymus destroyed. Ceillier confuses Pelagia, virgin and martyr of Antioch, with Pelagia the converted actress [PELAGIA (3)], but there was a century and a half between them. [G. T. S.]

PELAGIA (2), May 4, virgin and martyr at Tarsus. She was of singular beauty. Her acts tell a long story about Diocletian's desire to marry her after his own son had committed suicide, upon her conversion to Christianity. Upon her refusal she was put to death by burning in a brazen bull. Her story is told in *AA. SS.* Boll. Mai. i. 454-458, cf. 747. Her Greek acts have been critically reprinted, with learned notes, by H. Usener in his *Legenden der Heiligen Pelagia*, Bonn, 1879, p. 52. She must be carefully distinguished from the two Pelagias of Antioch [PELAGIA (3)]. [G. T. S.]

PELAGIA (3), surnamed MARGARITA, MARINA and PECCATRIX, Oct. 8, an actress of Antioch about the middle of cent. v., celebrated for her repentance. Her history has been the subject of a long discussion in the *AA. SS.* Boll. Oct. iv. 248-268, where she is distinguished from two other Pelagias of Antioch, and Pelagia of Tarsus, martyr under Diocletian. The story of our Pelagia has been told by Jacobus, a deacon and eye-witness of her conversion. Nonnus, bishop of Edessa and successor of Ibas in that see [IBAS, Vol. III. p. 195] [NONNUS (4)], was once preaching at Antioch when present at a synod of eight bishops. Pelagia was then the favourite actress and dancer of Antioch, whose inhabitants had poured riches upon her and surnamed her Margarita from the number of pearls she wore. She came into the church during the sermon, to the astonishment and horror of the other bishops. Nonnus had been an ascetic of the severe order of Pachomius of Tabenna, and he dealt with her. He addressed Pelagia with such plainness and

sternness, touching her sins and the future judgments of God, that she at once repented, and with many tears desired baptism, which, after some delay, was granted to her, the chief deaconess of Antioch, Romana, acting as sponsor for her as well as assisting at her baptism according to custom. Her acts then tell of the assaults made upon her by the devil, and his attempts to win her back to sin. She finally left Antioch, and withdrew to a cell on the Mount of Olives, where she lived as a monk in male attire, and died some three years afterwards from her excessive austerities. Jacobus, the deacon, gives us an account of a visit he paid to her there. It is very interesting as offering a description of an anchorite's cell, such as can be seen to this day in many places in Ireland, as at St. Doulough's church near Dublin, at the abbey of Fore in the co. Westmeath, and in considerable numbers in the monastic island of Inismurry, off the coast of Sligo in Donegal Bay. She was living as an enclosed anchorite, in a cell without any door, and with a window through which alone the occupant communicated with the external world. Her whole history is full of interesting touches, describing the ancient ritual of baptism and other ecclesiastical usages. Hermann Usener published in 1879 a treatise concerning her *Legenden der Heiligen Pelagia*, in which he printed her Acts in Greek, discussed their historical difficulties, and maintained in a lengthened introduction that the whole story was only an adaptation to Christian uses of the legend of the Semitic Aphrodite, which took various shapes all along the Syrian coasts, and among the Mediterranean islands. He quotes (p. xxi.) an inscription *C. I. L.* iii. 3066, which expressly gives the name of Pelagia to Venus. His theory is very interesting, and is worked out with much learning. It is the same as that which Baring-Gould, in his *Myths of the Middle Ages*, has already applied to the history of St. George of England [GEORGIUS (43)]. It has a basis of truth. The church certainly largely adopted holy places and days from the Pagans, but she connected them with Christian persons or facts. She had plenty of martyrs and saints for this purpose, without being compelled to dress up a Pagan deity in Christian attire. The mere identity of names is nothing, otherwise we might resolve hundreds of well-authenticated Christian martyrs and saints into Pagan gods. Usener gives, in pp. 29 and 30, an exhaustive analysis of the Latin, Greek, and Syriac MSS. of Pelagia's Acts, with very full notes on the Greek text. T. Gildemeister published Pelagia's Syriac Acts in the Bonn Universitäts-Programm of 22nd March, 1879. Cf. Wright's *Cat. Syr.* MSS. in *Brit. Mus.* p. 1101, num. 948.

[G. T. S.]

PELAGIANUS, bishop of Luperciana. (*Scntt. Epp.* 44, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii.) The name of his see is not found in the geographies or in any inscription. Morcelli ingeniously guesses that, from its Roman name and the worship or dedication implied by it, it was probably in the Roman province of Africa where Roman observances most prevailed. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, p. 496, indicates perhaps, though not so strongly as Morcelli says, that the cultus of the Luperci was not found in Asia.

[E. W. B.]

PELAGIUS (1), bishop of Laodicea in Syria Prima. While very young he became betrothed, and fulfilled his engagement, but on his wedding day he persuaded his bride to embrace with himself a life of continence (*Theod. H. E.* iv. 13). On account of his piety and many virtues he was chosen unanimously to the bishopric of Laodicea, to which he was ordained by Acacius of Caesarea (*Philostorg. H. E.* v. 1). He was present at the synod of Antioch in 363, and signed the letter of the bishops to Jovian declaring their adherence to the Nicene faith (*Labbe*, ii. 828; *Soer. H. E.* iii. 25; *Soz. H. E.* vi. 4). He was banished by Valens for his orthodoxy in 367 to Arabia (*Theod. H. E.* iv. 13). On his recall he attended the orthodox synod of Tyana in 367 (*Soz. H. E.* vi. 12), as well as that of Antioch in 378, where he signed the tome published by the Roman synod under Damasus in 369 (*Labbe*, ii. 894). In 372 he signed the letter drawn up by Meletius at the request of Basil, to the western bishops requesting their aid in redressing the evils of the Eastern Church (*Basil, Ep.* 93 [69]). In 376 Basil wrote to him expressing his desire to see him once again (*ibid.* 254 [311]). At the Council of Constantinople in 381 he, like Diodorus of Tarsus, was named one of those orthodox Eastern bishops communion with whom was a test of orthodoxy, and to whom the administration of the Churches of the East was committed (*Soer. H. E.* v. 8; *Soz. H. E.* vii. 9; *Theod. H. E.* v. 8; *Labbe*, ii. 955; *Facund.* iv. 2; and *Le Quien, Or. Christ.* ii. 793).

[E. V.]

PELAGIUS (2). The particulars of the early life and career of Pelagius, whose name is identified with the prominent subject of theological controversy of Latin Christendom in the 5th century, are very imperfectly known from contemporary history. He is said by Augustine, Prosper, Gennadius, Orosius, and Mercator to have been a Briton. Jerome speaks of him as coming of the Scottish race (*habet progeniem Scotiae gentis de Britannorum vicina*, Pref. lib. 3 in Jerem.), which may imply that he was an Irishman, the Scoti being at that time settled in Ireland. The name Pelagius undoubtedly looks like a Grecised version of some earlier name; but the tradition that the original name of the heresiarch was Morgan (*Marigena, Πελάγιος*), and that he came from Bangor in North Wales, rests on late and untrustworthy authority. The date of his birth is uncertain. It was probably about A.D. 370. The earliest information obtainable about him is that he was a monk, though he does not appear to have been a member of any particular religious community. It is expressly recorded that he was not in holy orders. Both Orosius and pope Zosimus speak of him as a layman. It is a question whether he is to be identified with the monk Pelagius, whose defection from his own cause St. John Chrysostom so bitterly lamented in a letter written to Olympias in the year 405 during his exile in Armenia. On the supposition that St. Chrysostom was speaking of the most famous bearer of the name, this would be the earliest historical notice of Pelagius, and would imply that he had been resident some time in the East; and some probability might be given to this hypothesis by the marked influence of the Eastern type of

thought upon his subsequent theological opinions. But the ascertained dates of incidents in the career of Pelagius seem to forbid the identification. Pelagius came to Rome very early in the 5th century. If the authority of Mercator is to be accepted, that he imbibed his opinions from Rufinus the Syrian in the episcopate of Anastasius, we must fix the date of Pelagius's arrival in Rome not later than A.D. 401, and he did not leave that city till A.D. 409. His personal character at this period of his life is spoken of with the utmost respect by his contemporaries. His great opponent St. Augustine describes him as being generally held to be a good and holy man, and of no mean proficiency as a Christian (*De Pecc. Mer.* iii. 1). Paulinus, bishop of Nola, who was much attached to him, esteemed him as a special servant of God. The coarse and abusive language in which in later years Jerome charged Pelagius with gross self-indulgence and deformities produced by an unrestrained sensualism is utterly unworthy of credit, for it is inconsistent with all that is known of him, and must therefore be dismissed as a calumny of unscrupulous opponents in the heat of theological controversy. Pelagius, upon taking up his residence at Rome, was actuated by a strong moral purpose, enforcing the necessity of a strict Christian morality as against a laxity of life which would content itself with external religious observances. It is to this period, before he had gained notoriety by the propagation of his peculiar opinions on the great subjects of grace and free-will, that must be assigned the composition of three works which Pelagius wrote. These were partly of a speculative and partly of a practical tendency. His first published work was a treatise in three books on the Trinity. The second was a collection of passages from Scripture, all bearing on points of Christian practice, called by Gennadius, *Eulogiarum Liber*, by Augustine and Orosius, *Testimoniorum Liber*. It was arranged after the model of St. Cyprian's treatise *Testimonia* (*Aug. Contra duas Pelag. epp.* iv. 21). The third was an exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul. This seems to have been a series of short explanatory notes on the thirteen epistles of St. Paul, and extracts from them are occasionally given in St. Augustine (*De Gestis Pel.* 39). This book has had a curious literary history. It was attributed at one time to Gelasius; for many centuries it passed under the name of Jerome, the bitterest opponent of Pelagius. It has in all probability been largely altered and modified by later editors, in order to purge it from the expression of opinions of a heretical tendency. There can, however, be no doubt that the work which appears in all the printed editions of St. Jerome's works is substantially that of Pelagius, for it coincides with the quotations given by St. Augustine and Mercator as expressly derived from Pelagius.

At Rome Pelagius became acquainted with Caelestius, whose name was so intimately associated with his own in the subsequent controversy. Caelestius had originally been an advocate (*auditorialis Scholasticus*), but was converted by the influence of Pelagius to a stricter form of religious life, and very soon became an ardent disciple of his master, whose views as they became more advanced he openly maintained and enforced by his writings. Setting aside as im-

probable the injurious imputations with which the hostility of later opponents attempted to blast the character of Pelagius, it is evident that during his long residence at Rome he was animated with a sincere desire to become a moral reformer. He set before him a high standard of righteousness as demanded of sincere Christians, and advocated a severity of life which was unwelcome to the luxurious and corrupt practice of the contemporary church. But the consciousness of the necessity of a pure and self-denying morality as an element in religion, led him to lay exaggerated stress upon the native capacity of the free will of man, to form a wrong estimate of the actual moral condition of human nature, and to overlook or fatally undervalue the necessity of Divine aid in effecting the restoration of man to righteousness. The first symptoms of his antagonism to those theories of St. Augustine which were then developing themselves and obtaining general acceptance in the Western Church are exhibited in an anecdote which we learn from St. Augustine himself (*De Dono Persev.* c. 53). Pelagius was violently indignant on hearing a bishop quote with approbation the famous passage in the Confessions of St. Augustine, where he prays to God, Give what Thou dost command, and command what Thou wilt (*Da quod jubes et jube quod vis*). This language appeared to Pelagius to involve an intolerable disregard of the freedom of human action, and to make man a mere puppet in the hands of his Creator. It was about the same time apparently (A.D. 405), that Pelagius wrote a letter to Paulinus (*Aug. de grat. Christi*, 38), which evidently touched upon the disputed questions of nature and grace. This letter is not extant, but St. Augustine, who had read it, declared that it dwelt almost entirely upon the power and capacity of nature, only in the most cursory manner making reference to divine grace, and leaving it doubtful whether by grace Pelagius meant only the forgiveness of sins, and the teaching and example of Christ, or that influence of the Spirit of God, which corresponds to grace proper, and is an inward inspiration. Pelagius remained at Rome till about the year 409, when in consequence of the threatened invasion of that city by Alaric, he withdrew in company with Caelestius to Sicily, and after a short interval proceeded to Africa. He visited Hippo Regius, from which at the time its great bishop Augustine happened to be absent, and therefore the opportunity of meeting his future opponent in his own city was denied him. Pelagius seems to have remained quiet at Hippo, but shortly afterwards repaired to Carthage, where he saw Augustine once or twice. Augustine was at that time deeply involved in the Donatist controversy, but it was then apparently that he first learned, in casual conversation with some Christians, that Pelagius and his friends had begun to advocate and openly propagate certain views which startled him by their novelty. The obnoxious opinion was broached that infants were not baptized for the remission of sins, but for the sake of obtaining a higher sanctification through union with Christ. This novel doctrine appeared to Augustine to be a denial of the accepted teaching of the Church, as it virtually involved the denial of any guilt of original sin which needed forgiveness, even in the case of infants. As, however, Augustine was pre-

occupied at the time with his vindication of the church against the Donatist errors, and did not ascribe much weight to the personal influence of the chief upholders of the new heresy, he refrained from immediately writing in defence of the doctrine assailed. Pelagius, after a short interval, sailed for Palestine, leaving his friend Caelestius behind him at Carthage. In Palestine he was soon introduced to Jerome, at that time residing in his famous monastery at Bethlehem, surrounded by Eustochium and Paula, and others whom he had persuaded to adopt an ascetic life of seclusion from the world. Caelestius, left behind at Carthage, had continued openly to disseminate his peculiar views, and on proceeding to seek ordination as a presbyter, was accused of heresy before the bishop Aurelius. A council was summoned at Carthage in A.D. 412, at which, however, Augustine was not present, and the accusation was conducted by Paulinus the deacon and biographer of Ambrose of Milan. The charges brought against Caelestius were seven in number. It was alleged that he taught (1) That Adam was created liable to death, and would have died, whether he had sinned or not. (2) That the sin of Adam hurt himself only, and not the human race. (3) That infants at their birth are in the same state as Adam was before the fall. (4) That neither by the death nor the fall of Adam does the whole race of man die, nor by the resurrection of Christ the whole race of man rise again. (5) That the Law introduces men into the kingdom of heaven, just in the same way as the Gospel does. (6) That even before the coming of Christ there were some men sinless, i.e. men as a matter of fact without sin. (7) That infants, even though they are not baptized, have eternal life.

Caelestius was heard in his own defence, and endeavoured to explain away some of his assertions. He declared that he fully admitted the necessity of baptism for infants, and their need of a share in the divine redemption. But his explanations were judged evasive, and his doctrines were condemned as unscriptural and contrary to the Catholic faith. A sentence of excommunication was passed upon himself and his followers. He proposed at first to appeal from the sentence of the council to the bishop of Rome, but abandoning the intention shortly afterwards sailed from Carthage to Ephesus. The prevalence which the opinions of Caelestius and his party had obtained, and the efforts which were made to diffuse them, led Augustine to denounce them both in private conversation, and in his public sermons. In three or four of his sermons delivered at this time (170, 174, 175), he devotes himself to the refutation of the innovating doctrines, though he still abstains from mentioning by name their chief upholders. His first written treatise on the controversy which was subsequently to engross so much of his literary efforts was called forth in reply to a letter addressed to him by his friend Marcellinus, who was troubled by daily assaults of Pelagian disputations. Marcellinus solicited the judgment of Augustine upon the doctrines that Adam would have died independently of his sin, and that his transgression proved injurious only to himself and did not in any way affect his descendants, and that the baptism of infants was not necessary for the remission of original sin, from

which they were wholly exempt, but of actual sin, of which they were potentially capable. The book in which the questions proposed to him by Marcellinus were discussed Augustine calls indifferently a treatise on the Deserts and Remission of Sins or on Infant Baptism, which church rite necessarily formed a prominent subject in the controversy. The work originally consisted of two books. The first book established the positions, that death in man was the penalty of sin, and not a mere condition of his natural constitution; that the whole offspring of Adam was affected by his sin, and that the purpose of baptism of infants is the remission of that original sin, the guilt of which they bear from their birth. Almost the whole of this book seems to have been a reply to a Pelagian treatise of some anonymous writer (*De Pecc. Mer.* i. 64). In the second book Augustine argued that the first man might have lived without sin by the grace of God and his own free will; that as a matter of fact no living man is wholly free from sin, the reason of this being that no man wills all that he ought to do, owing to his ignorance of what is right, or his want of delight in doing it; that the only man absolutely without sin is Christ, the God-man and Mediator. Augustine added by way of appendix as a third book of this treatise a letter which he wrote to Marcellinus when a very few days after the compilation of the former books he became acquainted with some fresh arguments against original sin advanced in the exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul by Pelagius, who, however, put the arguments in the mouth of another, and did not avowedly express them as his own. Throughout the two first books of this treatise Augustine never mentions Pelagius or Caelestius by name, possibly hoping that they might yet be won back to the orthodox faith; in the third book, while arguing strongly against the views of the nature of original sin propounded by Pelagius, he speaks of Pelagius with marked respect. He goes so far as to call him a signally Christian man, a highly advanced Christian (*vir ille tam egregie Christianus, De Pecc. Mer.* iii. 6; *non parvo propectu Christianus, id.* iii. 1).

Marcellinus was somewhat disturbed by the assertion of Augustine that it was abstractedly possible for man to live without sin, though as a matter of fact no man actually exhibited this sinless perfection. To quiet the perplexity of his friend, Augustine immediately wrote a second small treatise in one book, *On the Spirit and the Letter*, so entitled because it diverged into a discussion of the famous passage of St. Paul in 2 Cor. iii. 6. It is a beautiful and profoundly spiritual description of the way in which the letter of the law, whilst it enlightens the soul in the knowledge of duty, is unable to impart the power for its fulfilment, and therefore only evokes the consciousness of sin, whilst the grace of the Spirit kindles in the soul a new life and strengthens the will to holiness of conduct.

Pelagianism still continued to propagate and assert itself, and found many upholders in Carthage. It claimed to support itself by the authority of the Eastern Churches, whose tendency had always been to lay stress on the power of the human will, and boldly retorting the accusation of innovation, it declared that the views of Augustine, and the dominant party in Africa

were a departure from the old orthodoxy. This new move roused the indignation of Augustine. In a sermon preached on June 27, A.D. 413, after reading the Gospel containing the account of the discourse of our Lord with Nicodemus, he proceeded to handle the subject of infant baptism, and addressed himself particularly to the refutation of some new phases of Pelagian opinion. From this sermon we learn that the Pelagians now taught that infants were baptized, not because they needed any remission of the guilt of original or actual sin, from which they were wholly free, but in order that they might enter into the kingdom of God, and thereby obtain salvation and eternal life. The critical passage of St. Paul in Rom. v. 12, which declared that "by one man sin entered into the world," they interpreted as meaning that Adam sinned by an act of free choice, and so caused all his descendants to sin by the imitation of his example. If, they scoffingly asked, men are born sinners from a sinful parent, why are not men born righteous from believing parents who have been justified by baptism? If Adam's sin hurt those who had not sinned, why, by parity of consequence, should not the death of Christ profit those who have not believed on Him? The preacher, towards the close of his sermon, read to the congregation from the epistle of their famous martyred bishop St. Cyprian, written A.D. 255, a passage in which the judgment of the church of his day was emphatically pronounced that baptism was administered to infants for the remission of sin, which they had contracted through their birth, and ended by making an earnest appeal to his opponents not to persevere in the maintenance of opinions which, being hostile to such a fundamental point of church doctrine and practice as infant baptism, must be disowned by the church as heretical. He entreated them, as friends, to see the error into which they were drifting, and not to provoke a formal sentence of condemnation. About the same time he received a letter from Pelagius himself, who was still in Palestine, to which he replied in friendly and affectionate terms. This letter is preserved in Augustine's own treatise *De Gestis Pelagii* (c. 52), where Augustine points out the unfair inferences in his own favour which Pelagius had endeavoured to found on it at the synod of Diospolis.

The condemnation of Pelagianism by the synod of Carthage deterred its more prominent upholders from the continued open assertion of their peculiar doctrines, and induced them to be content with their more quiet and secret circulation in church circles. Adherents increased to such an extent that Augustine professed himself in alarm as to where the evil might break out afresh (*Epist.* 157). The tidings of such a fresh outbreak came to him in the following year (A.D. 414) from Sicily, where one Hilary wrote to him informing him that some Christians at Syracuse were asserting that man can be without sin, and easily keep the commandments of God, if he will; that an unbaptized infant overtaken by death cannot possibly perish deservedly, as he is born without sin. These were evidently forms of Pelagian teaching. Other opinions mentioned by Hilary at the same time as held by these Syracusans exhibit a fresh development of Pelagian thought, if they really originated

from the same source. These were that a rich man cannot enter the kingdom of God unless he sell all that he has, and that it cannot avail him to keep the commandments of God, if he does this whilst still retaining his riches and availing himself of their help. Such an assertion of the necessity of the monastic renunciation of private property as a condition of religious life was probably an exaggeration of the real teaching of the monks of the West, Pelagius and Caelestius. Augustine sent an elaborate reply to this letter of Hilary, in which he repeated many of the arguments which he had before employed in his already written treatises. About the same time it came to his knowledge that two young men of good birth and liberal education, Timasius and James, had been induced by the influence and exhortations of Pelagius to renounce the world and adopt the monastic life, and had adopted many of the peculiar opinions of their master. They had however been powerfully impressed with the arguments of Augustine on the nature of Christian grace, and forwarded to him a book of Pelagius, to which they requested Augustine to give a detailed answer. This he did in his treatise *De Naturâ et Gratiâ*. The book of Pelagius, if we may rely upon the fairness of the quotations made from it by Augustine, and there is no reason to distrust them, advocated in the interests of morality the adequacy of human nature for good action. It affirmed that it was possible to live without sin by the grace or help of God. But the grace thus recognised was the natural endowment of free will, itself the gift of God, though sometimes the conception of it was enlarged so as to include the knowledge of right conveyed by the Law. Sin was pronounced to be avoidable if men were to be truly accounted responsible moral agents, and sin being rather a negation than a positive entity could not vitiate human nature. When man has actually sinned he needs forgiveness. Nature was magnified, as if the admission of a subsequent corruption was derogatory to the goodness of the original creation. The instances of all the Old Testament worthies who are described as having lived righteously were appealed to as proofs of the possibility of living without sin. It is obvious that the continuance of controversy was leading Pelagius to a more formal and systematic development of his theory.

The same tendency to systematisation is seen in a document of definitions or arguments attributed to Caelestius, which was communicated to Augustine by two bishops, Eutropius and Paul, as having been circulated in the Sicilian Church. A series of sixteen, or as some condense them, fourteen questions is designed to point out the difficulties of the Augustinian theory, and to establish the contrary theory by one ever-recurring dilemma, that either man can live entirely free from sin, or the freedom of the human will and its consequent moral responsibility must be denied. Augustine replied to this document early in A.D. 415, in his treatise *De Perfectione Justitiæ Hominis*, addressed to the two bishops who had called his attention to this dialectical vindication of Pelagianism.

The scene of the controversy now changed from Africa to Palestine, where Pelagius had been resident for some years. In the beginning

of A.D. 415, Paulus Orosius, a presbyter from Tarragona in Spain, came over to Africa in order to consult Augustine as to certain questions connected with Origenism and Priscillianism, which were being stirred in his native land. He had conceived an intense admiration for Augustine, and became one of his most devoted disciples. Augustine describes him as quick in understanding, fluent in speech, and fervent in zeal. After giving him such instruction as he required on the subjects in which he was seeking guidance, he sent him to Jerome, at Bethlehem, ostensibly for the purpose of obtaining further instruction, but in reality to watch the proceedings of Pelagius, and announce to the church in Palestine the steps which had been taken in the African church for the suppression of the rising heresy. Orosius reached Palestine in June, and spent a few weeks with Jerome, who was at this time occupied in writing his Dialogue against the Pelagians. He was invited to a synod at Jerusalem held on July 28, and was asked what he could tell the assembled presbyters as to Pelagius and Caelestius. He gave an account of the formal condemnation of Caelestius by the council of Carthage in A.D. 412, and mentioned that Augustine was writing a treatise in answer to a work of Pelagius, and read a copy of the letter on the controversy addressed by Augustine to Hilary. Thereupon the bishop John desired that Pelagius himself should be sent for, and have an opportunity of personally defending himself from any charges of unsound doctrine which might be alleged against him. Pelagius, on his introduction, was asked by the presbyters whether he had really taught the doctrines against which Augustine protested. He bluntly replied, And who is Augustine to me? This bold and contemptuous rejection of the name and authority of the great bishop whose influence was paramount in the West, owing to his signal services in the Donatist controversy, roused the indignation of the presbyters, but the presiding bishop was not deterred by their clamour. To the amazement of Orosius he admitted Pelagius, layman and alleged heretic as he was, to a seat among the presbyters, and then, asserting his own independence, exclaimed, I am Augustine here. He proceeded to hear what charges might be made against Pelagius himself. Orosius thereupon said that Pelagius, according to his own confession, had taught that man can be without sin, and can easily keep the commandments of God, if he will. Pelagius acknowledged that he could not deny that he had used such language. Orosius claimed that such doctrine should be at once denounced as untenable on the authority of the recent council at Carthage, and of the writings of Augustine and their own venerated neighbour Jerome, who in a letter to Ctesiphon had recently expressed his sentiments on this novel mode of thought. The bishop took no heed of this vehement appeal and attempt to pronounce sentence without giving the accused the opportunity of a full hearing. He himself quoted the scriptural instances of Abraham, who was bidden "to walk before God and be perfect," and of Zacharias and Elizabeth who were described as "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the law blameless," as affording at all events a *primâ facie* justification for the statements of Pelagius. The diffi-

culty of discussion was increased by the circumstance that several members of the assembly were ignorant of Latin, and the aid of an indifferent interpreter had to be employed. The tables were now turned upon the accuser, for the bishop argued, If Pelagius said that man could fulfil the commands of God without the aid of God, his doctrine would be wicked and worthy of condemnation, but as he maintained that man could be free from sin not without the aid of God, to deny this position would be to deny the efficacy of Divine grace. Orosius proceeded to anathematize the notion of such a denial of grace, and seeing that John was unwilling to admit a charge of heresy against Pelagius, appealed to another tribunal. Declaring the heresy to be of Latin origin, and its dangerous tendency to be most formidable in the Latin churches, where it had chiefly been promulgated, he demanded that the whole question should be referred to pope Innocent, as the chief bishop of Latin Christianity. To avoid further risks this compromise was accepted. The whole account of the proceedings of this synod at Jerusalem is derived from the *Apology* of Orosius, and must be received with some deductions, having regard to the fiery and intemperate invective which the impassioned Spaniard lavishes upon Pelagius and all his followers.

This effort to quell Pelagianism having proved unsuccessful, it was determined by the opposing party to attempt a fresh judicial investigation of the incriminated doctrines before a tribunal of higher authority. If we may believe Pelagius himself, this renewed effort was the result of the influence of Jerome and a small knot of ardent sympathizers who made Bethlehem their headquarters. Towards the end of the same year, A.D. 415, two deposed Western bishops, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, laid a formal accusation against Pelagius before a synod, which met at Diospolis (the ancient Lydda) under the presidency of Eulogius, bishop of Caesarea and metropolitan. Fourteen bishops attended this synod, Eulogius, John, Ammonianus, Eutonius, two Porphyrys, Fidus, Zomnus, Zoboennus, Nymphidius, Chromatius, Jovinus, Eleutherius, and Clematius. When the time for hearing the accusation came on, the two accusers were absent owing to the illness of one of them, but a document (libellus) was handed in containing the principal charges. The propositions which it was alleged Pelagius had maintained were some of them of an ambiguous character, capable of being explained in either an orthodox or heretical sense, and some of them quotations from writings of Caelestius and other members of the party, for which Pelagius declined to be held personally responsible. It was objected to him that he had said that no one could be without sin, unless he had the knowledge of the law. On being asked whether he had used that language, he acknowledged that he had, but not in the sense which his opponents attached to it; he had intended by it to say that man is helped by the knowledge of the law to keep free from sin. The synod admitted that such teaching was not contrary to the mind of the church. It was charged again that he had affirmed that all men are governed by their own will. Pelagius explained that he had intended by this to assert the responsibility of man's free will, which God aids in its choice of good; the

man who sins is himself in fault as transgressing of his own free will. This too was pronounced to be in agreement with church teaching, for how could anyone condemn the recognition of free will or deny its existence, when the possibility of God's aid to it was acknowledged? It was alleged that Pelagius had declared that in the day of judgment the wicked and sinners would not be spared, but would be burned with everlasting fire, and it was inferred from this that he had intended thereby to imply that all sinners would meet eternal punishment, even those who had substantially belonged to Christ—it was probably implied that such teaching was a denial of the temporary purgatorial fire which was to purify the imperfectly righteous. Pelagius replied by quoting the words of the Saviour Himself, as given in St. Matth. xxv. 46, and declaring that whoever believed otherwise was an Origenist. This satisfied the synod. It was alleged that he wrote that evil did not even enter the thought of the good Christian. He defended himself by saying that what he had actually said was that the Christian ought to study not even to think evil. The synod naturally saw no objection to such language. It was alleged that he had disparaged the grace of the New Testament by saying that the kingdom of heaven is promised even in the Old Testament. It was supposed that by this he had proclaimed a doctrine that salvation could be obtained by the observance of the works of the law. He explained it as a vindication of the divine authority of the Old Testament dispensation, and its prophetic character. It was alleged that he had said that man can, if he will, be without sin, and that in writing a letter of commendation to a widow who had assumed the ascetic life, he used fulsome and adulatory language which glorified her unexampled piety as superlatively meritorious. He explained that though he might have admitted the abstract possibility of sinlessness in man, yet he had never maintained that there had existed any man who had remained sinless from infancy to old age, but that a man on his conversion might continue without sin by his own efforts and the grace of God, though still liable to temptation, and those who held an opposite opinion he begged leave to anathematise not as heretics but as fools. The bishops were satisfied with this acknowledgment that man by the help of God and by grace can be without sin. Other propositions alleged against him, such as those which were condemned by the synod of Carthage in A.D. 412, he declared were not his own, but made by Caelestius and others; yet he was willing freely to disavow them. It is hard to believe that in so doing Pelagius was not pronouncing condemnation on views which he had himself on other occasions maintained. Finally, Pelagius professed his belief in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and in all the teaching of the Holy Catholic Church, and the synod being satisfied of his agreement with sound doctrine, and his rejection of all that was contrary to the faith of the church, acknowledged him as a Catholic and in full communion with the church. It is evident that party feeling ran very high. Jerome was looked upon as having had a chief hand in the prosecution of Pelagius, and apparently by way of vengeance a violent and outrageous

assault was made upon his monastery at Bethlehem, which was ascribed to some of the Pelagian party, with what justice it is not easy to ascertain. As Neander remarks, it is not likely that Pelagius should have had any share in the tumultuous proceedings, as in that case there is no doubt evidence of the outrage would have been laid before the Roman bishop Innocent in the subsequent proceedings. Jerome, regarding the issue of the synod of Diospolis as an utter disappointment, and suspecting the orthodoxy of many of its members, spoke of the assembly as a "miserable synod." Augustine in his treatise *De Gestis Pelagii*, written after he had received a full official record of the proceedings of the synod, argued that Pelagius had only escaped by a legal acquittal of little moral worth, inasmuch as it had been obtained by evasive explanations and condemnation of the very dogmas which he had before professed. It is impossible, however, to read such records as remain of the debates at this synod without perceiving that the Eastern church had not embraced in its entirety the doctrine of grace as formulated by Augustine in the West, and that provided free will and grace were recognised as joint factors in the production of human goodness, it was not anxious to define by precise distinctions the exact limits of each agency.

The controversy once more returned to the West. A synod of more than sixty-nine bishops assembled at Carthage towards the close of A.D. 416. Orosius produced before them the accusations which had been presented against Pelagius by Heros and Lazarus. They recognised in them the same heretical opinions which had been previously condemned at Carthage in A.D. 412, and determined to appeal to Innocent, the bishop of Rome, on the great questions at issue. Granting that the synods of Jerusalem and Diospolis might have been justified in the acquittal of Pelagius on the ground of his explanations and evasions and disclaimers of responsibility for some of the positions alleged, they called attention to the continued prevalence of doctrines which affirmed the sufficiency of nature for the avoidance of sin and fulfilment of the commandments of God (thus virtually superseding the need of Divine grace), and which denied the necessity of baptism in the case of infants, as the way of obtaining deliverance from guilt and eternal salvation. A synod held at Mileum in Numidia in the same year, attended by sixty-one bishops, wrote a letter to Innocent to the same effect, and with these two synodical letters was sent also a letter from Augustine and four brother bishops, Aurelius, Alypius, Evodius, and Possidius, in which they sought to minimise the effect of the acquittal of Pelagius in the East at Diospolis by saying that the result had only been obtained by the accused concealing his real sentiments and acknowledging the orthodox faith in ambiguous language, calculated to deceive the Eastern prelates, ignorant as they were of the full force of Latin words, and at the mercy of an interpreter. They demanded that Pelagius should be summoned to Rome and examined afresh, to see whether he acknowledged grace in the full scriptural sense. To enable the Roman bishop to judge dispassionately of the merits of the case they forwarded to him the book of Pelagius, on which

Timasius and James had sought the judgment of Augustine, and the book (*De Naturâ et Gratiâ*) which Augustine had written in answer to this request. They specially marked some passages in the work of Pelagius, from which they thought Innocent must inevitably draw the conclusion that Pelagius allowed no other grace than the nature with which God had originally endowed man. Innocent answered this threefold appeal in three letters written on Jan. 27, 417. He began each with a strong assertion of the supreme authority of his see, and many expressions of his satisfaction that the controversy had been referred to him for final decision. He expressed his doubt whether the record of the proceedings at Diospolis which had reached him was to be trusted as authentic. The book of Pelagius forwarded to him he pronounced unhesitatingly to be blasphemous and dangerous, and gave his judgment that Pelagius, Caelestius, and all abettors of their views ought to be excommunicated.

Innocent died on March 12, 417, and was succeeded by Zosimus, whose name seems to indicate his Eastern origin. Caelestius who on his expulsion from Africa had gone to Ephesus, where he obtained ordination as presbyter, left that city and proceeded to Constantinople, from which, as he began disseminating his peculiar opinions, he was driven by its bishop, Atticus. Without delay he repaired to Rome, to clear himself of the suspicions and charges which were urged against him. He laid before the new pope Zosimus a confession of his faith, which after going minutely into an elaborate exposition of the chief articles of the Catholic Faith proceeded to make reference to the controverted doctrines of grace. Treating them as really lying outside the limits of necessary articles of faith, he submitted himself to the judgment of the apostolic see, if in any way he had gone astray from scriptural truth. He professed his belief that infants ought to be baptized for the remission of sins in accordance with church practice, as the Lord had appointed that the kingdom of heaven could not be bestowed save upon the baptized. But in acknowledging that infants ought to be baptized for the remission of sins, he did not admit that they derived sin by propagation; sin is not born with man, but is his own act of choice. To impute evil to human nature antecedently to any exercise of the will he held to be injurious to the Creator, as making Him the author of evil. Zosimus held a synod in the Basilica of St. Clement. He asked Caelestius whether he condemned all the errors ascribed to him. Caelestius answered that he condemned all that Innocent of blessed memory, the predecessor of his judge, condemned, and was ready to condemn all that the Apostolic see deemed heretical. Zosimus declined to pronounce a definitive sentence; at the same time he deprived and excommunicated the bishops Heros and Lazarus, who had not appeared to substantiate the charges made against the Pelagians, and after an interval of two months, wrote to Aurelius and other African bishops, censuring them for the premature condemnation of Caelestius. He refused to decide upon the merits of the accusation until the accusers of Caelestius appeared face to face with him, whilst he informed the African bishops that he had ad-

monished Caelestius and his followers to abstain from these nice and curious questions, which did not tend to edification. After the despatch of this letter Zosimus received a letter from Praylius, the new bishop of Jerusalem, speaking favourably of Pelagius, and this was accompanied by a letter from Pelagius himself, and a confession of faith, which he had drawn up for presentation to Innocent, but as they reached Rome after Innocent's death, they were delivered to his successor. This letter of Pelagius is lost, and known only by quotations of it made by Augustine. The confession of faith is extant. Like that of Caelestius, it recapitulates the great articles of the Christian faith. In it he declared that he recognised free will in such a way as that man always needs the aid of God, and charged with error both those who say with the Manichaeans that man cannot avoid sin, and those who assert with Jovinian that man cannot sin. He ended with professing his willingness to amend his statements if he had spoken incautiously, and to conform them to the judgment of the prelate "who held the faith and see of Peter." Zosimus had the letter and creed of Pelagius read in public assembly, and pronounced them to be thoroughly Catholic and free from all ambiguity. He even spoke of the Pelagians as men of unimpeachable faith (*absolutae fidei*) who had been wrongly defamed. He wrote a fresh letter to Aurelius and the African bishops, upbraiding them vehemently for their readiness to condemn men without giving them a proper opportunity of self-defence, strongly denouncing the personal character of Heros and Lazarus, as rendering them untrustworthy witnesses, and gratefully acknowledging that Pelagius and his followers had never really been estranged from Catholic truth. It is difficult to see how Zosimus arrived at a conclusion so strikingly different from that of his immediate predecessor. It may have been that the peculiar constitution of his mind did not fit him for the discussion of the deeper questions of theology, and may have led him rather to busy himself with the practical side of ecclesiastical administration. The points at issue had not occupied his attention, and so far as he entered into them, he may have been disposed to take the less rigid views of the Eastern church on original sin, grace, and free-will. It is obvious to conjecture that when he found Caelestius and Pelagius both acknowledge the necessity of grace, he did not trouble himself with any closer examination of what they understood by the term. His language implies that he thought the formal Augustinian theory an attempt to be wise above that which is written, and unprofitable in the interest of Christian morality. Augustine generally passes over in silence this action of Zosimus, speaking of it as an instance of gentle dealing with the accused, and rather implying that Zosimus, with an amiable simplicity, had allowed himself to be deceived by the specious and subtle admissions of the heretics.

The African bishops, though they had applied to Rome, were not willing to accept without remonstrance the judgment pronounced by the bishop in favour of opinions which long study had taught them to regard as inimical to the faith and destructive of all true spiritual life. Meeting together at Carthage, they drew up a

long letter to Zosimus, in which they defended themselves from the charges of hastiness and uncharitableness which he had brought against them, justified the condemnation of Pelagianism pronounced by Innocent, and entreated Zosimus to make a fresh enquiry into the doctrines of Caelestius. The subdeacon Marcellinus was the bearer of this letter. Zosimus replied in a letter, March 21, 418, extolling in extravagant terms the dignity of his own position as the supreme judge of religious appeals, but declaring that he had not taken any further steps, hinting also at the possibility of reconsidering the question. On May 1, 418, a full council of the African church, composed of 214, or as others enumerate them 224, bishops, was held in the basilica of Faustus at Carthage, under the presidency of Aurelius. This council was unwilling to wait for a theological determination of the see of Rome, but asserting its own independence, formulated nine canons in which the principal Pelagian dogmas were anathematised, some of them probably being a republication of canons passed at former minor councils.^a Anathemas were pronounced on the doctrine that infants derive no original sin from Adam which needs expiation in baptism, and that there is some middle place of happiness in the kingdom of heaven for infants, who depart this life without baptism. In like manner a strong protest was made against the views that the grace of God by which we are justified through Jesus Christ avails only for the forgiveness of past sin, and not for aid against the commission of sin, or that grace is only the revelation of the will of God, and not an inspiring principle of righteousness, or that grace only enables us to do more easily what God commands. The two concluding canons point to a peculiar application of Pelagian doctrine, which was a curious anticipation of the teaching of some modern sectaries. They reject the idea that the petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our sins," is inappropriate for Christian men in their own case, and can only be regarded as a prayer for others, and that it can only be used as a fictitious expression of humility, and not as a true confession of guilt.

Appeal was now made to the civil power. Possibly the intervention of Count Valerius, an intimate friend of Augustine, may have been employed in bringing to an end the controversy which was distracting the Western church. The emperors Honorius and Theodosius issued a decree banishing Pelagius and Caelestius from Rome, and pronouncing a sentence of confiscation and banishment upon all their followers. An imperial letter communicating this decree was forwarded to the African bishops. Zosimus, whether in vacillation or in alarm at the strong force of the dominant Catholic opinion which had now enlisted the state in its support, proceeded to investigate the subject afresh, and summoned Caelestius before him for fuller examination. Caelestius, seeing the inevitable result, withdrew from Rome. Zosimus thereupon issued a circular letter (*epistola tractoria*) confirming the decisions of the North African

church.^b He censured as contrary to the Catholic faith the tenets of Pelagius and Caelestius, particularly selecting for reprobation certain passages from Pelagius's Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, which since his former consideration of the case had been laid before him, and ordered all bishops in the churches acknowledging his authority to subscribe to the terms of his letter on pain of deprivation. This subscription was enforced through North Africa under the protection of the imperial edict by Aurelius, the bishop and president of the council at Carthage, and in Italy under the authority of the prefect. Eighteen bishops in Italy refused to subscribe, and were immediately deprived of their sees. The ablest and most celebrated of these was Julian, bishop of Eclanum in Apulia, who entered into controversy with Augustine with much learning and critical power, and a temper which his opponents might well have emulated. He complained, not without some degree of justice, that the anti-Pelagian party were attempting to suppress their opponents by the strong hand of imperial authority rather than to convince them by an appeal to reason. He charged the Roman bishop and clergy with a complete departure from their former convictions, and complaining that subscription to the letter of Zosimus was being enforced on individual bishops in isolation and not at a deliberate synod, demanded a further consideration of the points at issue in a fresh council, refusing to acknowledge the dogmatic authority of the North African church. A letter which was commonly supposed to be written by him was circulated in Rome, the professed object of which was to shew the mischievous consequences of the dominant anti-Pelagian doctrine, and another letter, written in the name of the eighteen deprived bishops of Italy to Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica, and remonstrating against their condemnation, was probably drawn up by Julian. The two letters came into the hands of Boniface, who at the end of the year succeeded Zosimus as bishop of Rome, and were communicated by him through Alypius to Augustine, who replied to them in his treatise *Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum*, addressed to Boniface. He subsequently pursued the argument against Julian at much greater length, first in a treatise *contra Julianum* in six books, written in A.D. 421, and then in the closing years of his life in a work left unfinished, of which six books only were completed before his death. Julian throughout his writings sought to cast a prejudice upon the Augustinian form of Catholic doctrine by raising forcible objections to the more unguarded assertions by which it laid itself open to attack by its very exaggerations. He boldly challenged it as a revived form of Manichaeism, not without an implied hint that the early education of Augustine in that heretical form of belief might still be moulding his doctrine. It was objected that the Augustinian system denied the goodness of the original creation of God—represented marriage, although a divine institution, as necessarily evil and sinful—disparaged the righteousness of the Old Testament saints—denied free will and its

^a These canons were ascribed by Baronius and others to the synod of Mileum, but the oldest copy preserved at Ghent, and Photius and pope Caelestine all agree in ascribing them to this council of Carthage, held in 418.

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV

^b A fragment of this circular letter is preserved in Augustine, *Epist.* 190.

consequent moral responsibility—and nullified belief in the forgiveness of all sins at baptism. Augustine showed that these were unfair deductions from his statements of doctrine, maintaining that the original goodness of man's nature is not incompatible with the recognition of its corruption after Adam's fall, that the Old Testament described the holy lives of the saints without asserting their sinlessness and freedom from temptation; that free will was so vitiated by the fall that it was powerless for righteousness, without the preventient and co-operating grace of God, and that even after the forgiveness conveyed in baptism there remained the sinful element or concupiscence. In meeting another objection of Julian, that the anti-Pelagians brought these high points of theological doctrine before the uneducated masses, who were incompetent judges, instead of arguing them before men of rational culture, Augustine could confidently and successfully appeal to the popular consciousness of Christendom, as bearing witness to man's moral impotence and his need of redemption. The experience of the human heart was, after all, a better judge of such spiritual facts than the most subtle arguments of reason and conflicting interpretations of the meaning of the New Testament.

The tendency of Pelagianism to underrate the necessity of the divine redemption, and to disparage the dignity of the Person of the Redeemer by denying his sinless humanity, is manifested in the case of Leporius. He was a monk and presbyter of Southern Gaul who had embraced Pelagian views, but coming into Africa had been reclaimed from them by Augustine. In making his recantation he acknowledges that he had taught that Jesus Christ as a mere man was liable to sin and temptation, but by his own efforts and exertions without divine aid had attained to perfect holiness. Jesus had not come into the world to redeem mankind from sin, but to set them an example of holy living (Cassian, *de Incarn.* i. 234; Gennadius, *de Script. Eccles.* 59). Leporius's peculiar anthropology had thus coloured his theological conception of the God-Man. Annianus, a deacon of Celada, wrote at the same time in defence of Pelagian views, and at the suggestion of Orontius, one of the deposed bishops, translated the homilies of John Chrysostom on St. Matthew in the interest of a high morality as he alleged. He claimed Chrysostom as a powerful upholder of evangelical perfection, a firm asserter of the integrity of human nature against any Manichean notions of its essentially evil character, and of the free will which it was the glory of Christianity to recognise in opposition to any Pagan ideas of fate and necessity. For this reason he recommended for purposes of edification the writings of Chrysostom as giving co-ordinate prominence to grace and free will.

That Pelagianism was not wholly extinguished even in Italy by the forcible measures adopted against it both by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities is proved by a letter of pope Leo, written about A.D. 444, in which he desired the bishop of Aquileia not to receive into communion any in his province suspected of the heresy before they subscribed a formal renunciation of its errors. The letters of pope Gelasius also refer to occasional outbreaks of the

heresy in Dalmatia and elsewhere towards the end of the 5th century.

Pelagianism came under the formal condemnation of the Eastern church in an incidental way. Several of the deposed Pelagian bishops repaired to Constantinople, where they found Caelestius. Atticus, the patriarch, had refused to receive them, but his successor Nestorius gave them a patient hearing. He wrote to Caelestius, the bishop of Rome, for information about the reasons of their condemnation and the nature of their peculiar doctrines, but received no answer. When Nestorius himself fell into disgrace owing to the assertion of his distinctive heresy touching the person of Christ, he was rather disposed to sympathise with Caelestius and his followers as the objects of persecution by a dominant party. It does not appear that the East had entered into any special discussion of the points raised by the Pelagian controversy; its leading rulers and writers were rather disposed to recognise generally the co-operation of grace and free will, without narrowly determining their limits. But the general council which met at Ephesus in A.D. 431, under the influence of Cyril, joined in the same condemnation the tenets of Nestorius and Caelestius, though it refrained from any specification of them. It pronounced sentence of deposition upon any metropolitan or any cleric who had held or should hereafter hold the views of Nestorius or Caelestius.

The personal history of Pelagius after the condemnation of his views by Zosimus is lost in obscurity. He is said to have died in some small town in Palestine, being upwards of seventy years of age. Caelestius in the same way disappears from history after the council of Ephesus; the time and place of his death are unknown. Julian is said to have died about A.D. 454 in an obscure town of Sicily, where he maintained himself by teaching a school. There is a story that in a time of famine he relieved the poor by parting with all that he had. There is a tradition that in the 9th century the inscription was still visible on his tomb, Here rests in peace Julian, a Catholic bishop.

A modified form of Pelagianism arose in the closing years of Augustine's life, to which later scholastic writers gave the name of semi-Pelagianism. The advocates of the system were spoken of at the time of its introduction as Massilienses, on account of their connexion with the church of Marseilles. Its originator was John Cassian, commonly called a Scythian, though he was probably a native of Gaul. He had been brought up in a monastery at Bethlehem, and after living some time with the monks of Egypt, went to Marseilles, where he founded two monasteries, one for men and one for women. He differed widely in opinion from Pelagius, for he acknowledged that the whole human race was involved in the sin of Adam, and could not be delivered but by the righteousness of the second Adam; that the wills of men are prevented by the grace of God, and that no man is sufficient of himself to begin or to complete any good work. But though he admitted that the first call to salvation sometimes comes to the unwilling, and is the direct result of preventing grace, yet he held that ordinarily grace depends on the working of man's own will. He constantly appeals to the cases of

Zacchaeus and the penitent thief as instances of men who received a call because they were first willing. He protested against ascribing nothing but what is evil and perverse to human nature. He rejected the idea of an absolute predestination, acknowledging, however, a predestination upon foreseen merits and perseverance. Grace is to work with man's own efforts; it is capable of being lost, and is to be retained not by a special gift of perseverance, but by man's own free will. The circulation and acceptance of these views were reported to Augustine by two lay friends, Prosper and Hilary, and by way of meeting them he composed two treatises, one on the Predestination of the Saints, the other on the gift of Perseverance. These treatises defended the doctrines of an arbitrary election and of a will determined wholly by grace, and failed to satisfy the objections felt by the church of Marseilles. The controversy was vigorously maintained on the Augustinian side by Prosper in the celebrated poem *De Ingratis*, full of much bitterness, and advocating the doctrine of irresistible grace. Augustine died in A.D. 430, but the Gallic theologians still felt the deepest objections to the predestinarian views which he had so distinctly enunciated, regarding them as in essence fatalistic and injurious to efforts after moral progress. The monastery at Lerins was one of the principal centres of opposition to ultra-Augustinian views. One of its members, Vincent, the author of the *Commonitorium*, was very probably the Vincent who drew up a series of sixteen objections to the current teaching, to which Hilary replied. God, he declared, did not predestine the wicked to sin, but to punishment; men are condemned for their own misdoings, and are reprobated because God foresaw that they would abuse their free will. Faustus, abbat of Lerins, and afterwards bishop of Riez, in Provence, in A.D. 475 prosecuted one of his presbyters, Lucidus, before a synod at Arles for advocating extreme predestinarian views, and at the request of the synod wrote a book maintaining vigorously the necessity of both grace and man's free will for the fulfilment of God's will. He charged the opposite doctrine with misleading worldly-minded Christians into Antinomianism. A body of Scythian monks at Constantinople in A.D. 520 were greatly disturbed by the opinions expressed by Faustus, and appealed to Hormisdas, bishop of Rome, for a formal condemnation of them, and subsequently to the African bishops who had been exiled into Sardinia after the irruption of the Vandals. One of these, Fulgentius, on his restoration, wrote in defence of the Augustinian system, endeavouring to clear it from misrepresentations as to its practical tendency. The controversy continued in Gaul and Western Europe generally. It was brought to a conclusion in the time of Caesarius, bishop of Arles. That eminent and devout prelate was an ardent admirer of Augustine, and by some of his sermons had given offence to the sympathisers with semi-Pelagian opinions. A council was held at Valence in the province of Vienne, to which Caesarius, who was unable to attend, sent representatives, explaining his views on predestination. The acts of that council are not extant, but very shortly after Caesarius held a council in his own province of Arles, at Arausio

(Orange), in July, A.D. 529, taking occasion of a large gathering there at the dedication of a new church by Liberius the Patrician, praetorian prefect. Caesarius brought before the council certain doctrinal articles received from the pope Felix IV., which were for the most part extracts from Augustine's writings or sentences of Prosper. These the council adopted and formulated, as the expression of Catholic truth on the doctrines of grace. It is impossible not to admire the gentle and Christian tone in which they were set forth, contrasting most favourably with the violent language of the earlier decisions which had ended in fulminating sentences of excommunication and banishment. The preface to the canons, which is probably due to Caesarius, beginning with a simple statement that tidings had reached the council that there were some who held incautious views touching grace and free will not in accordance with the rule of Catholic faith, proceeds to say that it had been thought well to set forth a few heads of doctrine gathered from Holy Scripture and the ancient fathers, and transmitted by the Apostolic See, to instruct those who think otherwise than they ought, and it entreats every one who had before not held right views on these points not to delay to conform his thoughts to this exposition of Catholic truth. The canons are twenty-five in number. The first two, in opposition to Pelagian doctrine, declare that by the sin of Adam not only his body, but his soul, was affected for the worse, and that his sin injured not only himself, but all his descendants. The next six expound the functions of grace, affirming that grace is given to man to make him in the first instance call upon God for grace, that God does not wait for man's will, but prepares it for deliverance from sin, that the initial act of faith is not from man, but from God's grace, that grace makes men believe and will aright, that we cannot without grace either think or choose any good thing pertaining to salvation. The eighth, in opposition to Cassian, rejects the idea that some are brought to the grace of baptism by their own free will, to hold this would be a virtual denial of the universal weakening of the human will by the Fall. The fourteenth asserts that no one is delivered from misery but by the prevenient mercy of God. The eighteenth that reward is due to good works when they are done, but grace, which is unmerited, must precede to enable them to be done. The twenty-second that if man has any truth and righteousness within him, it is from the fountain of all good. It is remarkable that not one of the canons touches on the disputed question of predestination. The prelates appended to the canons an address in which, after saying that they content themselves with having vindicated the indispensable necessity of grace for all good action, they affirm their belief that *all* the baptized, by the aid and co-operation of Christ, can attain salvation, a position which the rigid Augustinian theory would hardly allow. They protest that they do not believe that any are predestined to evil, but if there are any who hold that opinion, which they doubt, they repudiate it with indignation. They assert that without any preceding merits God inspires men with faith and love, and leads them to baptism, and after baptism helps them by the same grace to fulfil his will.

The faith of the penitent thief and of Zacchaeus they declare to have been a gift of God's bounteous grace, and not an act of unaided nature. Pope Boniface II., who had succeeded Felix, confirmed the decrees of this Gallican council in a letter written to Caesarius. The moderation and good sense of the fathers of Orange, and their earnest desire to avoid the extravagance either of extreme predestinarianism, which would annihilate the human will, or an arrogant self-trust, which would claim to be independent of divine grace, had their reward. Their decrees met with general acquiescence, and both Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism ceased to be dominant forces in Western Christendom.

Semi-Pelagianism was substantially a revival in the West of the early Eastern anthropology, guided by a clearer insight into the moral problems involved, which was a result of the experience of the Pelagian controversy. It held man in his original state to have had certain physical, intellectual, and moral advantages which he no longer enjoys. In the beginning his body was not subject to death, he had extraordinary knowledge of external nature and apprehension of the moral law, and was sinless. The sin of the first man brought into the world physical death for man's body, and a moral corruption which was propagated to his posterity. Freedom of will to do good was not lost, but greatly impaired. Man in his present condition is morally diseased. The imputation of original sin is removed in baptism, and baptism is essential to salvation. Man needs the aid of divine grace for the performance of good works and the attainment of salvation. The free will of man works in co-operation with divine grace. The two influences are not to be severed. There is no such thing as an unconditional decree of God, but predestination to salvation or damnation depends upon the use which man makes of his freedom to good. Election is therefore conditional. The merit of man's salvation is, however, to be ascribed to God, because, without God's grace, man's efforts would be unavailing. Wiggers has forcibly observed that Augustinianism represented man as morally dead, semi-Pelagianism as morally sick, Pelagianism as morally sound.

The full theory of Augustinianism in all its strong asseverations of an unconditional election and a total corruption of human nature did not retain its hold on the theology of the Western church during the succeeding centuries, nor was it ever acknowledged in the Eastern church. Practical questions of organisation of ecclesiastical authority usurped undue importance, and diminished the attention bestowed on the deep points of theological doctrine. It is true that men like popes Leo I. and Gregory I., in the 5th and 6th centuries, and Bede in the 8th were Augustinian, but the general tendency of the West turned in another direction, while it sternly rejected Pelagianism proper.

The famous history of the monk Gottschalk, in the latter part of the 9th century, proves how distasteful the assertion of an unqualified predestinarianism had become, but as this lies beyond the assigned limits of this Dictionary it must not receive more than a passing reference.

Pelagianism never developed itself into a schism by proceeding to set up an organisation

external to the Catholic church. It practised no distinctive rites, it accepted all the traditional ecclesiastical discipline. It freely retained for instance the practice of infant baptism, though it formed a different opinion on the moral and spiritual significance of the act. It was a mode of thought which strove to win for itself acceptance within the pale of the church, but was successfully cast out.

The impartial student of history, on his first survey of the controversy, is disposed to feel a certain amount of sympathy with the cause of Pelagianism. He feels indignant at the intolerance which appealed to the strong arm of the civil power to crush, by the physical forces of exile and confiscation, a theological doctrine, and too frequently refused a fair hearing of the accused in their own defence. And it is not unnatural that religious men of a strongly practical turn of mind should, in their admiration of the eager desire to foster a high standard of moral progress, and of the impatience of indolent self-excuses which apparently led Pelagius first to enunciate his views, look upon him as a misunderstood reformer. Thus John Wesley in one of his sermons expresses his belief, that the real heresy of Pelagius was neither more nor less than the holding that Christians may by the grace of God "go on to perfection," or in other words fulfil the law of Christ (*Works*, vi. 328, ed. 1829). But when we come to estimate Pelagianism as an entire system we perceive, that its triumph would have been in effect the revival of the old pagan mode of thought, and would have evacuated Christianity of all its spiritual and supernatural elements. It was unsound, both as a philosophy of human nature and as an interpretation of the teaching of Scripture. It represented death and disease as part of the original constitution of human nature, and in no way connected with any antecedent moral depravation, and regarded each human being as coming into the world furnished with moral faculties unfettered and unbiassed towards good or evil, the will being perfectly free to choose between good and evil. God had given to man the light of the Law, and subsequently the light of the Gospel that he might have the advantage of a revelation of moral truth, but obedience or disobedience to the law of righteousness was entirely the act of man's own free will. Goodness was a meritorious exercise of his capacities, wickedness was his own fatal choice, and justly rendered him liable to punishment. Each man began life free and innocent, and undetermined to good or evil; there was no original corruption of nature, no congenital moral weakness, no internal struggle of a higher and lower nature, no spiritual disease which needed a remedy. But to claim this dignity and perfection for human nature was to contradict the plainest verdict of human consciousness, which bears testimony to a frailty and corruption, and the perpetual acknowledgment of poets and moralists of the pagan world, who with one consent lament the moral impotence or imperfection of the will. Whatever was the account to be given of the origin of this connate tendency to sin, and of this internal struggle between reason and appetite, the fact of its universal existence was undeniable. The ideal free will might be one which was equally capable of doing anything

which was physically possible, the actual free will of which men find themselves in possession is weak and biassed to evil. As Prof. Mozley has said, "The Pelagian did not possess himself properly of the facts of human nature, and committing the same fault in morals that the mediaeval philosophers did in science, he argued upon an abstract idea, instead of examining what the faculty, as we experienced it, really is; and an absolute free will, which was a simple conception of the mind, displaced the incomprehensible actual will, the enigma of human nature, the mystery of fact."

Nor can the denial of original or birth sin be reconciled with the teaching of Scripture, except upon most forced methods of interpretation. It is true that in his uniform exposition of the important text, Romans v. 12, Augustine was led astray by the erroneous Latin version of *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον in quo omnes peccaverunt*, and the Pelagians were more correct in rendering this *quia* or *propter quod* peccaverunt, but this very passage itself refuted the theory of the actual sinfulness of many men maintained by Pelagius; and the whole tenour of the argument of St. Paul, throughout the context of the chapter treating on the need of redemption, was to assert a transmitted moral corruption and its accompaniment of a physical penalty, death. The repeated assertions in Scripture of the universality of the redemptive act of Christ presupposed the universality of the sinful nature which the redemption was designed to restore. It was idle for Pelagius to claim Abel, Enoch, Melchizedek and others as instances of sinlessness, simply because Scripture regarded only their righteousness, and was silent as to any faults in their lives. Incidental notices of events in their careers could not be pressed as if they were exhaustive biographies. And in the case of virtuous heathen such as Fabricius, Cato, Scipio, and others to whom reference was often made in the controversy, it was not necessary with Augustine to deny the reality of heathen goodness, and to designate their virtues as only "splendid vices." It would have been wiser not to narrow the conception of divine grace, and to admit that the goodness in the heathen world was due to some measure of divine inspiration; at the same time, it was an exaggeration of an imagination uncontrolled by sober fact to attribute a sinless perfection to the heroes of paganism.

In ascertaining the precise views of Pelagius and his followers, it is necessary to be cautious, because we depend for our information principally upon the testimony of their opponents. We have, however, some few original writings of Pelagius, the Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, the letter to Demetrius, and the confession of faith forwarded to Pope Innocent. Augustine also, in his own controversial treatises, often cites verbatim whole passages from Pelagius and his follower Julian, before proceeding to their refutation.

We may arrange the chief points of distinctively Pelagian doctrine under certain heads.

1. *Original Sin.*—It is plain that the Pelagians denied altogether the existence of original sin in any such sense as an hereditary moral corruption. They refused to acknowledge a sin propagated by generation (*peccatum ex traduce*).

Sin, they said, is not born with man, but is committed afterwards by man. It is not a fault of nature, but of free will. Julian expressly declared that God had made men without any fault at all, full of natural innocence, and capable of voluntary virtues. Pelagius, differing strongly from Augustine, denied the theory of traducianism or transmission of a soul by physical generation. He held each individual soul to be a direct creation of God at the birth of the body, and therefore pure and untainted. The infant before any exercise of his will has not corrupted the goodness of his simplicity. Moral corruption can only be produced by a long-continued habit of sinful acts. But this will be exhibited only in adults, and is brought on only by their own fault. Each man morally is at his birth in the same state of innocence as Adam was when first created. Sin can only be an imitation of Adam's transgression, not a congenital depravity of nature. Still less, in the view of the Pelagians, did original sin involve an imputation of the guilt of Adam to all his descendants. The Augustinian doctrine regarding Adam as the representative of the human race, the one head and centre in whom all men had unity and solidarity, accounted Adam's sin as entailing a double consequence to all his posterity, moral corruption and imputation of primeval sin (*vitium et reatus*). Pelagianism, on the contrary, declared that it was contrary to all principles of equity and moral rectitude that God should impute to a man the sin of another. Death it considered to be a natural necessity, and not a penalty of sin either in Adam or his descendants. Later forms of orthodox theology have so far accepted the Pelagian doctrine as to reject the theory of the imputation of Adam's sin to all his descendants, whilst fully admitting moral corruption as the hereditary taint of human nature.

2. *Infant Baptism.*—The Pelagians never called in question the validity and necessity of the baptism of infants, but they interpreted its significance in accordance with their view of the moral condition of the recipients. They could not regard baptism as administered for the remission of original sin in infants, seeing that on their theory infants had no original sin which needed remission. Making a distinction between salvation or eternal life and the kingdom of heaven, they declared the latter to be the distinctive salvation of Christians, and taught that baptism was the necessary introduction into this kingdom of heaven. Unbaptized infants, they held, might be partakers of salvation, for, as they had no guilt of birth sin, and were incapable of actual sin, it was impossible that they could be consigned to eternal damnation. Baptized infants received the sacred rite not for the forgiveness of their sins, but that they might attain spiritual sonship, and become partakers of the kingdom of heaven. The Pelagians thus agreed with the general mind of the Church in interpreting the saying of our Lord to Nicodemus (John iii. 5) as implying the absolute necessity of baptism for all, but sought to evade the repulsive dogma of the eternal damnation of the unbaptized by introducing the untenable distinction between the lower salvation and the higher entrance into the kingdom of heaven. Afterwards, the Pela-

gians more explicitly admitted that baptism, even in the case of infants, had for its object remission of sins, but not of original sin, nor of sins actually committed, but of sins which might hereafter be committed by the baptized infants. Baptism was designed, in the case of infants, not to make the guilty righteous in the sight of God, but to make the good better. It was accompanied not by justification, but by sanctification. It was the instrument of regeneration and renovation, of spiritual adoption and participation of all the benefits which Christianity imparted. The contrast between the Pelagian and Augustinian doctrine, on the purpose of baptism, cannot be more strongly exhibited than in a passage of Julian (*Aug. Opus Imp. v. 9*): "We do not baptize for the purpose of freeing from the claim of the devil, but that those who are the work of God may become His children, as pledges of His love, that those who have come forth from God's tuition may be still further advanced by His mysteries, and that those who bear the work of nature may attain to the gifts of grace, and that their Lord, who has made them good by creation, may make them better by renovation and adoption."

3. *The effect of the sin of Adam.*—The earlier form of Pelagian doctrine on this head was that the sin of Adam did not in any way injuriously affect his descendants: it entailed no moral or physical evil. Each man at his birth started with the same capacity for goodness as his first ancestor. But pressed hard by their adversaries and the clear language of the New Testament on this point, the Pelagians subsequently admitted that Adam injured his descendants by the example of evil which he set, by imitation of which they became sinners. They could also allow that men are not now born exactly in the same state as Adam before his transgression, because Adam, as an adult, was endowed with reason and freedom, whilst his posterity are born without the use of reason, and the consequent immediate exercise of will. The death to which Adam became subject in consequence of his disobedience they understood as spiritual, not physical. He might perhaps have attained to immortality, had he remained obedient to the law under which he was placed.

4. *Free will in man.*—Consistently with his denial of any such moral corruption of nature as the theory of original sin implied, Pelagius asserted the full and unimpaired freedom of the will. He maintained that all men are governed by their own will. Man brings into the world with him the capacity of good and evil. We are created without virtue, and so also without vice. In his letter to Demetrius, Pelagius unhesitatingly disclaims any idea of moral inability or weakness in the attainment of goodness. "We contradict the Lord when we say, It is hard: it is difficult: we cannot: we are men: we are encompassed with mortal flesh. O unholy audacity. We charge God with a twofold ignorance, that He does not seem to know what He has made, nor what He has commanded: just as if, forgetting the human weakness of which He Himself is the author, He had imposed laws on man which He cannot endure." Elsewhere (*De lib. Arbitrio*, as quoted by Augustine, *De Gratia Christi*, c. 4) he distinguishes three things, to be able, to will, and to be, *posse, velle, esse*.

To be able we place in nature: to will, in free will, to be, *i. e.* to do, in the effect. The first refers peculiarly to God who has bestowed this on His creature, the other two must be referred to men, because they flow from the fountain of free will. That we can do, say, or think any good thing is of Him who gave us the ability and aids it, but that we actually do, or speak, or think aright is of ourselves, because we can also turn all these to evil. It is obvious how entirely antagonistic this line of thought was to the Augustinian doctrine, which held one consequence of the fall of man to have been the loss of any real free will, and attributed to all men in their natural state an absolute incapacity for goodness.

5. *Grace.*—It is difficult to fix precisely the character of the Pelagian doctrine on the relation between free will and grace, on account of the ambiguity which is discernible in the Pelagian employment of the term grace. Augustine perpetually charges Pelagianism with limiting the notion of grace to some external benefit of creation or law or revelation, and denying its true sense as an inward operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of man. It is true that many of the passages cited from Pelagius put forward prominently this wider notion of grace. In the famous passage, already referred to, in which Pelagius distinguished the three stages of human action as power, will, and act, he ascribed power to nature, but immediately explains that this is a divine gift, as being bestowed by the Creator of man. Free will and all the faculties and affections of human nature are in this sense grace, being gifts of God. In other passages grace seems primarily to mean the law and the revelation of God. The knowledge of the law is necessary to righteousness, for God gives men precepts teaching them how they ought to live, and thus removes their moral ignorance, so that men may know what to do and what to avoid. This kind of grace is necessary to the attainment of perfect goodness. At other times the example of Christ in His holy life is spoken of as a gift of higher grace vouchsafed under the Gospel, rendering it superior to the earlier Mosaic Law. From another point of view the forgiveness of sins of those who have actually transgressed is called grace, and the word is also extended to baptism, which is the appointed symbol and channel of this forgiveness. The canons of the council of Carthage agree with the treatise of Augustine in understanding such wide employment of the term grace to imply a denial of the need of grace to assist man from falling into sin again when once forgiven, and of grace as an imparted disposition to love and a faculty to practise God's commands. But it may be fairly doubted whether the Pelagians intended wholly to deny grace in its stricter sense as an internal agency. Pelagius anathematized all who said that the grace of God was not necessary not only every hour and every moment, but also in each single action. Julian described the operations of grace as sanctifying, restraining, inciting, illuminating the human soul. This language implies more than creative grace, it speaks of a grace assisting the created nature, and this by influences addressed not only to the intellectual faculties by instruction and illumination, but to the will and affections by

incitement and restraint. So profound a student of the controversy as Professor Mozley has not hesitated to express his judgment that the charge against Pelagius that he meant by grace only the natural will and endowments of man considered as Divine gifts, or the outward means of instruction and edification provided for man in the Bible and the church is not altogether justified by the language of the Pelagians themselves. The error of the Pelagians was that attributing to man in his present state an absolute freedom of will, unmoved by any bias to evil, they denied the necessity of preventent grace from God to set the will in action. They argued as if a wholly independent act of the will could accept or use proffered grace. The Augustinian theory made the action of grace entirely independent of the will, it was an irresistible power which forced the will. The Pelagian made it depend on antecedent acts of the will, an *adjutorium quo*, and not an *adjutorium sine quo non*. It thus denied grace in the sense of internal spiritual influence as the initial step in the work of conversion to righteousness. Its whole tendency was to disparage the office of grace, to view it as facilitating rather than as inspiring right operations of the will and the affections, to claim for man the merit of his own progress in righteousness, and by thus engendering a proud consciousness of self-acquired virtue to extinguish humility. Such a system, besides being untrue to the facts of human nature, is proved by all experience to be adverse to the formation of devout and energetic piety.

6. *Predestination*.—Pelagius and his followers did not discuss with much frequency or earnestness the question of Predestination. The full development of the Augustinian doctrine on this head, as exhibited in the treatises, *De Dono Perseverantiae* and *De Praedestinatione Sanctorum*, belonged to a period when Pelagius himself had vanished from the scene. It is clear, however, from passages in Pelagius's Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles that he was opposed to any view of an absolute predestination to salvation or damnation, recognising only a predestination founded upon foreknowledge. God, he believed, destined for salvation those who, as He knew, would believe in Him and obey His commandments, and for damnation in like manner those who would continue in sin. Thus he explains Romans ix. 15, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," to mean, I will have mercy on him whom I have foreknown to be able to merit mercy, and on another verse of the same chapter he comments in very explicit language, "God's foreknowledge does not prejudge sinners should they be willing to be converted. The prophecy, 'Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated,' is not concerning those who are Jacob and Esau according to the flesh, but concerning those who were to be good or evil by works, and by the works themselves to have the hatred of God or to obtain His mercy."

Authorities.—Pelagius, *Epistola ad Demetriadem Virginem*, *Libellus Fidei ad Innocentium* [usually printed among Jerome's works]; St. Augustine, the anti-Pelagian treatises as contained in vol. x. of the Benedictine edition of his works, and his Epistles, *id.* vol. ii. (Classis 3); a convenient reprint of the anti-Pelagian treatises has been edited, with introduction by

W. Bright, D.D., Oxford University Press, 1880; Julian, *Libellus Fidei*, ed. J. Garnier, Paris, 1673; Jerome, *Preface to Jeremiah*, *Epistola ad Ctesiphontem*, *Epistola ad Ctesiphontem*; Prosper, *De Ingratis*, *Contra Collatorem*, *Epistola ad Rufinum* (Benedictine ed. Paris, 1711); Marius Mercator, *Commonitorium adversus hæreses Pelag. et Cacl.*, ed. Garnier, Paris, 1673 (appended are seven elaborate dissertations on points connected with the history of Pelagianism, full of research, though one-sided); Paulus Orosius, *Liber Apologeticus*, ed. Zangemeister, Vienna, 1882; Vossius, G. J. *Historia Pelagiana*, Leyden, 1618; Noris, Henr. de, *Historia Pelagiana*, Padua, 1673; Wiggers, G. F. *Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus*, in two parts, 1821, 1833; the first part was translated by R. Emerson, Andover, U.S. 1840 (a most exhaustive work, with copious references to original authorities); Neander, *Church History*, vol. iv.; Guizot, *History of Civilisation in France*, lecture v.; Jacobi, J. L., *Die Lehre des Pelagius*, Leipzig, 1842; Mozley, J. B., *Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, c. iii., London (Murray), 1878; Wörter, *Der Pelagianismus*, Freiburg, 1874; Klasen, F. *Die innere Entwicklung des Pelagianismus*, Freiburg, 1882. [W. I.]

PELAGIUS (3), a presbyter to whom Chrysostom wrote a letter from Cucus expressive of respectful regard. (*Chrys. Ep.* 215.) [E. V.]

PELAGIUS (4), a monk, celebrated for the severity of his ascetical discipline, whose defection Chrysostom laments in a letter to Olympias. (*Chrys. Ep.* 4.) [E. V.]

PELAGIUS (5), of Tarentum, mentioned by St. Augustine as not to be confounded with the heresiarch of the same name. (*Aug. Ep.* 186.) [H. W. P.]

PELAGIUS (6), bishop of Tarsus and metropolitan in the middle of the fifth century (Labbe, iv. 927.) [E. V.]

PELAGIUS (7), deacon of the Roman church, who wrote to Fulgentius Ferrandus, whose epistle in 546 (*Ep.* 6, *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. 921) is in reply to an enquiry from him and the deacon Anatolius. [J. G.]

PELAGIUS (8) I., bishop of Rome after Vigilius, in the reign of Justinian I., A.D. 555 to A.D. 560.* A native, and deacon, of Rome, he had been appointed by pope Agapetus, when about to leave Constantinople (A.D. 536) as his apocrisarius there. [See AGAPETUS.] After the death of Agapetus he seems to have been got hold of by the empress Theodora, and used as an instrument of her machinations for intruding Vigilius into the Roman see. For he was the emissary whom she sent to prevent, if possible, the return of Silverius, who after his election and ordination as successor to Agapetus, had been deposed and banished by Belisarius under her orders.

* If the inscription on his monument in the Vatican, as quoted by Baronius from Manlius, is to be trusted, he held the see for four years, ten months, and eighteen days, and was buried on the 4th of March. Accordingly his ordination would be in April, A.D. 555, and his death at the beginning of March, A.D. 560.

Under Vigilius he again appears as apocrisarius of the Roman see at Constantinople; and he it was who, having been sent on some mission into Palestine, joined with the patriarch Mennas on his return in moving Justinian to issue his edict for the condemnation of Origenism. After this he returned to Rome, where he appears as one of the two deacons of Vigilius who applied to Ferrandus of Carthage for advice after the issue of the imperial edict "De tribus Capitulis" (c. A.D. 544). For notices of his action so far, see *Art.* on VIGILIUS. When Vigilius had been summoned by the emperor to Constantinople in the matter of the Three Chapters, Pelagius remained behind as the archdeacon and chief ecclesiastic of Rome; and this position he occupied (the pope meanwhile lingering in Sicily on the way to the imperial city) when the Gothic king Totila (A.D. 546) besieged and captured Rome. Procopius (*de Bell. Goth. L. 3*) speaks of him at this time as follows:—"There was then among the Roman ecclesiastics one Pelagius, a deacon, who having resided for a long time at Constantinople had won in a very high degree the friendship of the emperor. Thence he had repaired to Rome, shortly before the siege began, fortified with great store of money. During the siege he imparted of it liberally to those who were in need, so that, having been before accounted a good man among the Italians, he acquired (as was fit) an increased reputation for charity and benevolence." The Romans being reduced to great straits from famine, he consented at their request (as Procopius further informs us) to go in person to Totila to sue for a truce of a few days, on condition that, if no succour should meanwhile arrive from the emperor, the city should be surrendered. He was courteously received by the Gothic king, but accomplished nothing. In the December of the same year Totila entered Rome as a conqueror, and went to pay his devotions in the church of St. Peter. There Pelagius met him, with the gospels in his hands, and falling on his knees before him, said, "Prince, spare thy people." The conqueror answered with a significant smile, "Hast thou now come to supplicate me, Pelagius?" "Yes," he replied, "inasmuch as the Lord has made me thy servant. But now withhold thy hand from these who have passed into servitude to thee." Moved by these entreaties, Totila forbade forthwith any further slaughter of the Romans. He also employed Pelagius, together with a layman Theodorus, in an embassy to Constantinople for concluding peace with the emperor, binding them with an oath to do their best in his behalf, and to return without delay to Italy. They executed their commission, and brought back Justinian's reply, which was to the effect that Belisarius was in military command, and had authority to arrange matters (*Procop. de Bell. Goth. L. 3.*)

The pope Vigilius having proceeded from Sicily on his voyage to Constantinople in the early part of the year 547, it was not long before Pelagius joined him; and he appears to have supported him and acted with him in his changing attitudes of submission or resistance to the emperor's will [see VIGILIUS]. Having signed his *Judicatum*, he afterwards kept aloof with him from the Constantinopolitan council (called the 5th oecumenical), and subscribed also his *Constitutum* in which its action was condemned.

For this he was, with others, exiled by the emperor, but recalled and received with favour on his joining Vigilius in his recantation; and with him he was allowed to return to Italy, A.D. 554, being said to have been even then nominated by Justinian as the pope's successor in case of his surviving him (*Victor Tur. Chron.*). He proceeded to Rome after the death of Vigilius at Syracuse, and was there consecrated pope, being supported by Narses, who at that time was in command of Rome, and who of course acted under the emperor's orders. The appointment was not welcome to the Romans themselves, and there was even difficulty in getting prelates to consecrate him. Two only in the end officiated, John of Perusium and Bonus of Ferentinum, assisted by Andreas, a presbyter of Ostia, in place of the bishop of that see, whose peculiar privilege it usually was to ordain the popes. Anastasius (*Lib. Pontif.*) attributes the feeling against Pelagius to his being supposed to have aided and abetted the persecutions undergone by Vigilius at Constantinople, and being even suspected of having caused his death; and he further states that, in order to satisfy the people, Narses and the new pope organised a procession with litanies to St. Peter's, where the latter, holding up the cross and the gospels, declared himself from the pulpit innocent of all ill-doing against his predecessor. It is quite possible that charges of having hastened the death of Vigilius had been brought against Pelagius by his opponents, which he found it thus necessary to reply to; but the real cause of his unpopularity could not well have been his previous persecution of the late pope, whom he had always acted with and supported; it rather was (as represented by Victor Turonensis) that he had acted too much with him, in consenting at last to condemn the Three Chapters, and that he came as the emperor's creature, pledged to support the decisions of the Constantinopolitan Council. A great part of the western church still, and for many years afterwards, was resolute in rejecting these decisions; and what is principally known of the action of Pelagius as pope is his unavailing attempt to heal the consequent schism. The bishops of Tuscany had written to request his concurrence in their rejection of the council, and (as appears from his answer to their application) had meanwhile ceased to pray for the bishop of Rome in the ecclesiastic office. He severely reproves them in reply, declares his entire acceptance of the first four general councils (by way of insisting that the condemnation of the Three Chapters by the recent fifth implied no disparagement of that of Chalcedon), and urges the guilt and danger of schism from the apostolic sees (*Ep. vi.*). It is observable that in this as in other letters he does not speak of the see of Rome in particular, but of apostolic sees generally, quoting St. Augustine as to the necessity of all churches being in communion with such sees. It may be that, acting as he now was with a view to please the emperor and retain his favour, and maintaining the decrees of a purely eastern council which in the end ignored the pope, he thought it prudent to avoid apparent disparagement of the eastern patriarchates through any peculiar exaltation of the Roman see, such as was usual in utterances from St. Peter's chair. And he might indeed have provoked inconvenient reprisals, had he pleaded prominently the authority of

his own see for compliance with what his predecessor, supported by the west generally, had once authoritatively denounced, and to which both he and Vigilius had so tardily and inconsistently given their adhesion. There remains also a letter of his, addressed to the church at large, in which he earnestly defends his own orthodoxy, declaring his unqualified adhesion to the four great Councils, and to all that the popes before Vigilius had written. He is careful especially to declare that he venerates as orthodox Theodoret and Ibas, who (be it remembered) had not been personally anathematized by the fifth council, though their writings had been. It is the letter of a man anxious to defend himself in a suspected and difficult position. Appeals and remonstrances proving of no avail, while large portions of Italy,—not only Tuscany, but also especially Liguria, Venetia, and Istria,—persisted in their repudiation of the fifth council, and even had renounced communion with Rome, Pelagius endeavoured to enlist the civil power in his aid. He wrote several letters to Narses, who seems to have shrunk from using violence, urging him to have no scruples in the matter. These letters are an unqualified defence of the principle of persecution. To punish evil done, or to prevent its being done, is (he says) not persecution, but love. "If, as some would persuade you, no one is to be thus brought from evil to good, all laws, human and divine, might be set at naught. That schism is an evil is undoubted; and that to separate from the apostolic sees, and erect altar against altar, is schism, is apparent also; and the rules of the fathers have specially enjoined that ecclesiastics resisting their superiors, or separating from them, or erecting rival altars, shall be deprived and excommunicated, and, if they persist in schism, be suppressed by the public authority." "So, sir," he concludes one of his letters, "as your mind is perchance timid, lest you should seem to persecute, I have thus briefly shewn you what is enjoined by the authority of the fathers; for there are thousands of other examples and constitutions in which it is evidently acknowledged that those who cause schisms in holy church ought to be suppressed by the civil powers, not only with exile, but also proscription of their goods and hard imprisonment." So, it seems, the generality were to be dealt with: the leading recusants, including (as is especially requested in one of the letters) the bishops of the great sees of Aquileia and Milan, he desires should be sent under a guard to Constantinople, to be at the mercy of "the most clement emperor." One of these, Paulinus of Aquileia, had convened a synod in which communion with Rome had been renounced, and Narses himself excommunicated. Pelagius expresses himself as shocked; but still thankful, inasmuch as this last act would be likely to make Narses do something. He sees the hand of Providence in the proceedings of those insensate and perverse men, who, imagining their sect to be the Catholic church, had gone to such a length as to exclude the exarch from the pollution of their communion, and so unwittingly driven him to take sides against them. Let not, says he, the presumption of those wicked men go on unpunished; they will go from less to more, unless you stop them. Further, as if still doubtful whether Narses would proceed as he desired him to do, he draws

his attention to the crimes of one Eufrasius, a person associated with the recusants, who had been proved guilty, he says, of homicide, adultery, and incest. See, he continues, what a set those men belong to who have so proudly insulted you: remove such men from the province: use the opportunity given you by God for suppressing them. By way of further disparaging the two metropolitans of Aquileia and Milan, and removing any scruples that Narses might retain, he represents one of them at least, Paulinus, as no lawful bishop at all. It had been a custom of long standing for these two great metropolitans to ordain each other: but (says Pelagius) the ordination was always to take place in the church of the ordained, so that the ordainer might not seem to claim jurisdiction over the other, and might also be assured that the new bishop was acceptable to his flock. In violation of this rule Paulinus had gone to Milan for consecration, and was therefore but a pseudo-bishop, as well as a schismatic; and the other was also compromised, having acted uncanonically. It does not appear that Narses took any action such as the pope desired. Certainly the two metropolitans retained their sees, and the schism continued during the reigns of many succeeding popes. Gregory the Great (*acc.* 590) found it existing still, and had to deal with it.

It is to be observed that there is no sign during this conflict of Pelagius having insisted on assent to the decrees of the fifth council by the objectors themselves, although the council, and Vigilius too, had distinctly anathematized all who should refuse such assent. He only fought against separation from the Roman see because of its assent. To have attempted more he probably saw would be at that time hopeless. And this policy of dispensation was continued by his successors. At a later period, indeed, it appears from *Diurn. Rom. Pontif.*, tit. 6, that bishops, on their ordination, were required to declare in their profession of faith, "Eos autem quicumque ab eisdem sanctis patribus in memoratis quatuor synodis, vel Quinta sub piæ memoriæ Justiniano confecta, diversis vicibus damnati leguntur, ego meaque ecclesia, earundem venerandam patrum auctoritatem sequentes, insolubili damnatione percullimus." But this addition is considered by Garner to have been made not earlier than A.D. 685. (See Pagi in Baron. *ad an.* 556, IV.)

In Gaul also Pelagius was accused of heresy. Consequently the Frank king Childebert sent to him an ambassador, by name Rufinus, to demand from him a confession of his faith, requesting him either to declare his acceptance of the tome of pope Leo, or to express his belief in his own words. He readily did both, asserting his entire agreement with Leo, and with the four councils, and appending a long confession of faith, which was of course altogether orthodox. But he made no mention of the fifth council, or of the necessity of accepting its decrees. He further praised the king for his zeal in the true faith, and expressed the hope that no false reports about himself might give occasion for any schism in Gaul (*Ep.* xvi. *ad Childebertum*; *Ep.* xv. *ad Sapaudum*).^b

^b *Ep.* x., which purports to have been addressed to Childebert on this occasion, is evidently not all genuine. It appears to be a compilation from two distinct documents: the beginning and the end suit the occasion, and

He seems to have been anxious about the result; for in a letter written soon after to Sapaudus, bishop of Arles, he says, "We exhort you, that if the letter which we have directed to our most excellent son king Childebert... has been pleasing to the most glorious king himself, and to your charity, or to our brethren and fellow-bishops, we be informed of it by a reply from your charity" (*Ep.* xv. *ad Sapaudum*). He had already shewn anxiety to conciliate Sapaudus, fearing, we may suppose, the possible defection of the Gallian church from Rome. He had seized an early opportunity of sending him a short friendly letter (*Ep.* viii.), though, as he says in it, he had not yet received (as would have been fitting) a congratulatory address from him: but he could not refrain (he continues) from sending a fraternal greeting, hoping that they might live on terms of mutual love, and correspond frequently. He afterwards sent him the pall, and conferred on him the vicariate jurisdiction over the churches of Gaul which former popes had been accustomed to commit to the metropolitans of Arles. It appears that Childebert's ambassador had previously asked him to do this, but he had delayed till he should receive, according to ancient custom, a written request from the bishop himself. On at length receiving this, accompanied by a letter from the king, he complied at once, replying cordially to both letters (*Epp.* xi., xii., xiii.). If in other letters that have been referred to he prudently refrained from asserting the universal supremacy of St. Peter's see, he did not so refrain on this occasion; being now, we may suppose, well assured of the spiritual allegiance of the Gallic church. He speaks in his letter to Sapaudus of "the eternal solidity of that firm rock, on which Christ had founded His church from the rising to the setting of the sun, being maintained by the authority of his (*i.e.* Peter's) successors, acting in person, or through their vicars." And, as his predecessors had, by the grace of God, ruled the universal church of God, he commits to the bishop of Arles, after their example, and according to ancient custom, supreme and exclusive jurisdiction over Gaul, as vicar of the apostolic see. It cannot but strike readers of church history during the reign of Justinian I., and especially of the proceedings of the fifth council, how little the theory of universal spiritual dominion thus enunciated agreed with facts. Indeed Pelagius himself, while he wrote in this strain, was really throughout his popedom acting as the creature of the emperor, who had defied and overruled the authority of the Roman see.

There are a few other letters, or fragments of letters, attributed, with no suspicion of spuriousness, to Pelagius. In one to Childebert, written after complaint received from Sapaudus, he respectfully remonstrates with the king for having allowed the metropolitan, who represented the pope himself, to be summoned on the petition of one of the suffragans before the tribunal of another bishop, who is not named. Some have reference to the schism in the matter of the Three Chapters, condemning it, and warning against it. One, to a patrician Cethegus, has may have been taken from a letter by Pelagius to the Frank king: the rest of the epistle, which constitutes the bulk of it, seems from its contents to have been addressed by pope Vigilius to the emperor Justinian,—perhaps from Sicily after he had left Constantinople.

reference to a bishop elect of Syracuse, who had been sent from Sicily to be ordained at Rome. Pelagius had refused for a whole year, on the ground of the man having a wife and children: but as the Syracusans obstinately persisted in their choice, he had consented at last, having endeavoured only to guard against any evil consequences by taking security from the person ordained not to divert any of the goods of the church to the use of his wife, family or relations, or bequeath to his heirs any part of what he should derive from his see.

From the monuments of the Vatican, collected by Manlius, Baronius cites as follows: "Hic requiescit Pelagius Papa, qui sedit annos quatuor menses decem, dies decem et octo. Deposit. iv. non. Martii" (*i.e.* March 4). According to this, his death was in the year 560. It occurred, according to Anastasius, after his foundation of the church of the apostles SS. Philip and James, which was completed by his successor John III.; with respect to which church Baronius also gives from the Vatican monuments aforesaid, "Pelagius coepit, complevit Papa Joannes." In a letter from pope Hadrian to Charlemagne about images, there is also the following passage: "Multo amplius ejus sanctissimi successores, domnus Pelagius et domnus Joannes mirae magnitudinis ecclesiam Apostolorum a solo edificantes historias diversas tam in musivo quam in variis coloribus cum sacris pingentes imaginibus et nunc usque hactenus a nobis venerantur." He was buried in St. Peter's. [J. B.—y.]

PELAGIUS (9) II., bishop of Rome after Benedict I., under the emperors Tiberius, Constantine and Mauricius, from November A.D. 578 to February A.D. 590, during a little more than eleven years. He was a native of Rome, the son of Winigild, and supposed from his father's name to have been of Gothic extraction. At the time of Benedict's death the Lombards, who were already masters of a great part of Northern Italy, were besieging Rome. Consequently the new pope was consecrated without the sanction of the emperor (required since the reign of Justinian) having been previously obtained. It might be partly to excuse this informality, as well as to solicit aid against the Lombards, that the new pope, as soon as he was able after his accession, sent a deputation to the emperor Tiberius, who had become sole emperor on the death of Justin II. in the October of 578. On this occasion it doubtless was that Gregory, known afterwards as pope Gregory the Great, was first sent to Constantinople as apocrisarius of the Roman see, having been, much against his own will, summoned from his beloved monastery of St. Andrew, and ordained deacon to qualify him for the office. But it has been a disputed point whether it was Pelagius II. or his predecessor Benedict who thus ordained him for the purpose. Paulus Diaconus, in his short life of St. Gregory, does not name the pope, saying only that the pontiff who then presided over the church drew him from his monastery and ordained him deacon, and that he not long afterwards sent him to Constantinople. But Joannes Diaconus, in his later life of St. Gregory (written with that by Paulus before him), names Benedict as the pope who ordained him, but Pelagius as having sent him to Constantinople, thus correct-

ing the loose account of the earlier biographer. It may be concluded that Benedict, having called him from his monastery, and ordained him with the intention of despatching him as apocrisiarius, had been prevented from doing so by the Lombard siege, and that Pelagius, the siege being raised, carried out the design. Gregory continued to represent Pelagius II. at the imperial city for many years, under Mauricius, who succeeded to the empire A.D. 582, as well as under Tiberius. But no record remains of instructions sent to him from Rome till A.D. 584, when Pelagius sent him a letter (dated 4 October in that year) by the hands of Sebastianus a bishop, and Honoratus a notary. Its main purport is to represent the lamentable condition of Italy, and the imminent danger of Rome, from the Lombard invasion, Longinus, the exarch at Ravenna, having been appealed to in vain. Gregory is directed to join Sebastianus in pressing on the emperor the urgent need of succour. He is also desired to send back forthwith to Rome Maximianus, the abbat of St. Andrew's monastery, who was at that time with him at Constantinople. Maximianus did accordingly return (Joan. diac. *Vit. S. Greg.* c. 33, cf. *Greg. Dialog.* iii. 36), and Gregory himself appears to have followed him soon afterwards, probably A.D. 585 (Joan. diac. *ib.*). Having returned to Rome, he was allowed to live as he desired in his monastery once more, but was still employed by Pelagius for literary work, as will appear below.

The policy of the emperor Mauricius at this time was to make friends with the Franks, and enlist their aid against the Lombards. He had made a treaty with the Frank king, Childbert II., engaging him to invade Italy, and drive out the Lombards, on condition of receiving a large pecuniary reward. The promised invasion took place, probably A.D. 585; but resulted in a treaty of peace between the Franks and Lombards (Greg. *Turon.* vi. 42; *Paul. diac. de gest. Longob.* iii. 17). How far, if at all, this policy of the emperor was due to any instigation from the pope does not appear; but it was certainly in accordance with his views and desires. For in an extant letter to Aunarius (or Anacharius), bishop of Auxerre, dated 5 Oct. A.D. 580, we find him urging that prelate to use his known influence over the Frankish kings, so as to dissuade them from friendship or alliance with the Lombards, and incite them to come to the rescue of Rome and Italy. It was not, he says, without providential design that the neighbouring kingdom of the Franks was united in orthodoxy of faith with the Roman empire. Let them use the power and opportunity given them by joining the emperor in defence of Rome, the mother of their common faith, and so avoid the danger of being implicated in the judgment which would fall eventually on the sacrilegious invaders.

On the retirement of Childbert from Italy, it appears that Smaragdus, who had succeeded Paulinus as exarch of Ravenna, had also concluded a truce with the Lombards (*Epp. Pelag. II. Ep. I. ad episcopos Istriæ*). Pelagius took advantage of it to open negotiations with the bishops of Istria, who still remained out of communion with Rome in the matter of the Three Chapters. For the earlier attempts of Pelagius I. to reconcile them, see the article on that pope. Paulinus, the metropolitan of Aquileia (whose

forcible removal the first Pelagius had in vain urged on the exarch Narses), had meantime (A.D. 568) been compelled by the Lombard invasion to take refuge with his treasure in the island of Grado*. He had been succeeded by Elias, who is said to have held a synod there for confirming the transference of the see from Aquileia to Grado; at which synod Laurentius, a presbyter, is further said to have been present in behalf of pope Pelagius II., producing a letter from him which authorised the transference of the see. But the alleged acts of this council of Grado (given Labbe, vol. vi. p. 651), and especially the letter from the pope, are probably spurious [see art. on ELIAS (19)]. The letters to be now spoken of, written, as aforesaid, after the truce concluded with the Lombards, and which are open to no suspicion, are inconsistent with any previous intercourse between Pelagius II. and the bishops of Istria, who are addressed as still out of communion with him, and as being now for the first time approached by him with a view to reconciliation. In the first of these letters (sent by the hands of a bishop Redemptus and Quodvultdeus, abbat of St. Peter's monastery) he attributes his long silence to the hard necessities of the time, and rejoices in the temporary quiet procured through the labours of the exarch Smaragdus, which allowed him at last to follow the yearnings of his heart. He implores them to consider the evil of schism, and return to the unity of the church. Like the first Pelagius, he is at pains to vindicate his own faith, and to declare his entire acceptance of the four great councils and of the tome of pope Leo, by way of shewing that his acceptance of the fifth council, and his consequent condemnation of the Three Chapters, involved no departure from the ancient faith. Like his predecessor, too, he does not insist on condemnation of the Three Chapters by the Istrian bishops themselves. He only begs them to return to communion with Rome, notwithstanding its condemnation of the same: and this he does so far in a supplicatory rather than imperious tone. In his second letter he declares himself deeply grieved by the unsatisfactory purport of their reply to his first, and by the reception which his emissaries had met with. He follows his predecessor in quoting St. Augustine as to the necessity of all churches being united to apostolic sees, but further cites Cyprian *De Unitate ecclesiae* (with interpolations that give the passages a meaning very different from what they were originally intended to convey) in support of the peculiar authority of St. Peter's chair^b. Finally he calls upon the Istrians to

* Hence called New Aquileia. It continued to be the seat of the old Aquileian patriarchate till A.D. 1450, when it was removed to Venice (Gibbon, c. xlv.).

^b It does not of course follow that Pelagius consciously misquoted St. Cyprian's text may have been already tampered with in the Roman copies of it. The quotations in the letter of Pelagius are as follows, the passage in brackets being absent from the oldest MSS. of Cyprian, and those in italics being omitted in the letter. "Exordium ab unitate profisciscitur [et primatus Petro datur ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra monstretur: et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur qui ab apostolis unanimi consensu pascatur] ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur. Hanc ecclesiae unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit [qui cathedram Petri super quem fundata est ecclesia deserit et resistit] in ecclesia se esse confidit?"

send deputies to Rome for conference with himself, or at any rate to Ravenna for conference with a representative whom he would send; and in connexion with this request he mentions (significantly, as will appear in the sequel) that he has written to the exarch Smaragdus on the subject. Another, called his third, letter to Elias and the Istrian bishops, is of the nature of a treatise on the subject of the Three Chapters, and was composed for him by Gregory, as Joannes Diaconus informs us: "Pelagius papa Eliae Aquilensi episcopo nolentia capitula Chalcedonensis synodi suscipere^c epistolam satis utilem misit, quam Beatus Gregorius, cum esset adhuc diaconus, scripsit" (*de gest. Longob.* iii. 20). It was probably this composition that Gregory, when pope, sent to certain bishops,^d who still demurred to the condemnation of the Three Chapters, speaking of it thus: "To remove all doubt from your minds, I have thought it useful to send you the book which my predecessor of sacred memory, pope Pelagius, wrote on the subject . . . If after reading this book you should persist in your present opinion, you will certainly shew yourselves to give heed not to reason but to obstinacy" (*Epp. S. Greg. lib. ii. Ep. 51*). Appeals and arguments proving of no avail, Pelagius seems to have followed the example of his predecessor in calling on the civil power to persecute, and to have succeeded better with Smaragdus than the first Pelagius had done with Narses. For Smaragdus is recorded to have gone in person to Grado, to have seized Severus who had succeeded Elias in the see, together with three other bishops, in the church, carried them to Ravenna, and forced them to communicate there with John the bishop of that see. They were allowed, however, after one year (Smaragdus being superseded by another exarch), to return to Grado, where neither people nor bishops would communicate with them till Severus had recanted in a synod of ten bishops his compliance at Ravenna (*Paul. diac. de gest. Long.* iii. 27, cf. *Epp. S. Greg. l. 1, Ep. 16*).

Towards the end of the pontificate of Pelagius (probably A.D. 588), a council was held at Constantinople in the matter of Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, who had been charged with crime, and had appealed to the emperor ("ad imperatorem et concilium." Evagrius). It was apparently a large and influential one, and not confined to ecclesiastics. Evagrius Scholasticus, who was present as the advocate of Gregory, describes it thus: "Cum omnes patriarchae, partim per se, partim per vicarios, quaestioni de Gregorio habitae interessent, et causa esset coram sacro senatu et multis sanctissimis primis episcopis primarum urbium cognita. . ." (*Evagrius, H. E. vi. 7*).

This council is memorable as having called forth the first protest from Rome, renewed afterwards more notably by Gregory the Great, against the assumption by the patriarch of Constantinople of the title "oecumenical." The

^c There is evidently a mistake in this description of the attitude of the Istrian bishops; but the testimony to Gregory's authorship of the letter sent to them by Pelagius remains.

^d Usually supposed to be the bishops of Ireland. But the title of this epistle of Gregory is uncertain.

title itself was not a new one; as an honorary or complimentary one it had been occasionally given to other patriarchs; and Justinian had repeatedly designated the patriarch of Constantinople "the most holy and most blessed archbishop of this royal city, and oecumenical patriarch" (*Cod. i. 7; Novell. iii. v. vi. vii. xlii.*). Nor do we know of any objection having been raised till the occasion of this council, at which it may have been ostentatiously assumed by the then patriarch, John the Faster, and sanctioned by the council, with reference to the case before it, in a way that seemed to recognise jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Constantinople over that of Antioch. Pope Gregory goes so far as to intimate that the assumption of the title had been John the Faster's main purpose in assembling the council, the appeal of Gregory of Antioch having afforded only a convenient opportunity: "Ex causa alia occasionem quaerens, synodum fecit, in qua se universalem appellare conatus est" (*Greg. I. Ep. ad Eulogium et Anastasium, l. v. Ep. 43*). At any rate Pelagius took fire. He regarded it as implying a claim to authority over the universal church; and he wrote accordingly to protest against it, declaring all the proceedings of the council (except with regard to the acquittal of Gregory of Antioch) null and void, and forbidding his apocrisarius at Constantinople to communicate with the patriarch. His letter has not come down to us (*Ep. viii. inter Epp. Pelag. II.*, which purports to have been written on the occasion, being undoubtedly spurious); but Gregory the Great, during his own contention with the same John the Faster on the same subject, speaks of it more than once, and of the action of Pelagius as above described (*Epp. S. Greg. l. v. Ep. 18, 43; l. ix. Ep. 68*).

In November A.D. 589 there was a remarkable and destructive inundation of the Tiber at Rome, followed by a plague described as "Pestis inguinaria," of which Pelagius II. was one of the earliest victims, being attacked by it in the middle of January A.D. 590 (*Greg. Turon. l. x. c. 1*). According to Anastasius he was buried on the 8th of February in St. Peter's. Gregory I. speaks in his dialogues of the peculiar destructiveness of this pestilence, and of arrows having been seen descending from heaven, and seeming to strike people (*Dial. l. iv. c. 36*). Anastasius records among the pious acts of Pelagius his having covered the shrine of St. Peter with silver-gilt plates, having made his own house a hospital for old men, and having built a new church over the body of the martyr St. Laurence, and adorned his sepulchre with silver plates. This last work of his is referred to by Gregory I. in speaking of the reverence due to the remains of saints. He says that Pelagius having desired to improve the surroundings of the martyr's place of burial, the persons employed, while digging, unexpectedly disclosed the body itself, and that all who had seen it, though none of them had presumed to touch it, died within ten days (*Epp. Greg. I. l. iv. Ep. 30, Ad Constantinam Augustam*).

In addition to the supposititious letter (above referred to) to John of Constantinople, there are three others, now acknowledged to be spurious, viz., to a bishop Benignus, to the bishops of Campania and Italy, and to those of Germany

and Gaul, of which the main drift (as is usual in the forged letters of popes) is the authority of bishops, and especially of the Roman see. Five *Decreta*, attributed to this pope, are given by Ivo and Gratian. [J. B.—y.]

PELAGIUS (10), bishop of Anagnia. His name appears among the signatures to the decrees of the Council of Rome in A.D. 595 (*Appendix ad S. Gregorii Epp.* 5). [F. D.]

PELAGIUS (11), bishop of Tours, was one of the Gallic bishops to whom Gregory the Great wrote, commending to them St. Augustine and his companions, in A.D. 596 (*Ep.* vi. 52). He was the immediate successor of GREGORIUS (32). [F. D.]

PELAGIUS (12) (PELAYO), first king of the independent Christian remnant, in the mountains of the Asturias. Sebastian of Salamanca (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 479) describes him as son "Fafilani ducis ex semine regio." The oldest MS. of the *Chron. Albeldense* (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 433), transcribed in A.D. 976, on the other hand makes him son of Veremund and grandson of RODERIC, with the evident intention, says Helfferich (*Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgothen Rechts*, 220, &c.), of connecting the new and old monarchies. Another MS. of uncertain date, from the monastery of San Millan, contains the following story, adopted by Lucas of Tuy and Roderic of Toledo, who wrote in the 13th century. WITITZA at Tuy "struck the Dux Fafila, Pelayo's father," whom EGICA had sent thither "quadam occasione uxoris fuste in capite," so that he died, and when he became sole king, he expelled Pelayo, who afterwards rebelled against the Saracens with the Asturias, from Toledo on account of the quarrel with his father." The story may be one of the interpolations of Pelayo of Oviedo (A.D. 1101-1129), who collected and altered various historical documents (among them the *Chron. Alb.*) generally in the interests of the see of Oviedo. [FROILA I.] The passage, however, is apparently wanting in the first edition of the *Chron. Alb.* in 1663, which was printed from such an MS. (See Florez's notes.) In Ibn-Khaldoun's *History of the Beni-Alphonso* (Dozy, *Recherches*, i. 86), compiled in the 14th century, and containing fragments from the work of a Cordovan annalist of the 11th century, who must, in Dozy's opinion, have used Latin chronicles now lost, we have Pelayo, son of Fafila; while in the monk of Silo (c. A.D. 1100 in *Esp. Sag.* xvii.), Pelayo is simply "Roderici regis spatarius." Later writers of the 16th and 17th centuries, improving on Lucas of Tuy, make Fafila and Theodifred, Roderic's father, sons of Kindasvinth, and thus victims in common of the rival house of Egica, in order to deduce the descent of the kings of Castile from the Gothic kings through Pelayo, and so trace it back to the emperor Theodosius, Theoderic the Ostrogoth, &c. &c. Roderic, too, and Pelayo thus become first cousins, and on Roderic's death, Pelayo inherits on strict principles of hereditary descent.

The authentic facts of Pelayo's history are but few. The chosen chieftain of the unconquered remnant in the Asturias, he headed a rising c. A.D. 717 or 718. At one time his followers were reduced to thirty men and ten women, who

took refuge in the cavern of Covadonga, where they supported themselves on the honey they found in the crevices of the rocks. Pelayo gradually grew stronger, till at last an army was sent against him under Alcama and the traitor OPPAS. The situation of the cave, situated in a narrow defile (see the description in Ford's *Handbook*, 241), was admirably adapted for defence against superior numbers; the Mohammedans were routed with great slaughter, Alcama was killed, and Oppas taken prisoner. Sebastian of Salamanca adds various legendary details; the arrows of the assailants were miraculously turned back upon themselves, 124,000 were killed and 63,000 more perished by the fall of a mountain in their flight. The effect of this victory was the evacuation of Gijon by the Berber governor Monnuza, who suffered heavy losses on his retreat.

Pelayo died in A.D. 737, after reigning between nineteen and twenty years, his capital being at Canicas (Cangas de Onis), and was buried with his wife GAUDIOSA, at St. Elalia of Velamio between that place and Covadonga. (*Chron. Alb.* Seb. of Sal.; Al-Makkari, translated by Gyangos, ii. 34; Dozy, *Hist. des Musulmans*, iii. 22.) [F. D.]

PELAYO. [PELAGIUS (12).] [F. D.]

PELEUS, an Egyptian bishop and martyr in Palestine with Nilus and Paternuthius, in the eighth year of the Diocletian persecution. They suffered by fire after labouring for a long time in the copper mines. (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13; *Mart. Palest.*, cap. xiii.) [G. T. S.]

PELUSIANUS, a friend of Antony the hermit, who, with another monk, Isaac, shared the sepulchre of Antony. (Jerome, *Vit. Hilarionis*, 30.) Jerome appears to have seen them himself (*ib.* 31). [W. H. F.]

PENDA, king of the Mercians. (PANTHA, Nennius, *M. H. B.* 75, 76.) Penda, according to the royal pedigrees preserved in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and by Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* 308, 630) was the son of Pybba or Wybba, the son of Creoda, the twelfth in descent from Woden. The British account preserved by Nennius makes him one of twelve sons of Pubba, and, omitting some of the intervening links, the eighth from Woden. We learn from Bede that there was before him at least one king of the Mercians, Cearl, the father of Quenburga, the first wife of king Edwin, but Cearl does not appear in the pedigrees, and is only conjecturally identified with Crida (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 14). Crida's death is noted in the Chronicle under the year 593, but the title of king is not given him there. By Henry of Huntingdon, however, he is made the first king of Mercia (*M. H. B.* 714). The title of king is not given by ancient authority to Pybba; and Cearl, if not identical with Crida, may have been his successor. But, however we attempt to pierce the obscurity, Penda seems distinctly to have been the first person who attempted to raise Mercia into a leading power. The tradition preserved by Nennius is that he was the first who separated the Mercians from the kingdom of the Northmen "Nordorum," and probably Crida and Pybba had both been dependent on the Northumbrian Ethelfrith,

after whose fall in 617 they would come under the rule or hegemony of Edwin.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle assigns to Penda a reign of thirty years, beginning from 626 (*M. H. B.* 308); the words of Bede (*H. E.* ii. 20) which give him a reign of twenty-two years from 633, might be interpreted to fix his accession as early as 611. The date usually accepted is the later one, and is certainly the point at which Penda enters into history. It is the year of Edwin's marriage with a Christian wife; Penda, the ruler of the territory that lay between Kent and Northumbria, must have made up his mind to reject Christianity; and as we do not know what had become of his kinswoman, Edwin's first wife, a family grudge may have affected his determination. From 626 to 655 Penda is the prop and mainstay of declining paganism and the ruthless destroyer of Christian kings.

We have no distinct data as to the extent of the Mercian territory when Penda became king; but it is certain that on the north, south and east he was pressed by hostile tribes of his own nationality, whilst on the west he had to deal with the remnant of the Britons who occasionally sought alliance with him against their still more powerful neighbours in Northumbria and Wessex. Long after this date the kingdom of the East Angles extended over Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire; Hwicca, or at least the southern portion, was West Saxon; and Oxfordshire likewise, when Dorchester was the ecclesiastical metropolis of Wessex.

Penda's first struggle was with Wessex; in 628, according to the Chronicle, he had a battle at Cirencester with Cynegils and Cwichelm, who were still heathen, and who made a treaty with him after what was perhaps a drawn battle (*M. H. B.* 309). It was possibly a result of this treaty that Coinwalch, the son of Cynegils, married a sister of Penda (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7), whom he afterwards repudiated. Five years after this, in conjunction with the British king Caedwalla, who was a Christian, Penda attacked Edwin in Northumbria, and defeated and slew him at Hatfield, Oct. 12, 633. In 635, however, Oswald threw off the Mercian yoke, and defeated Caedwalla at Denisesburn (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 1). Penda was at the time apparently engaged in a struggle with the East Angles, but he received as an exile Eadfrid, one of the sons of Edwin by his Mercian wife, who may have had reason to dread the jealousy of Oswald, and whom Penda subsequently murdered (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 20).

In 636 is dated the war with the East Anglian kings, Sigebert and Egric, both of whom perished in the same battle (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 18; *Flor. Wig. M. H. B.* 529). It is stated by Henry of Huntingdon that Earpwald, the predecessor of Sigebert, was slain by Penda, but this is not mentioned by Bede, and there was doubtless a danger that all such deeds should be laid to the account of the ruthless pagan.

The next recorded war took place in 642, when Oswald was the victim. Penda defeated and slew him at Maserfeld on the 5th of August. Oswy, who succeeded him in Bernicia, had, possibly under constraint from Penda, to allow Oswin (a kinsman of Edwin) to rule Deira for a few years.

In 645 Penda attacked Coinwalch in Wessex,

offended at the divorce of his sister, and drove him into East Anglia, where he was baptized at the instance of king Anna. Penda, however, never relaxed in his hostility to Northumbria; Bede mentions two expeditions, one in the time of bishop Aidan, in which he besieged Bamborough, and another in the time of Finan (*H. E.* iii. 16, 17). These inroads seem to fall between 645 and 652.

Penda must now have been feeling the approach of old age: if he was fifty in 626 he must have been now over seventy; and although he was wise enough to see that Christianity was everywhere gaining ground, and that it was of little use attempting to repress it at home, he kept up vigorous hostilities with the Christian provinces outside his own kingdom. Anna, king of the East Angles, who was an influential propagator of the Gospel, fell before him in 654. The year before this, Peada, Penda's eldest son, whom he had made king or viceroy of the Middle Angles, had received Christianity and brought missionaries out of Northumbria into Mercia. Penda, Bede tells us, did not forbid the preaching of the word; but those who having become Christians did not bring forth the works of faith, he especially despised, saying that they were wretched and contemptible who did not condescend to obey the God in whom they believed. It is possible that, whilst he would tolerate missions and monks, he would not tolerate the existence of political Christianity, or of a league of Christian kings against him.

But his end was drawing near. In 655 Oswy, worn out with the inroads of his pertinacious foe, offered to buy him off with a large gift of treasure. Penda declared that he would be satisfied with nothing short of the extermination of the rival power. Oswy thereupon, having vowed his daughter to perpetual celibacy and given twelve estates for the foundation of monasteries, marched with a small army against him. Alchfrith, one of his sons, was with him—Egfrith, another son, being a hostage in the hands of Penda's queen; and Oidilwald, the son of Oswald, being ranged on Penda's side; as was also the East Anglian king Ethelhere, whom Bede regards as responsible for the war. [ETHELHERE.] The two armies met near the river Winwaed, at a place which it has tasked historians and antiquaries for a thousand years to identify; the campus Gai of the British writers; placed by some as far north as the Forth, by others as far south as Leeds. Oswy gained a complete victory; nearly thirty ealdormen and British princes fell on Penda's side; and the aged king perished with his army.

The consequence, almost immediate, of Penda's death was the acceptance of Christianity in all the English kingdoms, though not at an equally rapid rate.

Penda's wife is called by Bede, Cynise, by Florence, Kineswitha. They had five sons and two daughters, all of them missionaries and five of them saints; Peada, Wulfhere, Ethelred, Merewald and Mercelm, Kineswitha and Kineburga. Legend adds a third daughter, Wilburga, the wife of Frithewald and mother of St. Osyth. [S.]

PENTADIA, a deaconess of the church of Constantinople, widow of the consul Timasius, "the master-general of the armies of Theodo-

sus" (Gibbon). On the banishment of her husband by the eunuch Eutropius to the African Oasis, where he subsequently perished (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 7), Pentadia had been also marked out for destruction by his base and cruel enemy. Hunted from one place of retreat to another, she at last took refuge in the church, where she was effectually protected by Chrysostom in defiance of the eunuch's abolition of the right of sanctuary, of which, by a nemesis of fate, he was not long after to avail himself to save his own worthless life. Pentadia, in gratitude, devoted her life to the service of the church which had afforded her asylum, and of the bishop by whom the rights of that asylum had been so effectually asserted. She became one of his deaconesses, and lived the life of a recluse, never leaving her house except to go to church. She was one of the faithful band of women with Olympias and Procula, who remained with Chrysostom to the very last, on the evening of his expulsion, and of whom he took so affecting a leave in the baptistery of the cathedral (Pallad. p. 90). She was subsequently apprehended on the charge of having been implicated in the conflagration of the church, and was dragged before the prefect Optatus, and by him committed to prison (Pallad. p. 28). Being brought before him a second time, Optatus sought to break down her firmness and intimidate her into a confession, by putting her fellow-accused of the male sex to exquisite tortures in her presence. But she remained constant in her denial of complicity in the fire, and without employing many words she stopped the mouths of her accusers, and convinced the bystanders that the accusation was false. She sent a detailed report of the circumstances, for which Chrysostom wrote her a long letter of warm thanks, at the same time praising highly her courageous wisdom (Chrys. *Ep.* 94). Subsequently when Heraclides, whom Chrysostom had appointed bishop of Ephesus in the place of the deposed Antoninus, was compelled in his turn to leave his see, Chrysostom wrote requesting Pentadia to render him all the support and consolation in her power (*Ep.* 14). Hearing that she was desirous of coming to visit him at Cucusus in the winter of 404, Chrysostom wrote entreating her to give up the notion, not only because her health was far too fragile to undertake such a journey at so inclement a season and Cucusus was exposed to the assaults of the Isaurians, but also because she could not be spared at Constantinople, where her presence supported and encouraged the faithful under their persecutions, and by leaving her post she would lose the spiritual gain she was acquiring by her beneficent actions (*Ep.* 104). Chrysostom wrote again complaining of her long silence, which surprised him the more, as several persons had come to Cucusus who could have conveyed her letters. He begged that she would send him a reply by the bearer of the letter (*Ep.* 185).

PEPIN. [PIPPIN.]

PEPUZIANI, another name for the Montanists (see MONTANUS, VOL. III. pp. 939, 945). Epiphanius may safely be disregarded, who, treating of the Montanists, in the 48th section of his work on heresies, treats of the Pepuziani, in the 49th, as a kindred but dis-

tinct sect; but his whole tone is that of one without any real information as to the special significance of the various names by which he had heard the Montanists designated. [G. S.]

PERATAE. [EUPHRATES (1).]

PERATICI, a heretical sect, anathematized in Actio x. of the sixth general council, A.D. 681 (Mansi, xi. 850), the same as the preceding.

[G. T. S.]

PEREBIUS (PERREBIUS, PERREVIUS), bishop of Pharsalia, appealed to pope Boniface I. against his fellow bishops, and Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica, in A.D. 422, was asked by the pope to enquire into the matter (Bonifacius I. *Epp.* no. 13, ap. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 776). He was present at the Ephesine council A.D. 431, where in the *Acta* he is called Περρέβιον Φαρμάλου, but in the subscriptions Θεσσαλονικέων Σαλτών, Thessalonicensium Saltuum. Le Quien places him in the see of Pharsalia (Hard. i. 1354, 1423, 1528; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 118; Jaffé, *R. P.* num. 146 al. 363).

[J. G.]

PEREGRINUS (1), called PROTEUS, an apostate from Christianity and a Cynic philosopher of the second century, whose history has been satirically told by Lucian. Lucian's work has sometimes been thought a romance, but the reality of it is amply confirmed by Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Attic.* viii. 3, and xii. 11, who describes Proteus as "a grave and courageous man, whom he had seen at Athens living in a hut, outside the city, where he taught wisdom and laid down that men ought not to sin when they can escape notice, fortifying his teaching out of Sophocles and the Greek poets." Aulus Gellius died early in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and before the suicide of Peregrinus. The real existence of Peregrinus is also proved by Philostratus (*Vitae Sophist.* ii. 13), where the contempt cherished for him by Atticus Herodes is mentioned. He was abusing, we are told, Herodes as he passed after the usual fashion of Cynic philosophers of that time, when Herodes turned and calmly asked him why he acted so. Peregrinus thereupon redoubled his reproaches in his semi-barbarous tones, when the other passed on, remarking, "We are both fools; you for abusing me, I for listening to you." Other writers, Pagan and Christian alike, of the same age, mention him as Tatian in his *Orat. adv. Graec.* c. 25; Athenagoras *pro Christian.* c. 26, who tells us of his statue which was erected at Parium; Maximus Tyrius, *Diss.* iii.; Tertull. *ad Mart.* c. 4; and Eusebius in his *Chronicon* (ii. 178 sq. ed. Schöne), cf. also among moderns, I. Sörgel, *Lucian's Stellung zum Christenthum*, 1875, Schiller's *Geschichte der Kaiserzeit*, p. 685, and Bernays' tract *Lucian u. die Kyniker*, Berlin, 1879. The story of Peregrinus is therefore a real one, and as such is a very valuable illustration of the life of the second century. The work of Lucian tells it. He was born at Parium on the Hellespont, where he committed various crimes, including parricide. He escaped justice by transferring his property to the municipality and then passed over to Palestine, where he came in contact with Christianity. He became a convert, and according to Lucian's account, even a bishop or at least a presbyter.

Lucian probably viewed the Christians as merely a Jewish sect, as he uses the term *Συναγωγεύς* about him. Yet this fact alone is not conclusive, for Jewish influences and names were then so widespread that they were applied sometimes even to pagan officials, of which a second-century example was lately discovered at Salonica, where the title *ἀρχισυναγωγός* is given to the president of a Collegium. Cf. *Comptes-Rendus de l'Acad. des Ins.* 1884, p. 259. Peregrinus was then imprisoned for the faith, and Lucian's words are a valuable and truthful description of the conduct of the Christians towards confessors generally. Crowds attended at the prison and ministered to Peregrinus, bribing the gaolers to obtain admission. The lately discovered "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" is also illustrated by this narrative. It takes elaborate precautions against wandering apostles and prophets, who desired only to make gain of the gospel. Such a false apostle was Peregrinus. His real character was, however, discovered, and he was excommunicated. He then became a Cynic philosopher, a sect which Lucian specially abhorred, and resided at Rome. He made use of the licence permitted them to abuse the emperor himself, but was speedily expelled by the Praefectus Urbis. He next passed into Greece, and there, to obtain a greater notoriety, burned himself alive at the Olympic games at the 236th Olympiad A.D. 165, following the example set by the Buddhist missionary who immolated himself at Athens in presence of the emperor Augustus. Cf. Strabo, xv. i. 73; Dion Cassius, liv. 9; and Lightfoot *On Colossians*, p. 394. Dr. Lightfoot has elaborately discussed the relations between the stories of Peregrinus and St. Ignatius in his new work (*SS. Ignatius and Polycarp*, t. i., pp. 129, 133, 331, 450, ii., pp. 206, 213, 306, 356; cf. Salmon's *Introd. to the N. T.*, pp. 522, 650). The article on Lucian in this Dictionary should also be consulted. Lucian's narrative about Peregrinus is there translated. [G. T. S.]

PEREGRINUS (2), first bishop of Auxerre, belongs to the second half of the third century. He was a Roman citizen, consecrated and sent to Gaul by Pope Sixtus II. A.D. 257, as one of a large number of missionaries who were bearing the Gospel into western Europe (Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 182 sq. ed. 1732). He is said to have been martyred at Baugi, in Auxerre, c. A.D. 304, and his usual feast is May 16, but his acts (Boll. *A. SS. Mai.* iii. 558-61), are not of historical value (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 261; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 42-3). [J. G.]

PEREGRINUS (3), a Donatist presbyter, who joined with the Seniors of Musti in denouncing the Maximianists, and requesting that they might be expelled from their churches (*Aug. c. Cresc.* iii. 56, 62). Whether the same as the Donatist bishop of Sufes, A.D. 411, does not appear. (*Coll. Carth.* i. 142.) [H. W. P.]

PEREGRINUS (4), a deacon, mentioned by St. Augustine in 412 to Marcellinus, as having accompanied Boniface, bishop of Cataqua, in a journey to Hippos (*Ep.* 139), perhaps the same as the one mentioned *Ep.* 149. [H. W. P.]

PEREGRINUS (5), a bishop to whom, c. 415, a letter was addressed by Alypius and Augustine

about Maximus, a physician, who had renounced Arian opinions, and to whom they had written previously on this subject. (*Aug. Ep.* 170, 171.) [H. W. P.]

PEREGRINUS (6), a count, baptized with Gabinianus at Easter 428 or 429, and spoken of very highly by St. Augustine (*Ep.* 227 al. 67; Tillem. xiii. 928). [C. H.]

PEREGRINUS (7), bishop of Misenum. [ENNODIUS; HORMISDAS.]

PEREGRINUS (8), disciple of St. Benedict, is Gregory the Great's authority for one of the miracles he relates of the saint (*Dial.* ii. 27). [F. D.]

PEREGRINUS (9), a bishop who wrote a preface to a short work containing a summary of Priscillian's doctrine in 93 canons first published by Card. Mai in *Spicileg. Rom.* t. ix. p. 1-10 (Ceillier, vi. 266). [G. T. S.]

PERENNIS, praetorian prefect and practical ruler of the Empire under Commodus. He condemned the Senator Apollonius to death as a Christian between 183 and 186. Perennis himself was executed on the demand of the guards. See PERENNIS in *Dict. Classical Biography*. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 21.) Görres in *Jahrbücher für Protest. Theologie*, 1884, p. 399-410, discusses the action of Perennis in the light of latest criticism. [APOLLONIUS.] [G. T. S.]

PERGAMIUS (1), a wealthy man in Egypt, to whom was attributed the wish to steal away the body of Antony, thus causing the friends of Antony to conceal his sepulchre. (Jerome, *Vit. Hilarionis*, 31-32.) [W. H. F.]

PERGAMIUS (2), a layman of position, who soon after Basil had become a bishop, wrote sharply to him, reproaching him with having allowed his letter to remain unanswered. Basil replies in a good-humoured strain, and says he must lose all knowledge of himself before he forgets Pergamius (Basil, *Ep.* 56 [354]). [E. V.]

PERGAMIUS (3), count of the East, whose wife was healed by Peter of Galatia, a solitary near Antioch c. 335 (*Theod. Hist. Rel.* c. 9; Tillem. xiv. 254). [C. H.]

PERGAMIUS (4), a bishop, a friend of Chrysostom, in whom he placed entire confidence, by whom, when on his journey to Cucusus, he requested Olympias to send him news of herself and her circumstances (*Chrys. Epp.* 10, 11, 12). [E. V.]

PERGAMIUS (5), chorepiscopus, about A.D. 430, commended for his kindness by Firmus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. (*Patrol. Graec.* lxxvii. 1514.) [G. W. D.]

PERGAMIUS (6), dux of Egypt, ordered along with the august prefect Apollonius in 482 by the emperor Zeno to expel John Talala from the patriarchal see of Alexandria and enthroned Peter Mongus (*Liberat. Brev.* c. 18). Pergamius afterwards carried Zeno's henotion to Egypt, and urged Peter to receive it, and admit the separatists to his favour (*Evag. H. E.* iii. 13). Tillemont, with great probability, identifies him with the Pergamius, brother of JOANNES (113)

SILENTIARIUS, described in the life of this saint as being high in the favour of the emperors Zeno and Anastasius, holding several offices under them, and zealously following in the steps of his pious brother (Boll. *Acta SS.* 13 Mai. iii. 231, § 3; Tillem. xvi. 330, 334, 634, 762). [C. H.]

PERGENTINUS, martyr with his brother LAURENTINUS (2).

PERIGENES (1), imaginary bishop of Argos, who, according to "Prædestinatus," c. 19, confuted the Sethites. [G. S.]

PERIGENES (2), bishop of Corinth, of which place he was a native, and where he was advanced by regular gradation to the priesthood. When the see of Patrae became vacant, he was made bishop by Rufus, bishop of Corinth, with the consent of all the provincial bishops, A.D. 419; but the people of Patrae would not receive him; their objection to him we do not learn, but he did not enter upon his see. When soon after the bishop of Corinth died, the Corinthians wished to choose Perigenes as their bishop, and petitioned pope Boniface for leave, as he exercised authority over the province of eastern Illyricum. After making some delay to allow of fuller information being received from his legate in that quarter, Rufus, bishop of Thessalonica, and also of fuller consideration of the question of episcopal translation (Socrates, *H. E.* vii. c. 36; Smith and Cheetham, *D. C. A.* i. 225), the papal consent was accorded, and Perigenes appointed bishop of Corinth c. A.D. 419, acknowledging the pope's supremacy, and that of Rufus his legate (Bonifacius I. *Épp.* no. 4; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xx. 760; Socrates, *ut supra*; Fleury, *H. E.* xxiv. 31; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 8). [BONIFACIUS I. Pope]. But on the death of Rufus, Perigenes hesitated to acknowledge allegiance to his successor at Thessalonica, though he was invested with the same legatine authority by pope Sixtus. To maintain his authority, Anastasius, the new bishop, convened a synod at Thessalonica, to which, as well as to Perigenes individually, the pope, A.D. 435, sent letters, urging him and the other Eastern bishops to yield obedience to Anastasius (Sixtus III. *Épp.* nos. 7, 8, 10; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* l. 610 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 250). His response to the papal address and the date of his death are unknown (Gams, *Ser. Episc.* c. 4; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 159). He was present at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, on the orthodox side (*Conc. Eph.* Act. vi. and *Conc. Chalced.* Act. i. ed. Binus). [J. G.]

PERISTERIA, a pious lady, who had bequeathed large sums of money for distribution among the monasteries and charitable houses in Egypt. The deacon Ischyrion accused Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, first in a letter to St. Leo, and then at the third Actio of the council of Chalcedon, of wasting her bequest [DIOSCORUS (1); ISCHYRION (4)] (Fleury, *H. E.* xxviii. 13). The same Peristeria is supposed to be "the most noted matron of that age," who is referred to by St. Nilus in his letter to the monk Agathias "de virtute colenda et vitio fugiendo." (Nilus, *Opp.* 596, Soares, 1673; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 428; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 209.) [J. G.]

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

PERPETUA (1), martyr, Feb. 2 (Bas. *Men.*), March 7 (*Mart. u.s.*; *Vet. Rom.*) In Wright's *Syriac Martyrology*, she is commemorated with Saturninus and ten other confessors. Her full name was Vibia Perpetua. The name Vibia often occurs among African inscriptions, but not Vivia, as Ruinart spells it. The name Perpetua occurs once only among the African inscriptions, *C. I. L.* t. viii. p. 1018. The place of Perpetua's execution has been a subject of debate. Ruinart and Valesius maintain the claim of Carthage, where Victor Vit. tells us the martyrs were buried in the great basilica. Tuburbium has the authority of some MSS., whence they have been sometimes called Martyres Tuburbitanæ; a name which more properly applies, according to Valesius, to three martyrs, Maxima, Donatilla, and Secunda, who suffered under Valerian, celebrated by Augustine in his 345th sermon, and by the ancient Carthaginian *Kalendar* in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* on III. Kal. August. Perpetua was arrested with Saturninus and Secundulus, and with two slaves, FELICITAS and Revocatus. Satorus, who also suffered with her, escaped arrest for a time, but subsequently surrendered. All of them seem to have been catechumens merely.

I. *Abstract of the Acts.*—Perpetua was honourably born, twenty-two years of age, married, and had lately brought forth an infant son. She had a father, mother, and two brothers, one of whom was a catechumen. As soon as she was arrested, her father strove to induce her to recant, an attempt which he frequently renewed even before the tribunal. The martyrs were baptized after their arrest, possibly while kept in custody by those who had arrested them (quum adhuc cum persecutoribus essemus), and before they were transferred to the public prison (in carcerem) (cf. Le Blant, *Actes des Mart.* v. 9, p. 48). Upon their transfer thither they seem to have been consigned to the dungeons, as Perpetua tells us of their frightful heat and darkness. They were at once attended, according to the ancient discipline of the Carthaginian church, by the deacons Tertius and Pomponius (Cypr. *Ep.* 15 *ad Mart.*). They bribed the soldiers to allow the martyrs the privilege of exercise in the air for a few hours every day. Perpetua now saw her first vision, indicative of her future passion. She saw a ladder reaching to heaven guarded by a dragon. Satorus mounted first and then Perpetua followed. They came to a large garden, where was a shepherd clad in white, feeding sheep, while thousands in white robes stood around. The shepherd gave Perpetua a piece of cheese, which she received "junctis manibus" and consumed, the attendants saying "Amen," upon which Perpetua awoke and understood that death was nigh at hand. Their trial came on soon after. They were suddenly summoned to the Forum while at dinner, where they were placed on a raised platform (catasta). After confession of their faith, the procurator Hilarianus, who presided instead of Minucius Timinianus, the proconsul, who had died, condemned them to the beasts on Geta's natal day, probably the anniversary of his assumption of the title Caesar, as his true birthday was May 26. After her condemnation Perpetua saw another vision about her brother Dinocrates, who had died when seven years old. She saw that he was in

punishment, but after continuous prayer for him it was revealed to her that he was removed into a place of refreshment and peace. This vision has been the subject of some controversy. It is of course a clear proof that prayers for the dead were then used by that party in the church which claimed to adhere most closely to apostolic usages. Some supposing Dinocrates unbaptized, have claimed it as sanctioning the view that the unbaptized dead are helped by prayer, a view which Augustine combated in *De Orig. Animæ*, lib. i. cap. 10, and lib. iii. cap. 9, where he maintains that Dinocrates was in punishment for sins committed after baptism. The day before her passion Perpetua saw another vision, wherein she triumphed over an Egyptian, representing the devil, and was rewarded with a golden branch. The portion of the Acts, ch. iii.-x. inclusive, purport to have been written by Perpetua; ch. xi.-xiii. were written by Saturus, and narrate his vision. He beheld that after they had suffered and had departed from the body they were borne by angels into the East. There other angels received them in a beautiful garden, where they met Saturninus and Artarius, who had been burned alive, and Quintus who had died in prison. They were then introduced, clad in white, into the Lord's presence, where the Trisagion was always sung, and round whose throne stood twenty-four elders. Before the door of this inner presence chamber they saw Optatus the bishop, and Aspasius the presbyter-doctor, sad and separated. These cast themselves at the martyrs' feet and entreated them to compose their quarrel. The martyrs embraced them, saying, "Art thou not our Father (Papa), and thou a presbyter, why cast yourselves at our feet?" The angels then sternly rebuked Optatus, and bade him correct his people because of their disorderly assemblies. The martyrs then recognised many of their brethren, and were regaled with perfumes breathing description. The Acts then give a minute account of their passion which bears every mark of authenticity. They were publicly entertained the day before their passion, at the supper prepared for those condemned to the beasts, which they turned into an agape (Tertull. *Apologet.* c. 42). When the hour of execution arrived the tribune attempted to array the men as priests of Saturn, the women as priestesses of Ceres, but yielded to the indignant protest of Perpetua. She suffered by the sword, after she had been tossed by an infuriated cow. Like Blandina at Lyons, who suffered the same, she was unconscious of any pain (cf. Dodwell's *Dissert. in Irenæum*, ii. §§ 43, 46; Routh's *Reliq.* i. 360). The conduct of the martyrs converted Pudens the governor (optio) of the prison, whom Ruinart would identify with a Pudens commemorated in the ancient Carthaginian Kalendar on April 29. The use of Optio for a prison official is fixed by August. in *Joh.* c. xi. trac. xlix. § 9; Le Blant, *AA. MM.* p. 49; and Du Cange, s. v.

II. *Date.*—The Acts fix the martyrdom on the natal day of the Caesar Geta. The term natal day, as we have already noticed, is used for the anniversary of the accession of an emperor. Now, according to Clinton's *Fasti*, Geta was made Caesar in the winter of A.D. 193, which would fairly agree with the time of year of the martyrdom. As to the precise year we are more uncer-

tain; the succession of African proconsuls being as yet very imperfectly known. We know that they suffered in the year when Minucius Timianus was proconsul and died in his period of office. One circumstance, however, would seem to fix the date to the year 202, or at farthest 203. There was as yet no general persecution of the Christians, such as soon after developed itself. The freedom enjoyed by the clergy and Christians in ministering to the martyrs is sufficient proof of this. Why, then, did they suffer? On January 1 of the year 202 Severus was at Antioch, where he appointed himself and Caracalla consuls for the ensuing year. During the month of January he proceeded by easy stages through Palestine to Egypt, upon which journey he exercised such severities upon the Jews as, according to Renan, have left their mark on the Talmud (*Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 775-76). He also published an edict forbidding any fresh conversions from Paganism to Judaism or Christianity, while imposing no penalties on original Jews or Christians. Now all of our martyrs were fresh converts, and as such seem to have suffered under this edict. It is difficult to decide between the years 202 and 203. Against 202 there is this to be said—our martyrs suffered on March 7. They must have been arrested some time in February, perhaps early in the month, to allow time for imprisonment apparently in three different places, the delivery of Felicitas and the trial. Now if the edict was published in January, sufficient time could scarcely have elapsed for its reception at Carthage. If it was not published till the emperor's arrival at Alexandria, where he seems to have specially devoted himself to the worship of Serapis, it could not possibly have been known in Carthage in time to satisfy our dates. We are therefore inclined to fix upon the year 203 as the true date. Görres, in *Das Christenthum u. Kais. Sept. Sever. Jahrb. Prot. Theol.* 1878, p. 315, cf. p. 290, points out that Perpetua was illegally condemned to the beasts, and should, as honourably born, have been beheaded. But the Roman proconsuls were not very observant of strict law in persecuting the Christians (cf. Tertull. *ad Scap.* c. 4; Pauli, *Sent.* v. 29, 1; Ulpian, *Dig.* xvii. 12, 2).

III. *Authorship of Acts.*—Some have maintained that Tertullian was the author of the Acts. The style is in many places very similar to Tertullian's. The documents themselves profess to have been in great part written by Perpetua and Saturus, and completed for publication by a third party. Who this third party was cannot now be ascertained. Tertullian certainly knew the Acts, as he refers to the vision of Perpetua in *De Animâ*, c. 55, where, however, he evidently writes from memory, and confuses the vision of paradise granted to Saturus with the vision of her conflict granted to Perpetua the day before her passion, not the day of her passion, as Tertullian states. A further question has been raised as to the opinions of the martyrs and of the compiler of the Acts, whether they were Montanist or Catholic. On the one hand it is urged that the preface utters Montanist sentiments, speaking of prophecies and visions as granted by the Spirit. On the other hand, it is equally clear that the martyrs had not separated from the Catholic communion, as they were

attended by the deacons, according to custom; while again Satorius sees the bishop Optatus and the presbyter Aspasius in Paradise, where the bishop is reproved not for rejecting the Paraclete, but for suffering his flock to walk in a disorderly manner. Yet it is quite evident that the spirit and tenets of Montanism had infected a large and enthusiastic section of the church, which hardly tolerated the more conservative and easy-going views and practices of the church authorities. From that section our Acts emanated. Cardinal Orsi, in the last century, wrote a long dissertation to prove the orthodoxy of the martyrs, which Basnage had impugned. Routh, on the other hand, lays down decidedly that the author was a Montanist (*Rel. Sac.* i. 455).

IV. *Original Language of Acts.*—All our manuscripts are in Latin; yet Aubé (*Les Chrét. dans l'Emp. Rom.* p. 615) thinks they may have been originally written in Greek. One MS. indeed represents Perpetua as speaking Greek to the bishop Optatus in Paradise. The Acts certainly contain a very large number of Greek words in Latin characters, whence we may at least conclude that the martyrs were bi-lingual, and that Greek was then very current at Carthage. [SCILLITAN MARTYRS.] The Acts contain some interesting illustrations of ancient church customs. The Good Shepherd appears as He does in the catacombs, feeding His sheep, Eucharistic words and actions are recorded. The shepherd gives a piece of cheese to Perpetua. She receives it "junctis manibus," while those around say "Amen" (c. iv.). The kiss of peace is given (c. x.). The Trisagion is sung, and in Greek (c. xii.). In the language of the visions we can clearly see the influence of the Apocalypse (cf. specially c. xii.). The Acts were discovered and published by Lucas Holstenius in the 17th century. Ruinart embodied them in his *Acta Sincera*. They will also be found in *Acta SS.* Boll. Mart. i. p. 630; Munter, *Primord. Eccles. Afric.* p. 226. They are translated in Clark's Ante-Nicene Series, Cyprian's works, t. ii. p. 276. Aubé, *l. c.* p. 521, has published another version from a Parisian MS.

On the chronology of the martyrdom, cf. Uhlhorn, *Fundamenti Chronolog.* Tertull. 1852, p. 5, sq.; Bonwetsch, *Die Schriften Tertullians*, 1878, p. 75; *Gesch. des Montanismus*, 1881, p. 184; Arkill on Perpetua, in new volume of Herzog's *Cyclopaedia*. [G. T. S.]

PERPETUA (2) JULIA. [JULIA (8).]

PERPETUUS, ST., sixth archbishop of Tours, between St. Eustochius and St. Volusianus, both of whom were his relatives, belonged to one of the great senatorial families of the Auvergne. He possessed considerable wealth (*Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc.* x. 31), was a student of sacred literature and a friend of the two poets Sidonius Apollinaris and Paulinus of Périgueux (*Sid. Apoll. Epist.* vii. 9; Paulinus Petr. *De Vita S. Mart.* vi.; *Epist. ad Perpét.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 1064 seqq., 1071). He was consecrated in 460 or 461, and in the latter year presided over the council of Tours, convoked to make head against the spirit of worldliness and profligacy which had pervaded the Gallic clergy (*Mansi*, vii. 943 seqq.). The council of Vannes,

held about 465, and over which apparently he also presided, had the same object in view (*ibid.* 951 seqq.). His principal work was the construction of the great church of St. Martin at Tours. The one built by Briccius had become too small for the fame and miracles of the saint. Of the new one which replaced it at 550 paces from the city, and to which the saint's body was translated with great ceremony (circ. Jul. 4, 473), owing to its being Gregory the historian's own church, we have full and interesting details and measurements. (See *Hist. Franc.* ii. 14; *De Mirac. S. Mart.* i. 6.) Euphronius, bishop of Autun, gave the marble for the saint's tomb (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 15), and inscriptions in verse were composed for it by Sidonius Apollinaris of Clermont and Paulinus of Périgueux. The former's has come down to us (*Epist.* iv. 18), but of the one contributed by the latter we only hear in his letter to Perpetuus (*Paulinus Petricord.*, *ibid.*, Migne, col. 1074). A good many other churches were built by Perpetuus, and notably one in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul, which he constructed to receive the roof of St. Martin's old church, as it was of elegant workmanship (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 14; x. 31). Besides church-building Perpetuus bestowed much care on the services of his church. Gregory recounts the fasts, vigils and regulations for divine service instituted by him for different seasons of the year, and still observed in Gregory's own time (*Hist. Franc.* x. 31; cf. *Hist. Litt.* ii. 626-627; Ceillier, x. 438, 441).

Perpetuus died in 490 or 491, after an episcopate of thirty years (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 26; x. 31), and, as he had asked in his will, was buried in the church he had built, at the feet of St. Martin (*Epitaphium* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 755, and elsewhere). The old hagiologies are at variance as to the day of commemoration of his death, Florus, Rabanus and others noticing it on Dec. 30, while Usuard and the *Roman Martyrology* place it on April 8 (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. i. 750, where the latter date is adopted as his day, but his *depositio* is fixed Dec. 30).

Perpetuus has left an interesting memorial in his will. It was first published, together with a metrical epitaph, by d'Achéry in 1661 in the fifth volume of the *Spicilegium*. It is also given by Boll. (*Acta SS.* Apr. i. 750-751), Ruinart (*Greg. Tur. appx.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1149, seqq.), Migne (*Patr. Lat.* lviii. 753 seqq.), *Gall. Christ.* (xiv. instr. 1-3), and Ceillier (x. 439-440). There seems to be no doubt of its genuineness. Perpetuus signed it in duplicate on Mar. i. 475. After giving their freedom to the slaves, both male and female, on an estate he had purchased, forgiving his debtors, bequeathing various legacies to churches, relations and friends, and providing from his own means a pension for two priests he had been compelled to degrade, he makes the poor the heirs of all the residue of his property (cf. *Hist. Litt.* ii. 624; Ceillier, 439-441). [S. A. B.]

PERSEUS, a bishop, "*Collega noster*," sent on business from Rome to Carthage with Felician. (*Cyp. Ep.* 59.) [E. W. B.]

PERSON OF CHRIST, CONTROVERSIES RESPECTING THE. A full discussion of the views held respecting the Person

of Christ within the period embraced in this Dictionary would range from the heresy of Simon at one end of the series to Adoptionism at the other, and the reader will find accordingly under such names as ARIUS, ARIANISM, ADOPTIONISTS, DOCETISM, SABELLIANISM, discussions of various portions of this great question. But the heresies which arose during our period touching the Person of Christ, may be classed under two great divisions. (1) Heresies which dealt with the Person of Christ in relation to the persons of the Holy Trinity; which, broadly speaking, embrace all heresies down to and including Arianism in its various shapes. (2) Heresies which deal with the Person of Christ, as considered in and by itself alone; embracing, therefore, all questions touching the relations between the human and divine natures and the mode of their union in His person. The first class, in fact, dealt mainly with the Godhead of Christ; the second dealt with His Incarnation. This second class begins with Apollinarianism, followed by Nestorianism, Monophysitism, Monothelitism, and ending with Adoptionism. Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, and Adoptionism have been already discussed. It only remains, therefore, to consider in this article the view of Christ's person taken by the Monophysite or Eutychian party, out of which was logically and necessarily evolved the Monothelite heresy; for if Christ had but one nature, and that the divine, He necessarily had but one will, and that the divine will. Under this article therefore will be treated the Monophysite and the Monothelite heresies.

MONOPHYSITES

is the general name of a number of sects agreeing in the heretical tenet, that only one nature subsisted in Christ after the hypostatic union. MONOPHYSITISM designates their doctrinal tendency (*μόνος, single, φύσις, nature*). The Monophysites (*Μονοφυσίται*) received this name from their theological opponents, whom they in turn styled Diphsytes or Dyophysites (*Διφυσίται—Δυοφυσίται*) and "Nestorians" or "semi-Nestorians;" by their own writers they are constantly spoken of as "the orthodox" and "the believers," or "the faithful." (See John of Ephesus, *Ecc. Hist. passim*.)

1. *Earlier traces of the doctrine of a single nature.*—The doctrine of the Divinity of Our Lord having been defined by the decrees of Nicaea, A.D. 325, the main problem of Christology next began to press for solution. The Nicene symbol had declared that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, was begotten of the Father, that is of His substance, and thus was God begotten of God, and consubstantial with the Father (*ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ*); and that for our salvation He came down, was incarnate, and made man (*σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα*). The church had thus decided that the Redeemer was both God and man; and the problem was to reconcile, in the concrete unity of His person, these two aspects or natures of the Godhead and the manhood; in other words, to define the relation between the divine and the human element in the historic personality of Jesus, and to determine how God and man coëxisted in the unity of one individual being. As Dörner has pointed out, the difficulty of the problem was rendered insuperable by the

fact, that the two natures were more and more regarded as mutually antagonistic and exclusive. Under such a condition no real union—no union, that is, which was more than a mechanical juxtaposition, or which did not involve an entire or partial suppression or absorption of one or the other nature—was conceivable.

The idea of the union as a *mixture* of the two natures, was one for which high patristic authority might be alleged. Origen (d. 254) and St. Gregory Nyssen had described the union as a *κρᾶσις* or *σύνκρᾶσις*, using these terms in their strict sense, and not in the free manner of SS. Irenaeus, Cyprian, Augustine. Origen speaks of "the quality of the mortal element in Christ changing into an ethereal and divine quality;" and of "His mortal body, and the human soul therein, changing into God, by participation in His divinity;" language which obviously implies a transformation of the human into the divine nature, in consequence of the union, the divine properties passing over into the human nature, and, as it were, deifying it. So also St. Gregory Nyssen taught that by the union with God, the flesh of Christ cast off all weakness and corruption, rising superior to the laws and restrictions of ordinary human bodies. Like a drop of vinegar poured into the ocean, it wholly lost its own nature, and took on the divine. Its *substance* remained unimpaired, but submerged and lost in the ocean of deity. Accordingly the divine and human elements in Christ might be distinguished only in thought.

Similar conceptions had been entertained by the Arians, were adopted by Apollinaris and his followers, and afterwards revived by the Julianist Monophysites. Like St. Gregory Nyssen, Apollinaris insisted upon the *oneness* of Christ. To distinguish God from man in Him was to set up two persons, two Sons (a favourite Monophysite contention). "The Jews," he wrote, "in crucifying the body, crucified God." The Scriptures make no distinction between the Word and His flesh; there is one nature, one hypostasis, one activity (*ἔστι μία φύσις μία ὑπόστασις μία ἐνέργεια*). Christ was neither all man, nor all God, but a blend (*μίξις*) of God and man. And as the worship of Christ is one, there are not divers substances (*ἄλλη καὶ ἄλλη οὐσία*) but one only, in virtue of the synthesis of God with a human body. That human body was not endowed with a rational soul (*ψυχὴ λογικὴ*), for where complete man is, there is also sin; and Christ did not grow in goodness through a course of discipline. In Him, therefore, the divine reason or *logos* discharged the function of intelligence or spirit (*νοῦς—πνεῦμα*). "O new creation!" he exclaims; "O godlike mixture! God and Flesh constituted one nature!" (*θεὸς καὶ σὰρξ μίαν ἀπετέλεσαν φύσιν*.)

The doctrine of a mixture of the natures was condemned by the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. As the conflict with Arianism had issued in a recognition of the perfect divinity, so the conflict with Apollinarianism produced the declaration of the perfect humanity of Christ.

2. *Antagonism of Alexandria and Antioch.*—The period between the council of Constantinople and that of Chalcedon (381-451) was marked by a controversy in which the antagonistic tendencies represented by the schools of Alexandria and Antioch came into collision with

each other. The question was whether the incidents of human life which the Scriptures predicate of Jesus, His birth, bodily affections, and death, must be referred to the manhood only, or to both the natures. The Alexandrian theology clung to the mystical and transcendent aspect of the incarnation, whereby God became one with man. The great Athanasius had asserted an unmixed physical union of the Word with the flesh that became His own, and explained this *ένωσις φυσική* as a union in respect to nature (*ένωσις κατὰ φύσιν*). In accordance with this thesis, which was aimed at the Arians, the weightiest emphasis was laid upon the unity of the divine and human in Christ; an idea which was pushed to such extremes that all distinction of the two natures appeared to be obliterated. Just as Apollinaris had approved of such expressions as "God was born," "God was crucified," so the Alexandrian church in general delighted to style the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God (*Θεοτόκος*). On the other hand, the theologians of Antioch, following the lead of Diodorus of Tarsus (d. 394) and Theodore of Mopsuestia, insisted upon the unchanged permanence of the human nature in and after its union with the divine. They had always before their eyes the spectre of Apollinarianism; and they rejected with horror phrases which seemed to attribute birth and death to deity. They admitted that the manhood was adorable in so far as it was the instrument of the Logos; not, however, as in any degree participating in the divine properties, which the Alexandrian doctrine of an exchange of attributes (*ἀντιμεθίστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων*) assumed.

3. *Theodore of Mopsuestia*.—The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia was intimately connected with his peculiar theory of man. He believed that it was Christ's vocation to be that true and real image of God which Adam ought, but failed, to have become; and he asserted that so far as He was man, Christ was subject to moral development, ascribing to Him, in opposition to Apollinaris, a real human soul endowed with the faculty of self-determination or free-will, which, for our salvation, sustained a real conflict with evil. When Jesus was formed in the womb, the divine Logos, foreknowing what manner of man He would become, united with Him; and all His life long, Jesus resolved and acted in harmony with the indwelling deity. Further, God dwells in men not specially in respect of His nature or activity, for in those respects He is omnipresent; but in respect of His good pleasure in them (*εὐδοκία*; St. Matt. iii. 17), which varies in degree according to the various excellence of their characters. The divine pleasure in Christ was so great, that God dwelt in Him as in the Son. Theodore called the union of the two natures a *synaphea* (*συνάφεια, connexion*). Each was complete, and therefore each involved a person, *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπρόσωπὸν ἔστιν ὑπόστασις εἰπεῖν*; but in their union they constituted one person (*πρόσωπον*).

Against the Syrian attempts at circumscribing the ineffable mystery of the Incarnation by the forms of the human understanding, the Alexandrian spirit rose in implacable hostility. Its principal champion was the patriarch Cyril, whose long and bitter controversy with Nestorius, beginning in a strife about the term *Θεοτόκος*, ended in the condemnation of his adversary by

the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. Nestorius, a Syrian monk who had been raised to the patriarchate of Constantinople, adhering to the theology of Antioch, disapproved of the popular title of the Virgin, as implying a confusion or mixture of the two natures in Christ: "The creature," he urged, "bare not the Creator; she bare a man, the instrument of deity. The Holy Spirit did not create God the Word, but fashioned of the Virgin a temple for God the Word to dwell in." Like his teachers, he held an indwelling (*ἐνὸικησις*) of the Godhead in Christ, and a conjunction (*συνάφεια*) of the two natures; but he seems to have carefully avoided that sundering of which his enemies accused him: "for the sake of the hidden, I adore the apparent; God is inseparable from the apparent, therefore I separate not the honour of that which is not separated: I separate the natures, but I unify the adoration."

The doctrine of the Antiochenes was a protest on behalf of the truth and reality of Christ's human nature. The grand objection to their theory lay in the fact, that it seemed to postulate a merely mechanical or local union of the two natures, and in its most developed form hardly got beyond a *relative union* (*ένωσις σχετική*), a union, that is, conditioned by the fitness of the elements for coexistence and coöperation. The Alexandrians rightly apprehended that the union of God and man in Christ was something much beyond this; but they fell into the opposite extreme of asserting what Dörner has called a *magical union*, appearing to maintain a transmutation of the human into the divine. Neither of the two conflicting schools shewed much inclination to understand the position of its antagonists; a captious deduction of repudiated consequences was the favourite argumentative device; anathemas were met by counter-anathemas; and the final triumph which Cyril obtained, through court influence, was rather a personal victory over his powerful rival than a triumph of orthodoxy over heresy.

4. *Cyril of Alexandria*.—The expulsion of Nestorianism did not bring peace to the church. Isidore of Pelusium had forewarned Cyril against preparing the way for perpetual schisms, a warning which was amply justified by the after course of events. In his intemperate advocacy of the Alexandrian doctrine, Cyril had allowed himself to use language which at least lay open to the gravest misapprehension. This was especially the case in his twelve *Anathematismi* or articles of recantation, which he launched at Nestorius (A.D. 430), and of which Gibbon has said that they are "indelibly tinged with the colours of Apollinarian heresy." Cyril held fast by the *ένωσις φυσική*, and adopted the formula "One incarnate nature of God the Word" (*μία φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*), which he cites as from Athanasius. After the union the two natures are no longer to be distinguished; in the abstract, indeed, two natures may be discerned, in the concrete only one, that of the incarnate Word. And the predicates proper to each are now transferrable; one may correctly say that the divine Word *suffered* in flesh, and in flesh was crucified. Mary was truly Theotokos. Cyril did not by any means deny the true humanity. On the contrary, he held that the Word took to Himself a perfect

human nature of the same substance as ours, which suffered no change by that ineffable union. In Christ there was God the Word + a true human soul and body. The union, however, was so close that not two natures but one resulted. Cyril explained this by the analogy of soul and body, which combine to constitute a single human nature, though they are in themselves absolutely different the one from the other. Thought can distinguish two natures in Christ, just as it can in a man; but in reality, they are so indissolubly united, that we ought not to say that two natures exist in Him, but only one. It was not that Cyril confounded the ideas of *nature* and *person*. He could distinguish them well enough for purposes of controversy. But he considered the Logos to be the personal element in Christ. The Logos at the incarnation appropriated flesh or humanity, as a mere selfless group of attributes. "He remained one, yet not lacking flesh nor without a body; but having a body as a *proprium*, inseparable in virtue of union" (*ἴδιον ἔχων ἀπὸ καθ' ἑνωσιν ἀδιάσπαστον*). The union did not modify the original divine attributes; it merely added another group of characters to the concept Logos, so that thenceforth Logos + Humanity made up one being. "The manhood became proper to the Word, and one Son is conceived of therewith" (*ἡ ἀνθρωπότης γέγονεν ἴδια τοῦ λόγου, καὶ εἰς υἱὸς νοεῖται σὺν αὐτῇ*). When hard pressed, however, Cyril could only defend his doctrine of the unconditional transfer of predicates, by such paradoxical sayings as that the Logos *suffered without suffering* (*ἀπαθῶς ἔπαθε*), or that Christ, while remaining omniscient, assumed also the attribute of limited knowledge *by way of an economy* (*οἰκονομικῶς οἰκειοῦται καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων*). No wonder that the unlettered monks, who were everywhere his passionate allies, mistook Cyril's meaning. The ineffable mystery which he rightly asserted for the incarnation, seemed to be preserved and enhanced by this kind of language; but it is certain that among the rank and file of his supporters, many, in their zeal against Nestorianism, fell into the opposite error of confounding the natures, and believed in an absorption or transmutation of the manhood by the Godhead.

5. *Eutychian development of Monophysitism.*—Cyril died in 444, and was succeeded by Dioscorus, who with less learning and argumentative power, was far more conspicuous for violence. The archimandrite Eutyches and the monks of Constantinople, who had done good service for Cyril against their patriarch Nestorius, were as zealous for his successor against the Syrian champion Theodoret of Cyrus, whom they supposed to divide the one and only Christ into two Sons of God. Already Dioscorus had accused his great opponent to Domnus the patriarch of Antioch, and had apprised the emperor that the whole church of eastern Asia was "Nestorian," when (A.D. 448) the charge of heresy fell like a thunderbolt upon his mainstay at Constantinople the abbat Eutyches. Eusebius of Doryleum pressed the charge of Apollinarian errors against this person, in the home synod of the patriarch Flavian. Before the synod Eutyches said, "I confess that our Lord originated out of two natures before the union; after the union I confess one nature"—the ordinary Monophysite

view. In accordance with Alexandrian phrase, he called the body of Christ God's body; but, he added—and this it was which gave the greatest offence—that he did not think it could be consubstantial with our bodies (*ὁμοούσιον ἡμῶν*). Condemned by the synod, Eutyches appealed from its sentence to a general council; and the emperor Theodosius, who was his friend and the fast ally of Dioscorus, ordered a council to meet at Ephesus (A.D. 449). Dioscorus was to preside, supported by Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of the Cappadocian Caesarea. Flavian and the other judges of Eutyches were not to vote, but to wait for the verdict of the council. The abbat Barsumas, a furious Monophysite, was to sit as representing the Syrian monks, who were all partisans of Alexandria. The verdict of such a council was certain beforehand. Bribery and intimidation secured the deposition of Flavian, Theodoret, Eusebius. The legates of pope Leo the Great could not get a hearing for his famous letter to Flavian, in which he drew the sharpest distinction between the two natures as subsisting in Christ after the union. Flavian, who was fatally maltreated by the brutal partisans of Dioscorus, appealed to another council to be held in Italy. Pope Leo, indignant at the lawless proceedings of what he not unjustly styled a "synod of brigands" (*σύνδοδος ληστρικῆ*—latrocinium), wrote, and induced Valentinian III. to write, to Theodosius proposing an Italian council. Unwilling to yield, Theodosius was compelled to negotiate, if he would have his new patriarch Anatolius recognised by the Western church. Soon a change of court parties restored his sister the princess Pulcheria to power, who was rigidly Dyophysite in her opinions; and the cause of the murdered Flavian triumphed when she and her consort Marcian ascended the throne (A.D. 450). With the court, many bishops, whom fear or servility had connected with the Egyptian party, now changed sides. Amnesty was proclaimed for all, save Dioscorus and Juvenal. By command of Marcian, 630 bishops met, first at Nice, then at Chalcedon, which was yet nearer to the court. The emperor, who dreaded the alienation of the powerful and fanatical Monophysites, was hopeful that a compromise might be achieved, and the schism healed by the labours of this council. As soon as the bias of the imperial court became manifest, Dioscorus was deserted even by his former allies. At the outset a majority of the bishops went over from the Egyptian to the Oriental benches. All assented to a reversal of the decrees of Ephesus. Yet when the first draft of a creed prepared by Anatolius and a secret committee of bishops was submitted to the council it provoked dissensions. The draft is lost, but apparently it asserted that Christ consisted of or originated out of two natures (*ἐκ δύο φύσεων*), an ambiguous phrase, more agreeable to the Monophysites than to their opponents. The Roman legates, who had before interfered to prevent Dioscorus from taking his seat in the council, now insisted upon the acceptance of Leo's decisions, formulated in the letter to Flavian; and the emperor ordered a second committee to draw up another creed. Much noisy contention followed. At last the imperial commissioners declared, that it was the opinion of Dioscorus that Christ *consists of* (*ἐκ*), not *subsists in* (*ἐν*) two natures; whereas pope Leo had

defined that two natures are united without confusion, without change, without separation, in the one Christ. Which was right? The bishops, or a majority of them, shouted their accord with the pope, and his doctrine was incorporated with the definition of the council, which concludes thus (Mansi, vii. 108): "Following, therefore, the holy fathers, we all, with one voice, teach to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, the same being truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body, of the same substance with the Father as touching the Godhead, and of the same substance with us as touching the manhood, in all respects save sin like unto us; before the worlds begotten of the Father, as respects the Godhead, in the last days for us and for our salvation of Mary the Virgin, the Mother of God (Θεοτόκου) as respects the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only begotten, known of two natures (Latin text, *in duabus naturis*; see Evagr. ii. 4), without confusion, without change, without division, without severance (ἐκ δυνάμεως φύσεων ἀσυνχύτως ἀρρήτως ἀδιαρίτως ἀχωρίστως ἑνωριζόμενον); the difference of the natures having been in nowise done away on account of the union, but rather the special character of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person and one hypostasis; not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and only begotten God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ: even as from the first the prophets and Jesus Christ Himself taught us concerning Him, and as the creed of the fathers hath delivered unto us."

Dioscorus did not quail. He denied the authority of the council, and even excommunicated pope Leo. He was deposed. In the eighth session Theodoret was restored to his see, but not until he had yielded a reluctant assent to the anathema against Nestorius.

The council of Chalcedon sought to exclude from the church the one-sided exaggerations of both Antioch and Alexandria, the errors identified with the names of Nestorius and Eutyches. Against the former, "those who ventured to corrupt the mystery of the economy, and talked shameless folly about a mere man who was born of the holy Virgin Mary," it adopted the synodical letters of "the blessed Cyril" to Nestorius and his Oriental sympathisers; against the latter, "those who introduce a confusion and mixture, and senselessly feign that the nature of the flesh and of the Godhead is one, and monstrosly assert that the divine nature of the only begotten was passible owing to the confusion," or who "insanely hold that the form of the servant taken from us was of a heavenly or some other (non-human) substance," the council stamped with its authority the letter of Leo to Flavian. The general Monophysite position was condemned in the words, "The synod anathematizes those who suppose two natures of the Lord before the union, but one after it." And the council ruled that, on pain of deposition for the clergy, and excommunication for monks and laity, none should propose, or write, or teach, or even think a different creed. The painful and repulsive features of the struggle should not be allowed to confuse the judgment of the modern student as to the real merits of the controversy, and the

importance of the points at issue between the contending parties. History compels us to distribute our blame impartially. Abundant evidence is supplied, by their own writers and champions, of the fierce intolerance of the Monophysite sectaries towards the Catholic body; apart from the general consideration, that the narrow exclusiveness of the sectarian spirit must always be essentially opposed to Christian forbearance and charity. Moreover, the degenerate manners of the times must not be forgotten. Incidents and behaviour characteristic of the age, however deplorable as exhibitions of an imperfect practical Christianity, cannot fairly be regarded as reflecting discredit upon the definition of Catholic dogma which emerges as the permanent outcome of those bewildering strifes and internecine conflicts. They, at all events, who believe in the perpetual guidance of the One Church by the Spirit of its Divine Founder will find no serious difficulty here. After all deductions upon whatever accounts, the truth remains that the definition of Chalcedon did inestimable service to the church, and to the cause of a sound Christology, by its authoritative declaration that the problem of the union of the two natures is not rightly solved by assuming either a dual personality or a metamorphosis of one nature into the other, i.e. either on Ebionitic or on Docetic principles. At the same time, as commonly happens, the solution of one problem was the suggestion of another; and henceforth theological speculation laboured with the difficulty of reconciling, in the unity of one person, the two natures which, as a result of the definition of the council, appeared to be mutually exclusive and incompatible with each other. During the following three centuries this antithesis rose into continually sharper and clearer contrast, until the rise of Adoptionism in the 8th century brought matters to a crisis.

6. *Progress of the struggle after the Council of Chalcedon.*—The council of Chalcedon broke up without having achieved its immediate ends. Opposing tendencies were not likely to be reconciled by the decrees of a synod which might be said to have oscillated between two creeds, and to have been swayed in its decisions by the imperial will. The partisans of Dioscorus spread their doctrines among the illiterate monks of Egypt and Palestine, who saw nothing but "Nestorianism" in the assertion of the two natures in Christ after the union. It was a common belief that Nestorius the arch-heretic had been invited to the synod of Chalcedon, but had providentially died on the way. The oecumenical council was regarded as a mere party synod; and the Monophysites—as they now began to be generally designated—stood aloof henceforth in sectarian isolation from the main body of the church. They constituted a numerous and powerful community not only in Egypt and the East, but also in Constantinople itself, as the lately recovered history of John of Ephesus abundantly proves. In Palestine the hot-headed monk Theodosius, abetted by the empress Eudoxia, excited his brethren of the cloisters, drove the time-serving Juvenal from his see, and usurped the patriarchate of Jerusalem, deposing and creating bishops with a high hand, until at last violence was suppressed by violence (A.D. 451–453).

At Alexandria terrible scenes had ensued upon the news of the deposition of Dioscorus. A number of imperial soldiers were burnt alive by the mob in the Serapeum. The outbreak was quelled by a stronger force, and the orthodox Proterius was maintained on the patriarchal throne, although the Monophysites held aloof under the presbyter Timotheus Aelurus (*weasel*), and the deacon Peter Mongus (*μωγγός, hoarse*). On the death of Marcian (A.D. 457), they ventured to make a patriarch of Timotheus Aelurus, and Proterius was murdered in the cathedral church. The fanaticism of the Monophysites was not appeased until it had burnt all the episcopal chairs in the churches, on which the murdered patriarch ever sat, washed with sea-water the altars at which he had ministered, removed his name from the diptychs, and confiscated his goods. The new patriarch at once excommunicated all "Chalcedonians," and among them pope Leo. Meanwhile some clerical refugees from his violence accused Aelurus at the court; and the latter, not to be outdone, memorialised the new emperor, accusing the late synod of "Nestorian" heresy, and vindicating his own views by passages from the fathers. The emperor Leo I., well aware of the power of the Monophysites and of the expedience of a peaceful solution (Egypt being, as John of Ephesus remarks, the granary of the capital), at first thought of another general council. This pope Leo strongly deprecated; and being likewise unwilling to come, as the emperor requested, and conduct the negotiations with the Monophysites, he advised that the metropolitans of all parts of the empire, except Egypt, should be ordered to ascertain the opinion of their bishops respecting the validity of the election of Aelurus, and the orthodoxy of the decrees of Chalcedon. A great majority of some 1600 prelates answered that the council was orthodox, and the election of Aelurus null and void. The bishops of Pamphylia attempted to mediate between the opposed camps, by replying that the symbol of Nice was sufficient for all practical needs. The doctrine of the union of two natures in the one Christ was not delivered to catechumens as a lesson or creed, but reserved to the clergy for polemical purposes. The epistle of Leo to Flavian was not a creed, but an invective against heresy. They further avowed a preference for the phrase, one incarnate nature of the Word, on the ground of patristic authority (Mansi, vii. 573). They concluded by recommending an imitation of the forbearance of Christ towards those who were in error. The emperor, however, proceeded to order an inquiry concerning the murder of Proterius at Alexandria, and banished Aelurus first to Gangra, then to the Tauric Chersonese (A.D. 460). Another Timotheus, nicknamed Salophaciolus (Σολοφάκιος) was appointed in his stead; a prelate whose orthodoxy was tempered by a conciliating spirit of Christian charity, which won the respect and affection even of the bitterest Monophysites.

Fresh disturbances broke out at Antioch. Peter the Fuller (*ὁ γραφεύς*), a monk who had been a fanatical supporter of Eutyches at Constantinople, succeeded, by help of the monks, in expelling the orthodox patriarch Martyrius; and having occupied his throne, convulsed the church by interpolating the liturgical Trisagion

with a Monophysite formula. The ancient hymn of the Seraphim (Isa. vi. 3) had been modified in the reign of Theodosius II. into "Ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς!" Peter further altered it by introducing the phrase, *ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς*. Thus originated the Theopaschitic controversy, which was not settled till the reign of Justinian (A.D. 553, *vid. infr.*). Not long afterwards Peter was banished by an imperial decree (A.D. 470). When, however, Zeno, the son-in-law of Leo, had been driven from the throne by the usurper Basiliscus (A.D. 476), who sought support by favouring the Monophysites, Peter the Fuller and Timotheus Aelurus were reinstated in their sees, and an Encyclical (τὸ Ἐγκύκλιον) was addressed by the new emperor "to Timotheus, the most pious and God-loving archbishop of Alexandria," ruling that the Nicene creed, and the canons of Constantinople and Ephesus should alone be valid. The decrees of Chalcedon and the letter of pope Leo were to be burnt, and all bishops were to subscribe the Encyclical (Evagr. iii. 4). As usual, the Greek bishops shewed themselves facile enough in the matter. But the orthodox monks of Constantinople were not inactive, and Acacius the patriarch was soon able to effect a successful rising in favour of the exiled emperor. The falling usurper vainly issued his *Ἀπὸρριπίδιον* (Repeal of the Encyclical); Zeno triumphed, and with him the cause of Chalcedon (A.D. 477). The five hundred bishops who had accepted the Encyclical now signified their sorrow to Acacius, at the same time excusing themselves on the ground of constraint. Shortly afterwards, Timotheus Aelurus died, and the Monophysites chose Peter Mongus to succeed him. The restored emperor passed sentence of death upon Mongus, who only saved himself by flight. Timotheus Salophaciolus was forced again upon the unwilling Alexandrians. Confiscation and exile were held over all who should not submit to his communion within two months. For a time the patriarch's wise moderation, an attitude which he maintained in spite of Zeno's exhortations to suppress the heretics, secured the tranquillity of the church. But upon his death, the Monophysites again elected Mongus, while the orthodox minority raised John Talaia to the patriarchate. Talaia, confident in the friendship of Illus, a great courtier, omitted to pay the customary compliments to the patriarch Acacius; a slight which the latter did not forget. The subsequent rebellion of Illus was sufficient to discredit Talaia with the emperor, and Mongus, seizing his opportunity, hastened to the capital and urged the expediency of a compromise with the Monophysite majority of Alexandria. By the help of Acacius, Zeno was persuaded to publish (A.D. 482) his famous Edict of Union (*ἑνωτικόν*), which sought a basis of union in the suppression of disputed phrases, and the use of less definite expressions such as all could admit. The document is preserved in Evagrius (iii. 14). It rules that the symbol of Nice, Chalcedon and Ephesus is alone valid, and confirms Cyril's Twelve Anathematismi. It declares that Christ is one and not two, for to one belong the miracles and the sufferings; and it condemns not only Nestorius and Eutyches, but all who, *whether at Chalcedon or any other synod*, had contradicted the doctrine of this

edict. [HENOTICUM.] In the heated state of parties the only effect of this well-meant effort for peace was an aggravation of discord. The zealots on both sides separated from the moderates who accepted the compromise. Many of the Egyptians renounced their connexion with Mongus, and were henceforth known as *Acephali* ('Ακέφαλοι, the headless party). John of Érphesus (v. 6) speaks of them as heretical. Many of them, he relates, found refuge in Pamphylia, where they were again converted by the zeal of the "orthodox" (i.e. the regular Monophysites). They regarded Aelurus as the last genuine patriarch; but, contrary to his teaching, they appear to have believed that the body of Jesus was superior to ordinary human bodies. On the other hand, acceptance of the Henoticon was a proof of Monophysite heresy in the eyes of inflexible partisans of the council of Chalcedon. Rome firmly opposed the compromise. Since the downfall of the Western Empire (A.D. 476) the popes had become independent of Constantinople; after vain remonstrances, therefore, Felix III. excommunicated Acacius, who, however, paid no heed to the sentence, but quietly removed the pope's name from the diptychs of his church (A.D. 484). The result was a schism between East and West, which lasted from A.D. 484 to 519. Meanwhile the Eastern church was still distracted by the questions which the Henoticon had failed to shelve or settle. In Constantinople the monks called *the Sleepless* ('Ακοίμητοι) maintained communion with Rome, and the bitterness of party there and elsewhere often broke out into open quarrel. Anastasius (A.D. 491-518) succeeded to the empire and policy of Zeno. His desire was to maintain the public peace by holding the balance evenly between the rival parties, but he was foiled by the fanaticism of the times. Suspected from the first by Euphemius the patriarch of Constantinople, who had wrung from him a written pledge that he would not attack the authority of Chalcedon, Anastasius got rid of him on a charge of treason (A.D. 495). The new patriarch Macedonius signed the Henoticon, and attempted to reconcile the fierce monks of the capital, especially the *Akoimetoí*, to the compromise, but was himself prevailed upon to become a decided Chalcedonian. Meanwhile the Monophysites of Syria, headed by Xenaias (the famous Philoxenus) bishop of Mabbogh (Hierapolis), rose in revolt against Flavian the patriarch of Antioch, who had subscribed the Henoticon, but was unwilling to condemn the council of Chalcedon and the doctrine of the two natures. Swarms of furious monks crowded the streets of Antioch; the citizens and another band of monks drove them out with bloodshed. Both Xenaias and Severus, another eminent leader of the Monophysites, afterwards repaired to Constantinople, whither hordes of monks of both parties followed them. The emperor now favoured the Monophysite faction, by way of reprisals on Macedonius and the unquiet Chalcedonians. Riots broke out in the very churches, one body of monks chanting the Trisagion in its older form, another interrupting with the Monophysite addition. After peace had been restored the emperor managed to depose Macedonius (A.D. 511) and appoint in his stead Timotheus, who accepted the Henoticon, and even anathe-

matized the council of Chalcedon. Next year another mad outbreak in Constantinople, again in connexion with the Trisagion, was only lulled when the aged Anastasius appeared in the circus as a suppliant, offering to abdicate his throne! In A.D. 513 Severus expelled Flavianus, and occupied his place as patriarch of Antioch. On the other hand, the orthodox majority in Jerusalem drove out Elias their patriarch, who belonged to the moderate party. The struggle pursued its wild and bloody course throughout the eastern provinces.

In A.D. 514 new troubles befel Anastasius. Vitalian, a rude savage, commanding the imperial troops in Thrace, declared himself the champion of Chalcedon; and after wasting the country up to the walls of the capital, compelled the emperor to promise the restoration of Macedonius and Flavianus to their sees, and the termination of the schism between East and West. Negotiations with pope Hormisdas were begun. The pope demanded of Anastasius (1) the recognition of the council of Chalcedon and Leo's letter to Flavian, and a general enforcement of the same upon the clergy; (2) the anathema upon Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, Aelurus, Peter Mongus, Acacius, Peter the Fuller; (3) the restoration of all deposed clergy who had supported Rome, their causes to be submitted to the pope, who should also have the trial of those who had persecuted the orthodox. Anastasius stood firmly by the memory of Acacius, and the negotiations were broken off, to be renewed by his successor, Justin I. (A.D. 518-527), a Dacian soldier, who had been captain of the guard. Though illiterate, Justin was known to be staunchly orthodox, and, moreover, allowed himself to be guided by the counsels of Vitalian and Justinian, both of whom were pledged to the cause of Chalcedon. The citizens of the capital were unanimous in their clamours for communion with Rome, for the recognition of Chalcedon, for the deposition of Severus of Antioch. Justin published edicts recalling the exiled bishops, deposing their Monophysite successors, and debarring heretics from public offices. The names of Acacius, Zeno, Anastasius, were stricken off the diptychs. Severus and the other Monophysite leaders fled to Alexandria, where the predominance of their party protected them against the violence of the court. The whole East, except Egypt, became orthodox, and the schism with Rome was at an end (A.D. 519).

7. *Disintegration of the Monophysites. Origin of the sects.*—The conflux of the Monophysite leaders to Alexandria was the occasion of new controversies within the party itself. Two main tendencies emerge, which may be generally described as a further evolution of Eutychianism, and an approximation to the standpoint of orthodoxy. On the one side the chief names are Dioscorus, Timotheus Aelurus, Julian of Halicarnassus; on the other, Severus of Antioch, and Philoxenus of Hierapolis. The former so rigidly insisted on the unity of Christ's incarnate nature as to involve a transmutation of human into divine; the latter made serious attempts to shew how distinctions might exist in the one compound nature.

(1) Dioscorus, the successor of Cyril, whose followers were called *Dioscoritæ* (Διοσκοριταί), taught that God the Word became man without

sin and without change; and suffered *not according to nature, but according to grace*. He did not doubt the reality of the flesh of Christ or of His sufferings; but he asserted that the blood of Christ was, *in its own nature*, the blood of God, and hence its transcendent sacrificial worth. It is not corruptible (*φθαρτόν*), nor of the same substance with anything merely natural (*μη γένοιστο ἐνὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὁμοούσιον τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ*).

Timotheus Aelurus in like manner appears to have believed that the incarnation involved no change in the divine nature, as must have been the case had it been mixed or compounded with a second nature, that is, humanity. "The one nature of Christ," he wrote, "is the Godhead alone, albeit the latter has been made flesh without change" (*φύσις δὲ Χριστοῦ μία μόνη θεότης, εἰ καὶ σαρκώεται ἀτρέπτως*). The Word was incarnate not by any natural necessity, but only with a view to the salvation of man. The human nature which He assumed *was of the same kind and substance as ours*; but being merely God's instrument adopted for a special purpose, it did not constitute a human nature distinct from the divine. "His flesh is neither the essence (*οὐσία*) nor the nature (*φύσις*) of Christ; it is a dispensational condition (*νόμος οἰκονομίας*) rightly carried out for our salvation;" yet, "it is called consubstantial and consubstantial (*ὁμοούσιος*) with us, according to the principle of the dispensation (*κατὰ τὴν τῆς οἰκονομίας λόγον*), viz. generation from a woman." But, "if the man who was to be formed in the Virgin's womb had been a man according to nature and law—an ordinary natural man that is, subject to human conditions—he could not have been born of her without destroying her virginity;" an argument similar to that which was ascribed to Eutyches, who was accused of teaching that the divine Word passed through Mary like water through a pipe. On the other hand, Aelurus proved to certain Eutychians who wished for communion with him, that "the Word was consubstantial with us according to the flesh, and with the Father according to the Godhead." It is clear that both Dioscorus and Aelurus assigned such overwhelming preponderance to the divine aspect of Christ that practically the human element was from the outset absorbed or at least deified. The *homousia* of His flesh with ours becomes, from their point of view, shadowy and unreal.

Dioscorus had declared that the blood of Christ was not earthly and corruptible like that of bulls and goats. JULIANUS, BISHOP OF HALICARNASSUS, took up and developed this idea, in his polemic for the absolute unity of Christ. "If we call the body of Christ corruptible (*φθαρτόν*), we make it essentially different from the Logos, and so admit two natures in Christ—the doctrine of Chalcedon." Accordingly the result of its union with the Logos was that this body forthwith partook of the divine incorruptibility; it acquired, as it were, a new and higher nature, which exalted it above even those innocent corporeal affections and weaknesses which are common to mankind (*πάθη φυσικὰ καὶ ἀδιάβλητα*), such as hunger, thirst, weariness, and the like. It was by no means denied that Christ took of the Virgin a body consubstantial with ours; but by its connexion with the Word, His body was

immediately invested with a supernatural character; it became *ἄφθαρτον*, like the body of the Protoplast (Adam) before the Fall; and was the same before as the orthodox believe that it became after the resurrection. At the same time, the sufferings of Christ were real; only He endured them by choice (*ἐκὼν*), and not by natural necessity (*ἀνάγκη φύσεως*). He was not subject to the laws of our nature, yet He freely renounced the impassibility of His human nature, and submitted to suffering for our sake. Julianus was no Docetist. He lays his curse upon those who say that human flesh, as an abominable or polluted nature, is unworthy of union with God.

The followers of Julianus were injuriously called by their opponents APHARTHODOCETISTS (*Ἀφθαρτοδοκῆται*) and Phantasiasts (*Φαντασιασταί*). The orthodox argument against them was this: if the body of Christ were incorruptible, it could not really have been consubstantial with ours; thus His sufferings and death were only in seeming (*δοκῆσει*); and in seeming only He became man, and we are saved (John Damasc.). But, like their master, the Julianists expressly asserted that Christ ate and drank and suffered not in show or seeming (*φαντασία, δοκῆσει*), but in reality; not, however, in consequence of natural necessity, but of His own voluntary choice, for our salvation. Further, they taught that His incorruptible body was consubstantial with ours. Against this, however, we must set the fact that, in opposition to the Severians (*vid. inf.*), they maintained that there was in Christ but one kind of life, viz. a divine life, one nature, viz. a divine, not a composite nature, *one essence (οὐσία, substantia) and quality (πόση)*. They seem to have meant that although Christ's human nature was in origin earthly, and like our own, the mode of His actual existence was purely divine; free from all human weakness, He felt, willed, and thought divinely. It followed that His sufferings were divine, and accordingly one of them spoke of His tear for Lazarus as *ἄφθαρτον τὸ δάκρυον καὶ θεῖον*. They urged that if Christ were not entirely identical with the Word, and yet were adored as God, a fourth person would be added to the Trinity. This Julianist view of the human nature plainly lies open to the objections (1) that if the body of Christ lacked a human method of feeling, willing, and acting, it was not truly human; (2) as it had exchanged human for divine properties, a mixture of the natures had taken place.

Some of the Julianists hesitated to exclude absolutely the conception of *φθορά* in relation to Christ's body. They allowed that it remained *potentially corruptible (δυνάμει φθαρτόν)*, while raised by the power of the Logos above actual "corruption." Others carried out their premises to the extreme conclusion, that from the moment of union the humanity became *increate*. Even as a man, Christ had a right to the titles of God and Creator, and therefore was a proper object of worship. The abolition of the distinction of human from divine was thus complete. They were called ACTISTES (*ἄκτιστος, increate*). They styled their opponents CRISTOLATRIANS (*κτιστός, created, λατρεύω, to worship*).

(2) The second and more important section of the Monophysites was constituted by the followers of Severus, patriarch of Antioch (from

A.D. 511, *vid. supr.*). The doctrine of Severus coincided in the main with that of the patriarch Cyril. Christ was of (ἐκ) two natures, neither of which was at all modified by the union: *μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν καὶ μένουσι καὶ σκοποῦνται ὅπερ εἰσιν. μένει δὲ ἐκάτερον ὅπερ ἔστι τῆ φύσει.* The two elements might still be discriminated in thought: "Two," he says, "are the natures that we mentally discern (*νοοῦμεν*) in the Christ, the one created, the other increate." And the human nature was consubstantial with ours: "The Word united hypostatically with Himself the body that was conatural and homogeneous and consubstantial with us" (*ἐνώσαντα καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἑαυτῷ τὸ ἡμῶν διωφρὲς καὶ ὁμογενὲς σῶμα καὶ ὁμοούσιον*). Moreover, in his controversy with Julianus and his followers, Severus wholly repudiates the notion of a blending or confusion of the natures (*σύγχυσις*), as well as that of a suppression of the humanity. On the other hand, he not less distinctly denies a permanent dualism of natures and anathematizes the council of Chalcedon: "The synod and pope Leo, having defined two natures in the case of Christ (*ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ*), and two activities of them, after the ineffable union, most righteously be laid under ban, as having divided the one Christ into two persons (*πρόσωπα*), for an impersonal nature is never active" (*οὐ γὰρ ἐνεργεῖ ποτε φύσις οὐχ ὁφειστώσα*). Leo had asserted, in his letter to Flavian, that the divine nature worked the miracles, the human underwent the sufferings; each nature fulfilling its own distinct function. Severus replied that such a view was virtually the *relative union* (*ἕνωσις σχετικὴ*) of Nestorianism. It seemed to him that a human nature, evincing its existence in a distinct activity (*ἐνέργεια*) of its own, involved a purely human substratum or subject (*ὁφειστός, ὑπόστασις*), side by side with and independent of the divine person of the Son. To avoid this result, Severus declared that all the actions and affections of Christ must be ascribed to the one incarnate nature of God the Word. The one nature was, indeed, compound (*σύνθετος*), but its two parts always acted together, so that both deity and humanity were concerned in all that Christ did and suffered. His doings and sufferings, therefore, were in no case wholly divine nor wholly human, but *theandric*, divine-human, or godmanlike; a term which Severus borrows from pseudo-Dionysius. "As the incarnate Word is undivided Himself, His activity also must be undivided (*ἀμερίστος*)." As an instance Severus was fond of adducing the walking on the sea (John vi. 15), an act performed through the flesh, yet transcending the laws of its nature (*ὅπερ τοὺς τῆς φύσεως νόμους*). Such cases proved to him that the laws of the human body might be temporarily suspended or counteracted by the will of the Logos; not that they were abolished from the moment of union, as the Julianists imagined. On the contrary, "His body bore its voluntary and sinless affections in accordance with the laws of its nature, by permission of God the Word," and "His death took place according to nature (*φυσικῶς*), with His own consent." Severus was careful to avoid Theopassianism: "So far as He was God, Emmanuel suffered not, save in seeming; so far as He was man, He suffered in truth." "He suffered in the flesh that He had made His own; and so the sufferings may be

called properties (*ἴδια*) of the incarnate Word" (Cyril's doctrine of *ἰδιοποίησις*), "and it is correct to say that God suffered for us."

It will be seen that the Christology of Severus approaches very near to that of Chalcedon. He held that Christ was one, and that this personal unity embraced a divine and a human element, each of which "remained unimpaired and unaltered, yet subsisting in composition, not in independent monads" (*ἐν συνθέσει ὁφειστώτων καὶ οὐκ ἐν μονάσιν ἰδιοσυστάτοις*). But he preferred to designate these elements as essences or substances (*οὐσίαι*) rather than as natures (*φύσεις*), lest he should appear to posit two such "monads," that is, independent (personal) centres of action.

Philoxenus (*Xenaias*) agreed with Severus in teaching that the one nature of Christ was composite. God the Son became a man of the Virgin, without alteration of His divine attributes. The Word was not changed into flesh at the union, nor was there any mixture of the two elements, nor transformation of either into the other. The one nature of Christ was constituted out of two, just as any one man is constituted of the two natures of soul and body (an illustration of Cyril's, which Severus also employed). Philoxenus appears to have agreed with the Julianists that the sufferings of Christ were not natural, but strictly a matter of choice (*Barhebraeus*).

The first class of Monophysites theorised chiefly about the body of Christ and its exaltation by union with God the Word. Severus, in commenting on the words, "Not as I will but as Thou wilt" (Matt. xxvi. 39), alleged that they do not prove the existence of two diverse wills in Christ, nor that His will flagged, nor that a struggle took place in Him. On the contrary, the Logos freely permitted His flesh to suffer according to its nature. The question was thus suggested whether the other faculties of Christ's human soul, volition and knowledge, were to be considered as ordinarily limited by the laws of human nature, to which His feelings and affections were confessedly subject, with occasional exceptions, determined by the controlling will of the Logos; or whether in these respects the soul of the God-man shared always in the divine perfection of the Logos. To be consistent, Severus must have admitted the former alternative. Accordingly, after his death, the deacon Themistius came forward at Alexandria with the doctrine that the human soul of Christ resembled ours in this respect also, that its knowledge was limited. In proof of this, Themistius referred to the Lord's declaration that no man knoweth the hour, *not even the Son*, but the Father only; and to His question about the grave of Lazarus, "Where have ye laid him?" The doctrine gained but a small following among the Monophysites. Its advocates were called *AGNOETES* (*Ἀγνοηταί*) or *THEMISTIANS*, and were excommunicated by Theodosius, the Severian patriarch of Alexandria. Thenceforth they formed a distinct sect, which existed down to the 8th century.

8. *Continuation of the external history.*—The emperor Justinian (A.D. 527–565) aspired to legislate for the spiritual as well as the temporal domain. His crafty consort Theodora played upon his weakness in the interest of

Monophysitism, to which she was devotedly attached. Her zeal in the cause is well illustrated by a story which tells how she contrived to forestall the emperor by converting the Nubians to Monophysite Christianity (John Eph. *Ecl. Hist.* iv. 1 sqq.). Justinian never wholly abandoned the hope of reconciling the Monophysite sects to the main body of the church. A recurrence of the Theopaschitic dispute afforded the first occasion for decided intervention. The formula of Peter the Fuller (*vid. supr.*), which implied that God was crucified, had found a certain degree of acceptance in Constantinople, especially with the monks and populace. This was quite natural, seeing that the church had sealed with its approval the use of the term Theotokos, "Mother of God." If birth were thus predicated of God, it might seem only consistent to attribute to Him suffering also and death. In the time of Justin (A.D. 519) John Maxentius and a band of Scythian monks had demanded official recognition of the Trisagion in its amended form at Constantinople; and not succeeding there, had applied to pope Hormisdas, who, however, pronounced the new clause heretical. His successor, John II., thought otherwise; and the famous theologian Fulgentius Ferrandus expressly maintained the doctrine, that one of the Trinity might be said to have been born and crucified. The formula gained an increasing hold upon the popular mind, until (A.D. 533) Justinian sanctioned it by a special edict, doubtless in the hope of satisfying the Monophysites, whose representatives had accused their opponents of not confessing that "the Lord suffered in the flesh, or that He was one of the holy Trinity, nor that the miracles and sufferings alike belonged to the same person." Justinian's edict ruled "that one member of the holy and consubstantial Trinity was crucified" (*crucifixum unum esse ex sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate*). In A.D. 553, the fifth general council anathematised those who should reject the formula. The orthodox in Syria continued to use the Trisagion with the added clause, until its rejection by the Quinisext council, Can. 81, after which it was peculiar to the Monophysites and Monothelites. This concession was as fruitless as the various conferences which the emperor ordered between the bishops of the contending parties. Justinian was swayed now in this, now in that direction, according as he yielded to the influence of the representatives of Monophysitism or orthodoxy. He can hardly have been very decided in his adherence to the tenets of either, seeing that for thirty years he employed the earnest Monophysite John bishop of Ephesus as a trusted minister; sending him in A.D. 542 to convert the heathen of Asia Minor, and in 546 appointing him inquisitor of the secret heathen of the capital.

The Monophysite leaders rallied around Theodora; the sect organised itself everywhere; Anthimus, represented as orthodox, was raised by her influence to the patriarchate of Constantinople (A.D. 535); Severus resorted thither. Next year, pope Agapetus appeared at the Byzantine court as envoy of Theodoric the Ostrogoth. To him some of the monks and clergy accused Anthimus. Agapetus excommunicated the patriarch on his refusal to make an orthodox confession, and return to Trapezus, his original

see. Justinian's eyes were opened, Anthimus was deposed, and Mennas made patriarch in his room. A home synod of the new patriarch at once condemned Monophysite doctrines, and Justinian sanctioned its decrees by a severe enactment, which banished their leaders from the capital and other chief cities, and warned them to abstain from public functions, and from making converts. The writings of Severus were doomed to the flames; those who transcribed them were to lose the right hand. In Alexandria itself Justinian appointed an orthodox patriarch, the abbat Paul. This persecution only availed to weaken the Greek empire in the East. The province of Great Armenia, which was almost entirely Monophysite, revolted to the Persians. Baffled thus far, but not discouraged, the empress now began a new intrigue. She secretly engaged to secure the popedom for the Roman deacon Vigilius, if he would pledge himself to subvert the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and declare in writing his sympathy with Anthimus and the Monophysite leaders. Silverius, who had succeeded Agapetus, proving less compliant than Vigilius, was banished, and Vigilius elevated (A.D. 538). He so far kept faith with Theodora as to address to Anthimus, and his friends Theodosius and Severus, an epistle which accorded with their peculiar sentiments: "me eam fidem quam tenetis," he wrote, "deo adjuvante et tenuisse et tenere significo." And in the confession appended to the letter: "non duas Christum confitemur naturas, se ex duabus naturis compositum unum filium, unum Christum, unum Dominum. Qui dicit quia hoc quidem miracula faciebat, hoc vero passionibus succumbebat (pope Leo's assertion) et non confitetur miracula et passiones unius ejusdemque quas sponte sua sustinuit carne nobis consubstantiali anathema sit!" and so on. But Vigilius was cunning enough to beg his correspondents not to publish the letter, but rather to pretend suspicion of him, in order to facilitate the fulfilment of his engagements to the party. This was not quite what the empress had expected. But she was not to be disheartened. At once she threw herself upon a new scheme, which might at least sow discord in the camp of the enemy. At this time Justinian was greatly under the influence of the abbats Domitian and Theodore Ascidas of Palestine, whose zeal for the council of Chalcedon he had rewarded with episcopal honours. Both were Origenists, and their influence at court enabled them to protect the monks of Palestine, who had adopted the same views, against the persecutions of the patriarch Peter of Jerusalem. Peter wrote to the emperor, complaining of the spread of Origenism. At the same time Pelagius, the pope's legate at Constantinople, and the patriarch Mennas urged the condemnation of Origen, probably because they were jealous of the power of Ascidas. The emperor was only too pleased to play the judge in such a cause. Forthwith he ordered Mennas to convene a synod and condemn the departed heretic (circ. A.D. 544). The fifteen anathemas against Origen appear to belong to this synod. All bishops and abbats were to subscribe them as a condition of consecration.

9. *Controversy of the Three Chapters.*—*Reaction against the School of Antioch.*—Ascidas and his friend Domitian outwitted their ad-

versaries by a prompt assent to the synod's decrees. But they could not feel safe until they had managed to occupy the heresy-hunting spirit of the emperor with some other object. Justinian was engaged upon a book intended to further his darling purpose of reconciling the Monophysites by answering their objections to the decrees of Chalcedon. Ascidas and Domitian assured him that he might dispense with the labours of authorship; the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, of Theodore's writings against Cyril of Alexandria, and of the letter of Ibas bishop of Edessa to Maris of Ardasher, would remove all objection to the council from the Monophysite apprehension. These three writers, as chief representatives of the theology of Antioch, were hateful to the Monophysites; and the empress gladly abetted a plot, which would wound the patriarch Mennas and the orthodox party, by a serious though indirect blow at the authority of the council of Chalcedon, which had expressly pronounced the writings of Theodore and Ibas to be orthodox. Justinian was persuaded, and published (A.D. 544) the famous edict of THE THREE CHAPTERS (*περὶ τριῶν κεφαλαίων, De tribus capitulis*), which anathematised the person and writings of Theodore, and the specified works of Theodore and Ibas. The letter of Ibas was offensive to the Monophysites, because, while it by no means acquitted Nestorius of blame, especially for his opposition to the term Theotokos, it accused the patriarch Cyril, whom they regarded as infallible, of Apollinarian heresy. Justinian was careful to add to his edict an anathema upon all who should construe it to the prejudice of the council of Chalcedon.

The edict of the Three Chapters was sent to all bishops for subscription. The patriarch Mennas yielded an unwilling assent, to be withdrawn if the pope's decision were adverse. In like manner the patriarchs of Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria only succumbed to threats of deposition. Bribery also was freely employed, and the time-serving spirit of the Eastern prelates is painfully illustrated by their general submission to the imperial dictates. On the other hand, the African, Illyrian, and Dalmatian bishops were nobly true to their convictions. Pontianus wrote to the emperor that the condemned writings were unknown in Africa; but in any case he and his brethren could not acquiesce in laying the curse of the church upon the dead. Justinian now turned to pope Vigilius, who was as destitute of moral courage as of theological acumen. In his perplexity the pope appears to have requested the opinion of the famous Fulgentius Ferrandus, deacon of Carthage. Ferrandus, writing to the Roman deacons Pelagius and Anatolius, pronounced against the edict of the Three Chapters, mainly on the three grounds (1) that there could be no question of the authority of general councils; their decrees were inviolable; (2) that deceased brethren are beyond human judgment, and that stumbling-blocks should not on their account be thrown in the way of the living; (3) that no individual ought to compass for his own writing, by many subscriptions, an authority which the church concedes to Scripture alone. In A.D. 547 Justinian summoned the vacillating pope to Constantinople. There Vigilius was terrified

into condemning the Three Chapters in a document called the *Judicatum*, reserving, however, in all things the authority of Chalcedon. A synod of Western bishops was now convoked (A.D. 548), which Justinian hoped to sway through the pope, who was himself naturally anxious to obtain their countenance. The African bishops proved obstinate, though Vigilius managed to get seventy signatures for his *Judicatum*. Thereupon Facundus, bishop of Hermiane, presented to the emperor his *Pro defensione III. Capitulorum*, a spirited work in which he condemned that arbitrary dogmatism which was the bane of the Greek church, and protested equally against state interference in matters of conscience, and the servility of the Eastern bishops.

Soon afterwards the synod of North Africa excommunicated the pope for his doings in the matter of the Three Chapters. Vigilius then begged the emperor to convene a general council, and, pending its decision, to allow him to withdraw the *Judicatum*. As the price of this concession, Justinian exacted a stringent oath, that Vigilius would abide by his condemnation of the Three Chapters. The same year (A.D. 551) the emperor issued a second edict, quoting and condemning Theodore of Mopsuestia, but declaring that no slight was thereby cast upon the credit of Chalcedon. Vigilius refused subscription, and excommunicated all who should subscribe. The barren strife had outlasted eight years, when the fifth oecumenical council met at Constantinople under the presidency of the patriarch Eutychius. The pope held aloof, but promised within twenty days to furnish the emperor with his final decision. This he did in his *Constitutum ad imperatorem*, which ruled (1) that though the extracts from Theodore of Mopsuestia were heretical, it was impossible to condemn a writer who had died in the communion of the church; (2) that to condemn the works of Theodore and Ibas, which had received the sanction of Chalcedon, would be to impair the authority of that council. Thereupon the council then sitting broke off communion with the pope, and ratified all the emperor's recent decrees. Theodore and his writings and followers were anathematised, and the curse was extended to the obnoxious works of Theodore and Ibas. The writers were spared because the council of Chalcedon had absolved them. The question of Origenism was not raised in a council in which the leading spirit was Theodore Ascidas. The unhappy Vigilius now finally submitted, formally condemned the Three Chapters, and assented to the decrees of the synod, as a condition of being permitted to return to Rome. He died on the way at Syracuse (A.D. 555). His successor Pelagius at once recognised the late council, owing to which some of the Western bishops cast off his communion, a schism which was only healed by Gregory the Great.

The weary quarrel was at an end, but Justinian was as far as ever from the attainment of his purpose, the reunion of the Monophysites with the general body of the church. The council of Chalcedon remained an insuperable barrier between the two camps. The emperor had evinced a leaning towards Monophysite conceptions by sanctioning their addition to the Trisagion (A.D. 533), as well as a similar formula of the fifth council. In the year of his death (A.D.

565) he issued a stringent edict in favour of Aphantodocetism, and deposed Eutychius patriarch of Constantinople for his resistance to the measure. Further persecution was interrupted by the emperor's decease. His successor Justin II. (A.D. 565-578), who was likewise anxious for religious unity, issued an edict commanding the cessation of all further dispute (A.D. 565), and behaved mildly to the Monophysites until the sixth year of his reign, when he sanctioned the violent repressive measures of John Scholasticus, whose zeal against heresy appears to have been inspired by the ambition of reducing all the prelates of the East into dependence on the patriarchate of Constantinople. Churches were razed, bishops and clergy thrown into prison, monks and nuns forced into communion with their persecutors by the expedient of thrusting the consecrated bread between their teeth. The violence of the persecution is vividly set forth in the pages of the Monophysite historian John of Ephesus. The same writer shews very clearly the strength of the sect both at the capital and elsewhere. Not only were the empress Sophia and her household Monophysites, but many members of the senate and the upper classes also. The persecution lulled some time before the death of Scholasticus, but was renewed by the restored patriarch Eutychius (A.D. 577). The Caesar Tiberius had been vainly importuned by John Scholasticus to take part in it; but upon his elevation to the throne (A.D. 578), being falsely suspected of Arian views, he was driven in self-defence into publishing an edict for the suppression of heresy, under colour of which the Monophysites again suffered cruelly. Tiberius had a plan for restoring union, but his wife hated the schismatics. While the emperor's attention was absorbed by his foreign wars, the patriarch Eutychius was left to take his own course with the Monophysites. One of his measures was the exaction from all new bishops of an oath to discontinue the use of the obnoxious clause of the Trisagion, which led to much disturbance in Syria and Asia Minor. His successor, John the Faster (A.D. 582), refused to persecute.

From the time of Justinian and his immediate successors, the Monophysites have remained in formal schism from the orthodox Eastern church. They owe their ecclesiastical organisation in Syria to the unwearied labours of Jacob, called al-Baradai and Zanzalus, who for upwards of thirty years (A.D. 541-578) wandered from place to place, sometimes in the disguise of a beggar, ordaining clergy, reconciling the feuds, and reviving the courage of his fellow-believers. [JACOBUS BARADAEUS.] Theodosius, the exiled patriarch of Alexandria, who for thirty years lived at Constantinople under the patronage of the empress Theodora, and until his death (A.D. 567) exercised a paramount influence upon his party in Egypt and elsewhere, suggested the revival of the Monophysite patriarchate of Antioch in the person of Paul of Asia. This was done by Jacob and his bishops; and the titular patriarch of Antioch has ever since been the recognised head of the Monophysite church of Syria. Subordinate to him was a functionary called the Maphrian (ܡܦܪܝܢ), who had

special charge of the district round Tekrit.

In Armenia the council of Chalcedon was anathematised by the synod of Tovin (Thiven, Twin, Tiben, Dovin), A.D. 536. The imperial persecutions drove the Monophysites into the arms of Persia. In A.D. 571 the Armenians revolted against Khosru Nushirwan, in consequence of the Magian attempts to compel them to renounce Christianity. But in A.D. 578 they were again reduced to submission. The Armenian church belongs to the Julianist species of Monophysitism. [ARMENIANS.]

In Egypt, their indigenous home, the Monophysites constituted the dominant church. The adherents of Chalcedon, although supported by the state, were too few to appear more than a sect of Melchites ("King's men," i.e. "Imperialists"). The Monophysites materially assisted the Muhammadan conquest of Egypt (A.D. 640), and were rewarded with possession of the churches and recognition as the legitimate Christian communion. The authority of their patriarch still extends over the Ethiopian church of Abyssinia. [COPTIC CHURCH.] The faith which has survived the vicissitudes of ages in Syria, Egypt, and Ethiopia is that of Severus. The Julianists had disappeared from the two former countries by the 9th century; they still had a patriarch in the latter, A.D. 798.

10. *Further development of the sects.—Conclusion.*—It was hardly possible for logic to acquiesce in the middle position of Severianism. Accordingly Stephen Niobes, a sophist of Alexandria, insisted on a thorough-going Monophysitism, teaching that the union abolished all distinction even of the essences (*οὐσίαι*) of the two natures. "Either we must maintain a perfect unity; or if we suppose a difference in Christ, we grant also a duality of natures, and so agree with the Chalcedonians." Niobes won over the two Syrian monks, Probus and John Barbür, who had accompanied their patriarch Peter of Callinicus to Alexandria. The two converts actively disseminated his doctrine in that city, until the patriarch Damianus expelled them, when, returning to the East, they found great success in the cloisters, and induced the patriarch Peter to hold a synod at Guba to consider their tenets. The synod pronounced against Niobes and his followers, the NIOBITES; and in its name Peter wrote a treatise asserting Severianism as the orthodox faith, and ruling that the two natures remained distinct even after the union, yet without number and without separation. John and Probus now declared for Chalcedon; and after Peter's death (A.D. 591), they argued their new cause with such zeal as to bring over many monks and even some whole towns to Dyophysitism.

In the reign of Justin II. arose the so-called TRITHEITES. Their founder was Johannes Askunages (ܝܫܘܢܝܓܝܫ) ("Bottle-shoes"), an obscure philosopher, whom Justinian banished from Constantinople. Barhebraeus quotes him thus: "I confess one nature of Christ, the Incarnate Word; but in the Trinity I reckon the natures and substances and godheads according to the number of the persons." This doctrine was developed by the famous Aristotelian commentator Johannes Philoponus. He conceived the essence (*οὐσία*) of the deity as a species, and the divine persons (*ὑποστάσεις*) as

the individuals included under it. The doctrine of the Tritheites was a logical deduction from the common Monophysite belief, that every φύσις involves an ὑπόστασις; everything that really exists, exists as an individual. Further, the church having sanctioned the formula, "One of the persons of the Trinity was crucified," it was natural to conceive of the other two persons after the analogy of the person of Christ, which was an approach to the Tritheite standpoint.

The monk Athanasius, a grandson of Theodora, and Conon bishop of Tarsus, were the heads of the two sections into which the Tritheites afterwards divided on the question of the resurrection of the dead.

Philoponus had written a treatise to prove that "there is no resurrection for these bodies, but other bodies are created, which come to the resurrection in their stead." He appears to have held that both the matter and the form (ἕλη—εἶδος) of the body perish in the grave. Athanasius and the ATHANASIANS or PHILOPONISTS accepted this doctrine; Conon and the CONONITES anathematised it and its advocates. Justin ordered a discussion between Conon and Eugenius on the one side and the chiefs of the Severians on the other, before the patriarch, John Scholasticus. The Cononites were defeated, and their leader Conon subsequently underwent a long imprisonment in Palestine. On his release he spread his doctrine in the provinces of Syria, Cilicia, Isauria, and Cappadocia. Theodosius the Severian ex-patriarch of Alexandria wrote against the Cononites; Eutychius of Constantinople actively persecuted them; Damianus of Alexandria excommunicated them. They were unable to make permanent head against the opposition of the main body of the Monophysites themselves. Later, Damianus, who from A.D. 577 was the Severian patriarch of Alexandria, himself became known as an heresiarch in his own communion. He distinguished God *per se* (αὐτόθεος), or the substance (nature) of God, from the three persons of the Trinity, and so was taken to assert four gods. He and his followers were accordingly styled TETRATHEITES or TETRADITES. The latter were also known as DAMIANITES, from their founder, and ANGELITES, from the town of Angelium. Peter of Callinicus, whom Damianus had appointed patriarch of Antioch in the lifetime of the patriarch Paul (A. D. 581)—a step which led to a long and bitter schism between the Monophysites—wrote against the views of Damianus, which were perhaps of a Sabellian character. Assemani gives a passage in which Damianus quotes the following from St. Gregory Nazianzen: "In divine worship we speak of one substance and three Persons. The former expression denotes the nature of deity, the latter the properties of the three Persons."

Hence he infers ἕνα θεῶν ἑκ τριῶν

ἕνα θεῶν ἑκ τριῶν , i.e. "The

Unbegottenhood, and the Begottenhood, and the Processiveness are the Persons." Thus Damianus identified each person of the Godhead with its characteristic property or differentia. Against this view, Peter urged that as each Person has several properties, Damian ought consistently to multiply the Persons. John of Ephesus

describes him as an unlearned and foolish man, but says nothing of his heresy, which must therefore have been broached later than A.D. 585.

The conflict between the opposed tendencies of Monophysitism and Dyophysitism may be regarded as necessary to the working out of a sound Christology. Starting from the conception of a duality of natures, the adherents of Chalcedon endeavoured to demonstrate their unity in the sphere of the person; their opponents, while insisting upon the unity of Christ, were in great part led to the recognition of an essential difference within the sphere of the one incarnate nature. The two methods were complementary. Moreover, the process of doctrinal evolution could hardly have dispensed with the metaphysical training and acute logical discernment which the Aristotelian Monophysites brought to bear upon the questions in dispute. Severus, Xenaias, John Philoponus, were thinkers of no mean dialectical skill. Indeed, in their scientific enforcement of the Monophysite idea, they sometimes had the advantage of their orthodox antagonists. As between the Severians and the church, the argument rather concerned right use of terms than truth of conceptions. The wavering and uncertain connotation of such expressions as φύσις, ὑπόστασις, οὐσία, made it very difficult for disputants to come to an understanding. Still the general question was by no means a mere logomachy; for it involved the explanation of a wonderful fact, the objective reality of which was taken for granted by both sides, viz. the union of God and man in the person of Christ. The Monophysites argued that φύσις denotes what is common to all the members of a genus. But this common something (κοινόν τι) only exists as individual; apart from some member of the genus it cannot be said to exist at all. So, then, neither the divine nor the human φύσις can exist except as individualised. The Monophysites called the individualised φύσις an ὑπόστασις. If, then, with the Chalcedonians we assert two natures in Christ after the union, we thereby assert two hypostases in Him, like the Nestorians. They therefore concluded that the two natures combined to form one new and wholly unique nature, viz. ἡ Χριστότης, the Christhood or theanthropic nature, and this new φύσις, of course, only existed as individualised in the actual Christ. On the other hand, the Dyophysites rightly saw in a union within the sphere of the natures a lurking danger of transmutation or mixture. They dreaded the Docetic and Apollinarian element in the conception of their adversaries, and they taught that the human nature was not, indeed, ἀνυπόστατος; it inhered in the divine hypostasis. But this was really marring the perfection of the humanity, and assuming a mixture in the sphere of the person like that which Monophysites assumed in the sphere of the nature. In fact, the contending parties were not far apart, when they, from different points of view, agreed in depriving the human nature of a proper self, making it merely an attribute or cluster of attributes taken on by the Logos (the opinion of Cyril).

Sources.—The documents in Mansi, *Concilia*, vi.-ix.; Niceph. Callist. *Hist. Eccl.*; Evagr. *Hist. Eccl.*; *The book of Timothy (Aclurus) against*

the Council of Chalcedon, MS. Br. Mus. Add. 12,156; John of Ephesus, *Third part of Ecol. Hist.*; the Syriac MSS. of Severus and Philoxenus (see Wright's *Catalogue*); Liberatus, *Breviarium* (apud Mansi, ix.); Zacharias Rhetor ap. Land. *Anecd. Syr.* iii.; Facund. Hermianens. *pro Defens. III. Capit.*, Gall. xi., and 665, sqq.; Fulgent. Ferrand. *Pro tribus Capit.* ibid.; Leontius Byzant. *de Sectis*, and *contra Eutych. et Nestor.* Galland, xii.; Procopius, Theophanes.

Works.—Walch, *Gesch. der Ketz.* vi. vii. viii.; Baur, *Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes*, ii.; the Church Histories of Neander, Gieseler, Hase, Kurtz; Mai, *Nov. Coll.* vii. i.; Gieseler's *Commentatio qua Monophysitarum veterum variae de Christi persona opiniones etc. illustrantur*; Hagenbach, *Dojmengeschichte*; Dorner's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, a work to which the writer is specially indebted; Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* ii.; Milman, *Lat. Christ.* ii.; Gibbon, ch. xlvii.; the articles in Herzog, Wetzler and Welte, Lichtenberger. [C. J. B.]

MONOTHELITISM.

(The adherents of this view are called by Johan. Dam. *Μονοθεληται*, cf. Stephanus ed. Dindorf. *s.v.* *Μονοθεληται* is a bad reading of Euthymius in *Fab. Bib. Græc.* viii. 333. Milman and others call this party Monothelitism.) This name designates not so much a sect without the church as a controversy which raged within its borders. It was simply a development of the Monophysite controversy. As the Oriental mind pondered upon the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, it perceived that it was logically necessary to hold that Christ had but one will, and that, a divine will, if the Monophysite conception were correct, and He had but one nature and that, a divine nature. This controversy had also its own issues, and they, very important and far-reaching. It paved the way for the schism between East and West, exaggerating and deepening the jealousy between Rome and Constantinople, which uniformly took opposite sides in this struggle; while, again, it led up to the Iconoclastic disputes, which occupied the whole of the 8th century as Monothelitism occupied the 7th. [ICONOCLASM.] Monothelitism originated in politics. Heraclius was engaged in his great struggle with Chosroes and the Persian Empire, which terminated in his triumph, A.D. 628, wherein he felt the manifold evils which resulted from the religious feuds which desolated the empire. To reconcile, therefore, the Eutychian or Monophysite party to the orthodox he held several conferences with leaders of the former party, trusting largely to his own theological powers to effect a reconciliation. The precise date of the birth of Monothelitism is surrounded with much obscurity. Thus Theophanes in his *Chronograph.* i. 506, asserts that the heresy originated in a conference at Hierapolis in Syria, between the emperor and Athanasius, sixth Jacobite patriarch of Antioch (Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* ii. 1361). The emperor promised him the throne of the orthodox patriarchate if he would admit the authority of the Chalcedonian synod. He then admitted his belief in two natures, but skilfully invited the emperor to determine *περὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ τῶν θελημάτων* whether he

should assert two or one. The emperor being puzzled consulted Sergius patriarch of Constantinople and Cyrus of Phasis [CYRUS (4)]. Both of them agreed to the doctrine of one will and one energy. On the other hand the libellus of Stephen bishop of Dora, read at the Lateran council, A.D. 649, asserts that it was Theodote of Pharan who started this heresy (Mansi, x. 891-902), while the patriarch Sergius presents us with another and more reliable version of the story. Writing to the pope Honorius to secure his co-operation as against Sophronius and the Dyothelites, he gives us his account of the origin of the controversy. During the Persian war, Heraclius being in Armenia, Paul, a follower of the heretic Severus, entered into controversy with the emperor, whose theological skill the patriarch praises. This conference was probably held at Theodosiopolis in Armenia, A.D. 622. The emperor there spoke of the one energy in Christ. Some time after, the emperor being at Phasis, he consulted Cyrus the bishop about the doctrine of one will and one energy. Cyrus being in doubt, the emperor commanded him to consult Sergius whether any of the fathers had ever used such an expression. Sergius replied by sending various passages which seemed to support this view, and specially some extracts from an alleged epistle sent by one of his predecessors Mennas to pope Vigilius. These varying accounts may all be true. Monothelitism was in the air, and the question may have been raised in various quarters about the same time. It is impossible, however, now to determine the exact sequence of events amid which it originated, or to settle exactly its chronology, though Hefele attempts to do so in his *History of the Councils* (sec. 292; cf. Pagi, *ad annum* 627 sqq.). We can only say for certain that prior to the year A.D. 629 the controversy was firmly established. We may now divide its history into four periods.

I. A.D. 623-638, when the question chiefly discussed was whether we are to assume only one energy in Christ with the Monophysites and Monothelites, or two energies with the orthodox. The effect of this view was, as Dorner remarks, the Monothelites held that the deity of Christ alone was active, the humanity being completely passive.

II. A.D. 638-648. This second stage was inaugurated by pope Honorius. He asserted that there were two natures in Christ, each working in its own way, each with its own *ἐνεργεια*, but only one will, which he assigns to the personality of Christ. During this period Monothelitism was dominant in the East, while, after Honorius, it was vigorously opposed in the West.

III. A.D. 649-680. During the greater portion of this period Monothelitism was dominant in the East, while the West continued its opposition. The emperors attempted to break down the opposition by treating it as rebellion. From the year 677, however, a change came, and Constantinus Pogonatus began to treat with the pope about the meeting of the sixth general council, which assembled in A.D. 680, and condemned Monothelitism.

IV. The revival of Monothelitism for a short period under the emperor Philip, A.D. 711.

i. During the earliest period, A.D. 623-638, Egypt was in the first instance the great centre of

interest. There the Monophysite party had rent the church asunder. The schism, in fact, was so deep that it threatened dire political danger to the empire in the conflict with the Saracens which was just then impending. (Cf. on this point *art.* on COPPIC CHURCH in t. I. pp. 666, 667.) Cyrus, therefore, the trusted friend and counsellor of Heraclius, was sent thither as patriarch in A.D. 630, when the emperor was reorganising the empire after his great struggle against the Persians. [CYRUS (4).] The object of his elevation was simply to effect the union of the Monophysite with the Catholic party. This is manifest from a letter in which Cyrus tells Sergius of the union which he had accomplished and which he entirely ascribes to the instructions and advice of the emperor and the patriarch himself (Mansi, t. ix. p. 562). The date of this union was June A.D. 633. At that time, however, two monks, Maximus, from the monastery of Chrysopolis near Constantinople, and Sophronius, from the monastery of St. Theodosius in Palestine, were tarrying in Egypt, whither they had fled some time previously through fear of the Persians. These men became afterwards the leading opponents of Monothelitism. Indeed, the most careful and logical expositions of the orthodox system will be found in the writings and disputations of St. Maximus [MAXIMUS]. Sophronius inaugurated the opposition. Maximus describes (*Opp.* t. ii. p. 75, and in Mansi, x. 690) his action at the synod of Alexandria, where the nine articles of union were adopted. Both of them were tarrying at the time in Egypt. As soon as they heard of the proposed union they resorted at once to Alexandria, where Sophronius rushed into the assembly, and with strong cries and tears, rolling himself on the pavement, besought them to reject the articles which had been read for their information by the patriarch's command, who evidently wished to secure the co-operation and assent of men so distinguished for orthodoxy. Sophronius repudiated them, however, as being equivalent to the heresy of Apollinaris. He specially objected to the seventh article, which laid down that "one and the same Christ had performed His divine and human actions by one theandric operation as St. Dionysius taught," referring to an expression of the Pseudo-Areopagite in *Ep. ad Caium* 3, 4 (cf. *Schol.* Maximi in app. *Opp.* Joh. Scot. Erigen. p. 58 sqq. Oxon. 1681). Failing in his opposition at Alexandria, Sophronius departed to Constantinople, where he endeavoured to bring over Sergius to his views, but in vain. Sergius, like Cyrus and the emperor, was far more anxious about the political union and strength of the empire than about exact orthodoxy. Sergius, however, for peace sake consented to cease all discussion upon the disputed points. Sophronius returned home to Palestine, where he was soon chosen patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 633 or 634. Sergius seems at once to have recognised in his election a threatening danger to the union which had been accomplished. He therefore, without waiting to receive formal notice of Sophronius's elevation, wrote a long epistle to pope Honorius detailing the history of the whole dispute, and appealing to him for assistance in maintaining peace. This letter is a most important document for the early history of the movement. It will be found in Mansi, xi. 530. We possess two

letters of the pope to Sergius. The first is the immediate reply to the letter of Sergius mentioned above. In it he sanctions the course adopted by Sergius and Cyrus. In Mansi, xi. 579-582, we have a fragment of a further letter from Honorius to Sergius. Sophronius, upon his election, issued, as usual with bishops, a synodical epistle, *γράμματα ἐνθρονιστικά*, as it was technically called. In it he professed his own faith and made a fierce attack upon his opponents. This is one of the ablest and earliest expositions of the Dyothelite point of view. It will be found in Mansi, xi. 459-510. He specially insists, as in *l. c.* 486, that unless the distinction between the human and divine wills and modes of working be maintained, the incarnation will be resolved into a mere docetic phantasm. Furthermore, he recognised equally with Sergius the importance of securing the support of the great patriarch of the West. He therefore despatched envoys to Rome to state his case. In the second epistle of Honorius to Sergius (Mansi, xi. 579-582) the pope informs the latter of their arrival and of the counsel he had sent Sophronius, advising him to observe the rule of silence upon the whole question. Both these letters of the pope were ordered to be burnt by the sixth general council. The reply of Constantinople to the synodical epistle of Sophronius was the publication A.D. 638 of the *Ecthesis* [ECTHESIS], which, though nominally an imperial edict, was really the work of the patriarch alone, as Heraclius himself tells us in a letter written to pope John IV. in A.D. 641 (Mansi, xi. 9). A careful study of its contents demonstrates this, as it merely reiterates the views and expressions urged by Sergius in his letter to the pope. The *Ecthesis* was read in the third session of the Lateran council, A.D. 649, and will be found in Mansi, x. 991. It left the controversy in this position: it prohibited the use of the expressions one "energy" or two "energies," but was clearly favourable to the Monothelite view. The issue of the *Ecthesis* terminates the first stage of the controversy. ii. The second period extends from A.D. 638-648. We cannot within our limits trace the progress of the controversy from year to year as is done in works specially devoted to the subject, like Combefis, *Hist. Haeresis Monothelit.*, to which we must refer the reader anxious to make a fuller acquaintance with its details. Having discussed at some length the documents which opened the debate on either side, we can now merely indicate the principal events of its history. The leading figure of our second period is Maximus. The details of his personal history are given under his name. He was, as we have seen, the personal friend and devoted ally of Sophronius. He was a man of the highest character, who had surrendered the most splendid prospects for conscience' sake, and by the devotion of a long life, and finally by a martyr's death, proved the reality and depth of his convictions. His writings too, which are very extensive, show him to have been a man of deep and subtle thought. As the letter of Sophronius was the leading document on the Catholic side in the first period, the discussion of Maximus with Pyrrhus holds the same position in the second. By the year 642 most of the earlier leaders had passed from this earthly scene, as Honorius and Sergius in

638, Heraclius and Cyrus in 641. Into the place of the patriarch Sergius, Pyrrhus abbat of the monastery of Chrysopolis was chosen. It was to this monastery Maximus belonged, and over it was he now called to preside as successor of Pyrrhus.* This latter prelate was deposed in 641 and driven into Africa, whither he was followed by Maximus in 645, who had become so alarmed at the progress of heresy that he left his monastery to seek the help of the pope. Finding that Pyrrhus was spreading his views in Africa, he challenged him to a public discussion, which took place in July 645, in presence of the African bishops and of Gregory prefect of the province. This discussion is very valuable for its historical details as well as for its logical exposition of the orthodox view. Pyrrhus opened the discussion by asserting, that as there was but one person in Christ so there was but one will, will being attached to personality. If there were two wills in Him, then there must have been two persons. Maximus, on the other hand, maintains that will is an essential part of either nature, the human or the divine, and necessary to its perfection. As Christ then had two perfect natures, He must have had two wills and two modes of working. The discussion is a very lengthened one. It will be found in Mansi x. 710-760, and in the collected works of Maximus. It was successful for the time in the apparent conversion of Pyrrhus, who accompanied Maximus to Rome, and was reconciled to the papal see. His conversion was merely dictated by political motives. Gregory the prefect of Africa was plotting a revolt. The pope was throwing all his influence upon his side as an upholder of orthodoxy, and Pyrrhus hoped to regain his patriarchal throne through their means. Some time after, being disappointed in his hopes, he returned to his former Monothelitism. Maximus remained at Rome for several years, and took part in the Lateran synod of 649. Another leading champion of this period on the orthodox side was Stephen bishop of Dora, the friend of Sophronius and his delegate to the pope. He presented a treatise on the subject under debate to the Lateran synod, which is valuable for some of its historical details. It is contained in Mansi, x. 891. The second period terminated with the excommunication of Pyrrhus the ex-patriarch, and of Paul the actual patriarch, of Constantinople, in a synod held at Rome by pope Theodore A.D. 648, when the indignant pope signed the sentence of excommunication with the consecrated wine of the Eucharist. The emperor and the patriarch Paul, on the other hand, issued in the same year the Type, an imperial edict which, in a more moderate shape than the Ethesis, re-imposed silence upon the controversialists under the severest penalties.

III. A.D. 649-680.

The third period at its opening saw Monothelitism dominant, at its termination saw it overthrown. The history of so complete a revolution is very interesting, proving the power of ideas when supported by faith and enthusiasm as against movements which rely, as did Mono-

* The question whether Maximus was successor of Pyrrhus, or whether Pyrrhus was ever abbat of Chrysopolis, is a disputed one. Cf. Pagi *ad ann.* 642, 1; Hefele, *l. c.* sec. 303.

theitism, upon the civil power alone; for Monothelitism, it must never be forgotten, from the day of its birth revelled in the full sunshine of imperial favour, while Dyothelitism had to struggle with every earthly force arrayed against it. Dyothelitism produced its martyrs, its Martin I., its Maximus, its Anastasii. Monothelitism was simply a statesman's device, which collapsed when deprived of civil support, because devoid of any innate life of its own. This third period opens with the meeting of the Lateran council at Rome in the year 649, convoked by pope Martin I., who was chosen pope in July of the same year in succession to Theodore. He had been, prior to his election, Apocrisarius of the Roman see at the imperial court, where he had ample experience of the intolerance of the Monothelite party. Immediately upon his consecration he convoked a synod almost entirely composed of Italian bishops, which met on Oct. 5, and continued its sittings till Oct. 31. The transactions of this synod, as contained in Mansi, t. x., embody many documents valuable for the earlier history of Monothelitism, as the *Libellus* of Stephen of Dora, extracts from the writings of Theodore of Pharan, one of the earliest and ablest exponents of Monothelitism, copies of the *Ethesis* and *Type*, letters of Sergius and Cyrus. This synod published a creed, which was identical with that of Chalcedon, with the addition of the following words bearing on the question at issue: "Credimus et duas ejusdem sicuti naturas unitas inconfuse, ita et duas naturales voluntates divinam et humanam, et duas naturales operationes, divinam et humanam, in approbatione perfecta et indiminuta, eundem veraciter esse perfectum Deum, et hominem perfectum, eundem atque unum Dominum nostrum et Deum J. Ch., utpote volentem et operantem divine et humane nostram salutem." This decision was further elaborated by the council in twenty canons, setting forth their own Christological conception and anathematizing the opposite error. The acts of this synod were sent broadcast throughout Christendom, while a special letter was sent to the emperor, Constans II., calling upon him to reject his Monothelite advisers and to submit to the decision of the Roman council. The emperor, however, had no such intention. During the very sessions of the synod he sent the exarch of Ravenna, Olympius, to arrest pope Martin, to force the Roman church to accept the Type and observe silence upon the controverted points. When Olympius failed, he sent a more determined man, who arrested the pope in 653 and conducted him to Constantinople, where he was consigned to a miserable imprisonment. After various attempts to shake his determination, he was banished to the Crimea, where he died amid the glory of martyrdom, Sept. 16, 655. At the same time Maximus and his two disciples, the Anastasii, were arrested at Rome, where their intellectual influence on the Dyothelite side had been very great. They were also brought to Constantinople and tried, chiefly on political grounds. Maximus was accused of bringing about the capture of Egypt, Alexandria, and Africa by the Saracens, by inducing Peter prefect of Numidia to withhold his troops when ordered by Heraclius to advance to the aid of the invaded districts, on the plea that the emperor was a heretic. Space would fail to tell

of the debates, trials, tortures, and exiles of Maximus and his friends. Let it suffice to say that they too, after suffering mutilation of the tongue and right hand, were banished to the Lazian district, where Maximus died a martyr to his consistency on Aug. 13, 662. The energy displayed in this persecution availed to secure silence for a time. Vitalian and Adeodatus, popes from 657-676, even joined in communion with Constantinople, and had their names inscribed in its diptychs, a favour conceded to no Roman pope since Honorius. But a change was coming over the prospects of Monothelitism in the midst of its apparent prosperity. Constantinus Pogonatus, or the Bearded, reversed the imperial tradition, embraced the Catholic view of the controversy, and issued a summons for a general council, which accordingly met and established Dyothelitism as the creed of the universal church. [CONSTANTINUS V.] This sixth general council was, as Milman remarks, a triumph and a humiliation for the Roman see, since while it established the faith for which it had so long struggled, it at the same time condemned Honorius, a former pope, as an excommunicated heretic, a condemnation which pope Leo II. himself, when announcing the decisions of the council to the kings of the West, glories in and ratifies (cf. Milman's *Latin Christianity*, lib. iv. cap. 6).

The acts of this general council will be found in Mansi, t. xi. They are discussed at considerable length by Hefele in his *History of the Councils*.

IV. A.D. 711-713.

The fourth period of the controversy embraces only two years. The emperor Justinian II. was a cruel tyrant but a supporter of the Catholic side. He was deposed and murdered by his army, and Philipppicus Bardanes chosen into his place. He had been reared in the Monothelite faith, which he at once proceeded to re-establish. He removed even before his entry into Constantinople the picture of the sixth general council, which had been attached to the wall of the imperial palace, between the fourth and sixth guardhouses (scholae). He restored to the diptychs the names of Honorius, Sergius, and the others excommunicated by the council, and finally, after deposing the Catholic patriarch, Cyrus, and substituting in his place John, a Monothelite, he summoned a synod, which, after the manner of Constantinople, obediently ratified the imperial wishes. The emperor then called upon pope Constantine to accept the change. The pope at once refused, and, backed by the Roman people, declared the emperor a heretic and removed his name from the diptychs and his portrait out of the churches. This reaction, however, lasted only two years, as Philip was deposed at the feast of Pentecost, A.D. 713, after which we hear no more of Monothelitism. The interest indeed attaching to the abstract question was henceforth swallowed up by the more practical and pressing iconoclastic controversy, which very controversy was indeed, as we remarked at the beginning, another branch out of the root of Monophysitism. [ICONOCLASM.]

The Monothelite party is now represented by the Maronites of the Lebanon, who united themselves to the Roman communion, A.D. 1182. The term Maronite was generally used in the East to express the Monothelite party. Euty chius,

Elmacin, and other Eastern authors refer the origin of Monothelitism to a certain Syrian monk, one Maro, who lived under the emperor Maurice, towards the end of the 6th century (Renaudot, *Patr. Alexand.* p. 149). The reputation of Maro is vindicated by Assemani, *Acta Mart. Oriental.* t. ii. p. 405-412; cf. *Bibliographie Universelle*, s.v.

The authorities about Monothelitism are of two kinds, (1) Ancient; (2) Modern.

(1) The ancient authorities have been mentioned to a large extent already. They are comprised in Mansi, t. x.-xii., and all other standard collections of the councils. The student who wishes to investigate further will find a complete list of all the ancient and modern writers, down to his own day, either for or against Monothelitism in Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, t. xi. p. 151-153, ed. Harles.

(2) Of the modern authorities we need only notice the monographs devoted to the subject, as of course all the great histories discuss the heresy at large. They are seven in number. Combefis, *Hist. haer. Monothel.* in *Auct. Nov.* t. ii. Paris, 1648; J. S. Assemani, *Biblioth. Juris Oriental.* t. iv.; Jac. Chmel, *Dissert. Hist. de Origine haeres. Monothel.*; Tamagnini, *Hist. Monothel.*; Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, Bd. ix. s. 1-666; Hefele, *Concil. Geschichte*, Bd. iii. s. 110-332; Forbesii à Corsa, *Instruct. Histor.-Theolog.* lib. v. Dorner, in his *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Div. ii. vol. i. p. 155 sqq. Clark's ed., has an able discussion of the whole question, as has also Neander, t. v. 242-272, Clark's ed. Neander and Dorner may be consulted specially for the bearing of the controversy on Christological doctrine. Cf. also Ceillier, tt. xi. and xii. *pass.*; Bower's *Hist. of the Popes, pass.*; and for the civil history of the controversy Le Beau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, ed. Saint-Martin; and Finlay's *Greece*. The articles on the different names mentioned above will furnish much information. [G. T. S.]

PERTINAX, P. HELVIUS, made emperor by the conspirators after the murder of Commodus, January 1, A.D. 193, murdered by the mutinous praetorians on the following March 28. (Dion. lxxiii. 1-10; Herodian, ii. 1-5; Julius Capitolinus, *V. Pertinacis*; Tillemont, *Emp.* ii.; Gibbon, c. 4.) [F. D.]

PERVINCUS, deacon of TURRIBIUS of Astorga. (Leo, *Epp.* 15; Idatius, *Chron.*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 678, li. 882.) [F. D.]

PETELMUS, addressed by archbishop Boniface. [PECTHELM.]

PETILIANUS, an eminent Donatist bishop, probably a native of Constantina or Cirta, chief town of Numidia, born of parents who were Catholics; but while he was still a catechumen he was carried off almost by force against his will by the Donatists, received by baptism into their community, and subsequently made, between 395 and 400, their bishop in Cirta. (Aug. c. *lit. Petil.* ii. 104, 238; *Serm. ad pleb. Caesar. de Emerito*, 8.) He had practised as a lawyer with great success, so as to obtain the name of the Paraclete, the identity of which name with that of the Holy Spirit, if we may believe St. Augustine, was flattering to his

vanity (*c. lit. Petil. iii. 16, 19*). He afterwards took a prominent part in the Conference, A.D. 411, as one of the seven managers on the Donatist side, but after this we hear no more of him. (*Aug. Retract. ii. 34; c. lit. Petil. ii. 40, 95; iii. 57, 69; Optatus, Opp. Mon. Vet. Don. liii.*) About A.D. 398 or 400, Augustine addressed to some of the leaders of the Donatist sect in Circa a private letter inviting them in temperate language to discuss the questions at issue between them and the church, an invitation which was rejected by them with contempt. But when he was in the church of that place, together with Absentius (Alypius) and Fortunatus its Catholic bishop, a letter addressed by the Donatist bishop (Petilianus, but without a name) to his own clergy, was put into his hands, of which he found the purport to be at once to cut off communion with the Catholic church. This proposal seemed to him to be so monstrous as to make him doubt whether the letter could have proceeded from a man of his reputation, until he was assured that this was the case. (*FOR-TUNATUS (10), Vol. II. p. 552.*) But lest silence on his part should be misunderstood, he undertook at once to reply to its statements, though the letter was plainly imperfect, and ought to be presented in a complete state. The writer accuses the Catholics of making necessary a repetition of Baptism, because, he says, they pollute the souls of those whom they baptize. The validity of baptism in his view depends on the character of the giver, as the strength of a building depends on that of the foundation. He quotes *Eccles. xxxiv. 30, (25)* applying to his own sect the words, "wise men" (*Matth. xxiii. 34*), interpreting the word "dead" (*mortuo*) to mean an ungodly person; he charges the Catholics with persecution, and also with "tradition," and makes an insinuation about Manicheism. Replying to these charges, Augustine shows that the validity of baptism depends, not on the conscience of the minister, but on the promise of Christ, and urges the difficulty created by the Donatist argument. If a person receives baptism from an ungodly minister without knowing his character, will he receive faith? On the principle laid down by the writer, plainly not: will it be guilt? If so, then Donatists ought to re-baptize all who fall into sin after baptism. But Scripture bids us not to trust in man, not even in a faithful steward, and St. Paul forbids any mention of his own name in connection with baptism. If by "dead" (*Eccles. xxxiv. 30*) he meant ungodly, what is to be said of Optatus (of Thamugada)? If by this word he meant "guilty," i.e. convicted, what can be said of Felicianus and Praetextatus, the advisers of Maximianus against Primian, who were condemned by the Donatist Council (of Bagaia)? Augustine also urges against the Donatist party their perverse inconsistency in cutting off from communion churches in other countries, entirely ignorant of the transactions in Africa, the use made by them of the military power of Gildo, and shows that even "tradition," which he condemns as strongly as his opponents can do, cannot affect the descendants of "traitors," of whom they receive one at least without scruple. If they who suffer persecution are more righteous than their persecutors, the Maximianists, whose church was overthrown by the soldiers of

Optatus, and who, at the instance of Primianus, were excluded from their own churches by order of the pro-consul, must be more righteous than those who promoted these acts. Certainly they cannot justly complain of imperial edicts against those who separate from the Catholic Church. In separating themselves from the universal church, they show their blindness for the sake of a few tares in Africa, cutting themselves off from the "corn" of Christ. But the promise of God cannot be overthrown by a few failures. As to conduct, what can be said of the circumcellions and the excesses committed during Gildo's supremacy? Perhaps the writer of this letter will not acknowledge his authorship, for his party are much afraid of their words being retained, and perhaps he expects Augustine to refute what has been said about Manicheism, but it is difficult to see how its errors can be overthrown by those of Donatism. In conclusion, he calls on his opponents to meet the argument founded on the case of the Maximianists.

In his second book, Augustine, for the benefit of the less acute among his brethren (*tardiores patres*), takes one by one the charges of Petilian, whose letter had by that time been received in a complete state. The statements, 108 in number, including applications of Scripture passages, and an appeal to the Catholics, are answered by Augustine *seriatim*. Remarkable in the first place on the form of salutation used by Petilianus, which agrees mainly with those adopted by St. Paul in his Epistles, he asks why he and his party do not communicate with the churches to whom St. Paul wrote? The arguments used by Petilian may be summed up under two principal heads as follows, but they are much intermixed with each other, and contain much coarse vituperation. 1. *The inefficacy of Baptism by ungodly persons.* The corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, but the party who call themselves Catholics are corrupt, followers of Judas, false prophets, false priests, whose "oil" is to be avoided (*Ps. xli. 6; xli. 5*), children of "traitors," whose deeds resemble those of their predecessors, no true bishops. Can a man pronounce a legal decision who is not a magistrate, or will a magistrate's decision carry weight if his life be immoral; or can a man be truly called a priest who only repeats priestly words? If the Apostles were justified in re-baptizing disciples of St. John Baptist, what can be said against the baptizers of those who have received only a profane baptism? 2. *The iniquity of persecution.* Did the Apostles persecute? St. Paul certainly did so as a Jew, but regretted it deeply afterwards. The persecutor is a true child of the devil. God delights to draw people to himself, why do not the Catholic party, so called, leave people to choose for themselves? God did not wish schismatics to be killed, and the true pattern in this respect may be learnt from our Lord's conduct under persecution (*Matth. xxvi. 51, 52*). It is the Catholics who have broken unity, but truth and falsehood, life and death, cannot be united, nor true believers (Donatists) with Macarius (*MACARIUS (21), Vol. III. p. 774*). The Catholics break the Commandments, contradict the Beatitudes, make martyrs, are wolves among sheep. What business have

Christians with kings, of whom so many have been persecutors: why calling Donatists heretics, do the Catholics desire their communion; if they are innocent why persecute them, if guilty why seek union with them? Woe to those who lack unity, let people beware of partaking in the sins of others. In his reply Augustine shows, 1. *The true nature of Baptism*. Those who fall away after baptism must return, not by re-baptism, but by repentance. The notion of the Apostles as a body being polluted by the presence among them of Judas is distinctly contrary to our Lord's words (John xiii. 10). Petilian ought to be ashamed of speaking of baptism in the name of the Trinity as a falsehood or a counterfeit to any one, but if this were so, the counterfeit would be found in Optatus (of Thamugada) who regarded Gildo as God. The authority of a magistrate is derived from the emperor, and as to what he said about a man repeating priestly words, even Caiaphas was a true priest, but the Donatists profane the Sacraments on account of men's personal faults. If his doctrine about Baptism be true, why did St. Paul and other Apostles baptize persons already baptized by the Baptist, whose baptism was a preparatory ordinance, and distinct from Christian baptism, which is given in the name, not of Caecilian, or Petilian, or Augustine, but of Christ. If the Holy Spirit can only be given by the hands of pure men, how was it that 120 persons received it on the Day of Pentecost without any imposition of hands, and Cornelius, even before baptism itself. 2. *As to Persecution*. Augustine denies the charge, and retorts it upon his adversary, whose partizans, the Circumcellions and others, were guilty of persecution. As to Marculus, he doubts the facts of the case (MARCULUS, Vol. III. 824). But even if the charge were true in respect of former days, it does not inculpate men of the present day. Even the acts of Optatus, though he lived among the Donatist party, and his birthday was celebrated by them, and his patron Gildo held by them in reverence, do not condemn Petilian, and it was he who compelled Felicianus to return to the Donatist communion. Augustine mentions also the acts of Faustinus at Hippo, and Crispinus at Calama. (CRISPINUS (2), Vol. I. 713. FAUSTINUS (8), Vol. II. 464.) He points out the inconsistency of the party in their behaviour towards the Maximianists, and the manner in which Rogatus suffered during the ascendancy of Firmus. The way of life is narrow, but if the Donatist party claim to be the only true church, the claim of the Maximianists must be stronger still, because they are fewer in number. Petilian had asked *quae est ratio persequendi?* Augustine replies (1) by quoting Ps. c. 6 (ci. 5), by which quotation he implies, as he does elsewhere, that what his adversary regarded as persecution, he on his part regarded only as legal and justifiable prosecution, a confusion of terms which it is plain that no argument could ever reconcile; (2) by reminding Petilian that our Lord himself drove the buyers and sellers from the temple with a scourge. 3. In near connection with this question of persecution comes the one of *appeal to the civil power*, in which Augustine shows that the Donatists themselves not only appealed to Constantine, but took advantage of the

patronage of Julian. The cases quoted by Petilian of persecuting emperors are irrelevant, for their severities were directed against the undivided church, some of them, as Nero, being heathens, one, viz. Valens, an Arian. So too are the cases of Macarius and Ursatius, who are said by Donatists to have suffered the just punishment of their crimes by violent deaths. Ursatius died in battle, and how Macarius died is not known. The church supported by Catholic princes was opposed by Optatus, and it therefore became necessary to bring forward the law about a fine of 10 lbs. of gold for irregular ordination (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5. 21, A.D. 392), a law of which Donatists take no notice, but accuse Catholics of cruelty in enforcing it, yet neither Crispinus nor Petilian have been losers in any pecuniary way. 4. *Language of Scripture and of the Church perverted*. Regarding his own party as pure, and his opponents as impure, Petilian applied without scruple to himself and his party all passages which extolled purity, and to the others all which condemned impurity. Among others great stress was laid by them on Ps. cxl. 6 (cxli. 5) on which the reading of the lxx. and Vulgate is plainly founded on a reading of the Hebrew, of which neither party were aware, but which gives a totally different meaning. Taking the sense, however, as it stands in those two versions, Augustine protests against the bigotry which would reject the prayers even of sinners, such as we all are, and reminds Petilian of the petition in the Lord's Prayer, which, asking forgiveness for ourselves, presumes the same on our own part towards others. Petilian laid stress on the meaning of the word "Catholic," which he said was "single" or "universal," *unicum vel totum*, and charged his opponents with breaking the unity of the church. In reply Augustine, confessing that his knowledge of Greek was not great, shows that his adversary's was still less, for "Catholic," *καθ' ὅλον*, cannot mean "single" but "universal," i.e. spread over the whole world. Petilian says, "Come to the Church." Augustine replies, Where is it? It cannot be in Africa only, or among the Montenses at Rome, or in Spain in the family of one woman (Lucilla). The efficacy of baptism rests not with Petilian or Peter, or Paul, or Donatus, but on the Trinity itself. In receiving persons baptised by Donatists, the Catholics seek to destroy, not their baptism but their error.

After this Petilian wrote a second letter, which, except some passages quoted by Augustine, has not been preserved, but which appears from his reply to have contained no new arguments but much of personal abuse, to which he made little reply, though he says that he is not conscious of the truth of the charges brought against him (Possidius, *Indiculus*, iii.). His reply forms the third letter to Petilian, and in it, besides refuting some personal charges, he repeats his former arguments, and one of them at much greater length, viz. his answer as to the dependency of the benefit of baptism on the moral condition and intention of the minister. Dealing with some of the charges brought against him, while he expresses his sincere regret for his own way of life before baptism, he points out that his former sins were cleansed therein; and as to his subsequent life, those who

knew him can bear witness to what it has been since that time. Petilian calls him a Manichean, a charge which his conscience does not admit; and he appears to believe a vague statement, made by a woman, that he was a priest of the Manichean sect. He begs, however, that the Donatist party will judge fairly between himself and Petilian, whose witnesses they accept, though they refuse to believe his own. He may call himself Paracletus and Augustine Tertullus, and try to turn on him the charge of Manicheism; he accepts the angry words of (Megalus) his ordainer, but passes by the apology made afterwards by him before the council. He finds fault with monks and monasteries, knowing nothing of them, and passes by the cases of the Maximianists and of Optatus. He asserts falsely that Augustine was banished from Africa by Messianus the pro-consul; for at the time at which this is alleged to have been the case he was delivering lectures on rhetoric at Milan. In preparing his argument against that of Petilian, that the validity of baptism depends on the moral condition of the minister, he puts forward the very tenable supposition that this might not be pure, and if so, as shown in the first letter, what, on his theory, would be the result to a receiver ignorant of the fact? Petilian taxed them with introducing a mere vague supposition (fortasse), one of the same class as the one that the sky might fall. But there are many instances of men, Augustine says, some of them among Donatists, whom he mentions by name, who have done this, and, having performed the ceremony of baptism, have afterwards confessed their unbelief or wickedness of which at the time they were guilty, and have been degraded from their office, and yet the sky has not fallen. Church discipline ought to be maintained, but the whole church is not polluted by a few ungodly members. Some persons condemned by the church have been rebaptized by Donatists. Much that he had said in his former letter is wisely passed over by Petilian, but he asks Donatists to judge fairly between him and his opponent. It is plain that Augustine felt that there was some weight in the question raised by Petilian about the character of the minister of baptism, and for this reason he discussed it at some length, as he did also at still greater length, though not exactly from the same point of view, in his treatise *de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, in which, though not agreeing in the general doctrine laid down by Cyprian, he appears to admit a necessity for rebaptism in some extreme cases (*de Bapt.* i. 19, 29). But his argument against Petilian and his party from their own point of view is conclusive, and demonstrates the insufficiency of the ground taken by them in separating themselves from the church.

In close connection with these letters is the treatise of St. Augustine on the Unity of the Church, which he wrote at the time between the second and third of them, and which is intended to supply an answer to the question, "Where is the church?" The church was called by the men of former days "Catholic," because it is καθ' ἅλους, i.e. universal, and it is the Body of which Christ is the Head, so that they who are not in the church do not belong to his Body. Where is this to be found? Appeal must be made

to Scripture (*libri Dominici*). Christ consists of Head and Body, and so they who do not believe in his Incarnation, &c., do not belong to his Body. The treatise then points out (1) the types and prophecies relating to the church, beginning with the ark, mentioning a curious misapplication of its description made by a Donatist preacher at Hippo (c. v. 10), the application of those prophecies to himself made by Christ; (2) the necessity for mixture in the church of evil with good even in Africa, as shown by the outrages of the Circumcellions, and the proceedings against the Maximianists, and the universal character of its structure, contrasted with the exclusiveness of Donatism.

In the enquiry at Carthage, in which Petilianus took a leading part, he was chiefly remarkable for ingenious quibbling and minute subtlety on technical details of proceeding, wrangling about the delay as to the day of commencing proceedings, the blame of which he tried to fix on the opposite party; insisting on personal signature by every bishop without exception, and insinuating fraud in this matter on the part of the others; attempting to throw on the catholics the position of appellants, so as to place himself and his own party in that of respondents only; objecting to production of legal documents as if the whole question were to be argued on scripture grounds only; refusing for himself and his party the liberty of sitting in the presence of the Commissioner, and thus obliging him to stand during the proceedings; using, in short, as Augustine said afterwards, every artifice in order to prevent real discussion; and on the third day losing his temper and insulting Augustine personally in a coarse and vulgar manner; showing throughout the faculties and disposition of a pettifogging advocate, adroit but narrow, dishonest himself and suspicious of dishonesty in others; spinning out the time in matters of detail, taking every advantage which the case afforded, fair or unfair, and postponing, though with much ostentatious protest to the contrary, the real matters in dispute. In the earlier part of the account his name, as that of every other speaker, is mentioned in its special place; but as the details of the latter portion are lost, and the account given by Augustine in his *Breviculus* omits the names, the share taken by Petilian in this latter portion is unknown (see Vol. I. 894, and *Coll. Carth.* edd. Dupin and Oberthür; *Aug. Retract.* ii. 18, 25, *Ep.* 141; Ribbek, *August. und Donat.* p. 341-348; 391-424; 524-609). [H. W. P.]

PETRAIN (PETRANIUS, PETRANUS), Irish bishop of the third order of saints, abbat of Lusk, and died A.D. 616. (*Ann. Ulst.* A.D. 615; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 331-4.) [J. G.]

PETROCUS, ST., son of Clement, a Cornish prince (Rees's *Welsh Saints*, 266, *Life of S. Cadoc* in *Cambro-British Saints*, 310, Shearman's *Loca Patriciana*, 172), is said to have died June 4, 564 (William of Worcester 100, 101, 108, 115, 129; Haddan and Stubbs, i. 157, 701). Leland (*Itin.* viii. 514) refers to the old life of the saint, which was used by John of Timmouth, and is given in the *Acta Sanctorum* for June 4, i. 400-402 (Hardy's *Cat. Mat.* i. 117). He lived in a hermitage near the river Heyle at

Bodmin, the old name of which was Petrockstow (Aelfric cited in Wuelcker's *Anglia*, iii. 107; see too Leofric's *Missal*, ed. Warren, 1883, p. lxii., 5, 272, 280), and there his relics were preserved in an ivory casket which still survives. His relics were so much esteemed that in 1177 they were stolen and carried off to the abbey of St. Mevennus in Brittany (Oliver's *Monasticon*, Exon. 16), and it needed a special interposition of Henry II. to enforce their restoration. A most curious memorial connected with his altar there is the Bodmin MS. of the Gospels, now in the British Museum, on the leaves of which are entered the manumissions of many Cornish serfs between 941 and 1026 (the list is printed in Kemble and Thorpe, and in Oliver's *Monasticon* Exon. 431, Haddan and Stubbs, i. 676 to 682; and with corrections by Whitley Stokes in Gaidoz' *Revue Celtique*, i. 332 to 345). Probably the Celtic bishopric of Cornwall was seated at Bodmin (William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum*, ii. § 95, p. 204), until the Danes destroyed the place in 981. (*Sax. Chron.*) It is to the Danish ravages that we owe the almost complete destruction of the documents connected with the Cornish church; only the memory of the old dedications of churches survives, representing the ruin of the early condition of the West. The bishopric seems to have been then removed to St. Germans (apparently once called Llan-aledh, Haddan and Stubbs, i. 697), and then united with that of Crediton, and finally the joint bishopric of the two counties settled at the strong fortress of Exeter in 1050. The monastery of Dinurinn from which bishop Kenstec sent his profession of faith and obedience to archbishop Ceolnoth not long before 870 (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 674), may have been either Dingerein or Gerrans, just east of Falmouth, which belonged to the see of Exeter, or Dymure, one mile north of Bodmin, where there was an important British camp and bridge (William of Worcester, 109). His life says that Petrock studied in Ireland, that he visited Rome and the East, and that he returned to Cornwall accompanied by Credanus, Medanus, and Dechanus, who were all (according to Leland's *Descript. Brit.* 61) buried at Bodmin. They are said to have landed at the place afterwards called Petrockstow or Padstow, but previously Aldestowe, which was a dependency of the manor of Bodmin (it is not called Petrockstow till 1349). Many churches were dedicated to St. Petrock. In Cornwall we have Bodmin, Padstow, St. Petrock minor, Trevalga; in Devon, West Anstey, South Brent, Clannaborough, St. Petrock in Exeter (see Kerslake, *The Celt and the Teuton in Exeter*), Hollacombe (which belonged to St. Petrock's at Bodmin), Lidford, and Newton St. Petrock (see the *Journal of Institution of Cornwall*, ii. 199, 1867, and a *Life of St. Petrock* in iii. 1-9; *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis*, by Boase and Courtney, p. 477).

[C. W. B.]

PETRONIA, a lady of Uzalis, mentioned by St. Augustine as having been cured of a disease of long standing, for which she had worn a charm, by means of the relics of St. Stephen. (*Aug. Civ. D.* xxii. 8, 21.)

[H. W. P.]

PETRONILLA (1), saint and virgin. According to the legend related in the letter

attributed to Marcellus, son of the prefect of the city, and incorporated in the apocryphal acts of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, she was the daughter of St. Peter, was struck with palsy by her father, and afterwards was restored to health by him. On account of her great beauty count Flaccus fell in love with her, and came with a number of soldiers to take her by force as his wife. She rebuked him for coming with an armed band, and desired him, if he wished to have her as his wife, to send matrons and virgins on the third day to conduct her to his house. He granted her request, and she passed the three days in prayer and fasting with her foster-sister Felicula, and on the third day after receiving the sacrament died, and the women brought by Flaccus to escort her home celebrated her funeral. She was buried on the estate of Flavia Domitilla, on the road to Ardea, a mile and a half from Rome. (*Acta SS.* May, iii. 10-11, vii. 420-422.)

Such is the legend: it remains to inquire from what sources it was derived. It seems to have originated (see Lightfoot, *S. Clement*, 259-262) from the combination of two elements: (i.) the Manichaean apocryphal story mentioned by St. Augustine (*c. Adimantum*, xvii. *Op.* viii. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xlii. 161) that St. Peter by his prayers caused his daughter to be struck with palsy (the account in St. Augustine implies, without expressly stating it, that she was afterwards restored to health by her father); (ii.) the existence in the Christian cemetery of Flavia Domitilla of a sarcophagus inscribed with the words AURELIAE (or AUREAE) PETRONILLAE FILIAE DULCISSIMAE. Petronilla was assumed to be a diminutive of Petros; the inscription, it was imagined, had been engraved by the hand of the apostle himself, and in the early ages of the church the supposition that St. Peter had a daughter excited no repugnance. Later writers, for instance Baronius, felt this to be a difficulty, and accordingly explained *filia* in the sense of a spiritual daughter, in the same manner as St. Peter speaks of St. Mark as his son. But the legend is based entirely on the assumed derivation of Petronilla from Petros, whereas it is really derived from Petronius or Petro. Now the founder of the Flavian family, the grandfather both of the emperor Vespasian and his brother, T. Flavius Sabinus, the head of that branch of the Flavii to which the supposed converts to Christianity belonged, was T. Flavius Petro of Reate. Petronilla therefore was probably one of the Aurelian gens, several of whom are shown by the inscriptions discovered by De Rossi to have been buried in the same cemetery, and was by the mother's side a scion of the Flavian family, and was therefore related to Flavia Domitilla, the owner of the land under which the cemetery was formed, and was probably, like her, a Christian convert. So much may be affirmed with reasonable certainty, the rest of her history is unknown.

Probably on account of her supposed relationship to St. Peter she was held in high veneration. Though the subterranean basilica constructed by pope Siricius between A.D. 391 and 395 contained the tombs of the martyrs SS. Nereus and Achilleus, it was in her honour it was dedicated, and there her body remained in its sarcophagus till A.D. 757, when it was translated by pope Paul I. to the Vatican, and placed in what had

been the mausoleum of the Christian emperors, close to St. Peter's (*Liber Pontificalis* in *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1139). This was done in fulfilment of a promise made by the pope's brother and predecessor Stephen II. to Pippin king of the Franks, on his visit to his court, as a token and pledge of the alliance between the Papacy and the Franks against the Lombards, which within fifty years was to lead to the re-establishment of the Western Empire. St. Peter being specially honoured by the Franks, and being their patron saint (*Epp.* Steph. II. iv. v. in *Cod. Carol.* in *Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 101, 102), Petronilla naturally shared in the veneration paid to her reputed father, and is in fact styled by Paul I. the *auxiliatrix* of Pippin (*Epp.* Pauli I. xiii. in *Cod. Carol.* in *Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 150). Stephen had himself converted the mausoleum into a chapel for the remains, but had died before the translation was accomplished.

There her body remained, the chapel being considered to belong in an especial manner to the kings of France. In A.D. 1471 a restoration was begun at the expense of Louis XI., in the course of which the ancient sarcophagus was discovered, and the inscription was fortunately copied by Sabinus, the antiquarian. After the chapel was demolished, early in the 16th century, in consequence of the rebuilding of St. Peter's, the sarcophagus and its contents lay for a long time neglected in the sacristy, till at last, in A.D. 1574, it was broken up and used for paving the new church, and the relics, transferred to a new receptacle, were in 1606 deposited at the altar where they still remain beneath the mosaic copy of Guercino's famous picture of the original interment of the saint. To the present day the French ambassador, after presenting his credentials to the pope, visits the chapel of St. Petronilla.

Within the last ten years, thanks to the indefatigable industry of Cav. de Rossi, the ancient basilica of St. Petronilla has been discovered and excavated, the original positions of her sarcophagus and the tombs of SS. Nereus and Achilleus have been determined, and a fresco, probably of the first half of the 4th century (*Bull.* 1875, 16), has been found, which represents St. Petronilla conducting one of her votaries to Paradise. In this picture she is designated as a martyr. The last discovery (*Athenæum*, March 4, 1882) in these catacombs is a chamber, the great antiquity of which is shown by its style of decoration, akin to the Pompeian. The inscription which had been over the door, written in characters of the Flavian era, is AMPLIATI, which at once suggests the thought, can this be the tomb either of the Ampliatius himself or of his family to whom St. Paul alludes? (*Rom.* xvi. 8). An interesting account of these discoveries, and a discussion of the legend of St. Petronilla and the history of her cultus is given in Cav. de Rossi's papers (*Bullettino di Archeologia Christiana*, 1865, 46; 1874, 1, 68, 122; 1875, 1-77; 1878, 125-146; 1879, 1-20, 139-160; 1880, 169), and the fourth volume of *Roma Sotterranea* is to be devoted to the subject. St. Petronilla is commemorated on May 31. [F. D.]

PETRONILLA (2), a Lucanian lady, had been induced by bishop Agnellus to enter a nunnery and to endow it with all her property. When

she with the other nuns fled to Sicily before the Lombard invasion, Agnellus, the son of the saint bishop, was said to have seduced her. Gregory in A.D. 593, directed the deacon Cyprianus to inquire into the charge, and if it was true to compel her to re-enter a nunnery and do penance (*Ep.* iv. 6). [F. D.]

PETRONIUS (1), a monk in the coenobium of Pachomius at Tabenna in the Thebais, of eminent virtue. When Pachomius died, May 9, 348, Petronius, who was then superior of the coenobium of Men or Tisemen in the diocese of Panis, was chosen to succeed him, but he survived his election only thirteen days. The source of our information is the Greek *Acta* of Silvanus and Pachomius (Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 27 CD, 52 C, 42 CD, 44 DC; Tillem. vii. 176, 217, 218, 229, 230, 689, 692, viii. 130). [C. H.]

PETRONIUS (2), ST., bishop of Bologna, early embraced the monastic life. According to Gennadius (*de Script. Eccl.* 41, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 1082) the *Vitae Patrum* being Lives of the Egyptian monks, which monks regarded as the rule and mirror of their profession, were attributed to him. This work is not extant, unless Gennadius refers to the *Vitae Patrum* of Rufinus (*Patr. Lat.* xxi. 387), which, it has been suggested, were composed by Rufinus from materials furnished by Petronius. The book is indeed attributed to Rufinus by St. Jerome, (*ad Ctes.* in *Patr. Lat.* xxii. 1151), but is not included by Gennadius in the list of his works. It relates a journey to the most celebrated monasteries and hermitages in Egypt, but from what is known from other sources of the life of Rufinus, it appears that he could not have been in Egypt at the time the journey is represented to have been made. Tillemont (*M. E.* xii. 657) collects the evidence, of which one specimen will be sufficient. The writer (ch. i.) mentions that he was with St. John of Lycopolis, when news of the defeat of Eugenius by Theodosius arrived at Alexandria, i. e. late in A.D. 394; now St. Jerome states (*in Ruf.* iii. 18 in *Patr. Lat.* xxiii. 470) that Rufinus was never in Alexandria after Theophilus became bishop, i. e. after A.D. 385. One solution is that Rufinus wrote the book from the materials supplied by and under the character of some traveller, who probably was Petronius; another is that Petronius found the book in Greek and employed Rufinus to translate it. The writer was a deacon, and travelled with six companions from Jerusalem (ch. i.). He first narrates what he saw in the Thebaid and then in Nitria. The perils of the way prevented them going further than Lycopolis. At the end of the book he mentions the various dangers they encountered. Their boat was once almost upset in the Nile, they were wrecked on an island in Lake Marcotis, were pursued by robbers, were nearly lost in the inundation of the Nile, and finally in Nitria were nearly devoured by some crocodiles in a pool left by the inundation, which they had incautiously approached, thinking they were dead. Gennadius also mentions a treatise (*de Ordinatione Episcopi*) attributed to Petronius but written in too good a style to be his. He therefore supposes it was written by his father, Petronius, who was distinguished for his learning

and eloquence; as the author speaks of himself as praetorian prefect. It is uncertain which of the praetorian prefects of the names is meant. A Sextus Petronius Probus was praetorian prefect four times, first in A.D. 368 (*Cod. Theod.* x. tit. 24. 1), but it is generally supposed that the father of St. Petronius was either the Anicius Probus, son of the last mentioned, who may also have borne the name of Petronius, and who was consul in A.D. 406, or the Petronius who was vicar in Spain, A.D. 395-7 (*Cod. Theod.* iv. tit. 21. 1. tit. 6. 5), and prefect of the Gauls between A.D. 402 and 408 (*Cod. Just.* xi. 73). The whole question is discussed by Tillemont (*M. E.* xv. 30) and the Bollandists (*AA. SS.* Oct. ii. 424). Gennadius states that St. Petronius died during the joint reign of Theodosius and Valentinian, i. e. between A.D. 425 and A.D. 450. Eucherius of Lyons, writing about A.D. 432, mentions St. Petronius as a contemporary instance of one who had forsaken the highest worldly position (*Ad Val. in Patr. Lat.* l. 719), and Gennadius speaks of the holiness of his life. He is commemorated on Oct. 4, and is the patron saint of Bologna. [F. D.]

PETRONIUS (3), a presbyter of Gaul, messenger to Leo the Great. (*Leonis Epp.* lxvi. and lxvii.) [C. G.]

PETRONIUS (4), bishop, to whom in A.D. 525 Dionysius Exiguus addressed the first of his two letters on the Pasch, giving an account of the cycle which Dionysius was about to publish [DIONYSIUS (19)]. [J. G.]

PETRONIUS (5), the fifth abbat of St. Augustine's, Canterbury. According to the legendary history of the abbey, he was a Roman, elected to succeed Gratiosus, whose death is fixed to 638, and was blessed by archbishop Honorius in 640. No reason is alleged for the delay, but it is conjectured that Honorius may have been on a long tour. His death is dated 654, and the place of his burial was unknown. There is, however, an epitaph assigned to him in the Monasticon,

"Abbas Petronius, bonitatis odore refertus
Subjectos docuit, vitiorum sorde plavit."

The years assigned to him fall pretty nearly within the archiepiscopate of Honorius and the reign of Earcumbert. But nothing is really known of him, and his existence depends for historical credibility on the possible authenticity of the ancient list of abbats. (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 175, 183; W. Thorn, ed. Twysden, c. 1769; *Mon. Angl.* i. 120. Somner's *Antiquities of Canterbury*, ed. Battely, pt. 2, p. 164.) [S.]

PETRUS APOSTOLUS, PREACHING OF (*Κήρυγμα Πέτρου*; *praedicatio Petri et Pauli*). Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 3) enumerates four spurious works bearing the name of the Apostle Peter, but not recognized by ecclesiastical writers. These are the Acts of Peter, the Gospel of Peter, the Preaching of Peter and the Revelation of Peter. To these Jerome, in his *Catalogue*, adds a fifth: the Judgment of Peter. Concerning the Acts of Peter, see ACTS APOCRYPHAL, CLEMENTINE LITERATURE, and LINUS; concerning the Gospel

and the Revelation, see GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, APOCALYPSES APOCRYPHAL; concerning the Judgment see TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES. In this article an account will be given of the Preaching of Peter, a work which must be as old as the middle of the second century. It is quoted several times by Clement of Alexandria, who uses it without scruple as a genuine record of Peter's teaching (*Strom.* i. 29, p. 427 Potter; ii. 15, p. 465; vi. 5, pp. 759-762; vi. 6, p. 764; vi. 7, p. 769; vi. 15, p. 804; *Ecolog. Prophet.* 58, p. 1004). It had been previously employed by Heracleon, who is quoted by Origen (*In Johann.* xiii. 17) as citing the same passage as that quoted by Clement, p. 760. In this passage Origen leaves it to his readers to determine whether the 'Preaching' is to be regarded as genuine, spurious, or mixed; but elsewhere (*De Princ.* Praef. 8) he expresses a decidedly unfavourable opinion of the book.

Critics of the school of Baur assume it as an article of pious belief that the first Acts of Peter must have been Ebionite and anti-Pauline, relating a contest between the Apostle Peter and Simon Magus, under which disguise Paul is to be understood as represented. But there is no real proof that any work which professed to record Peter's preaching is more ancient than the work now under consideration; and this is distinctly neither Ebionite nor anti-Pauline. In the passage which is largely quoted by Clement (*Strom.* vi. 5), the Christians are described as a community distinct alike from Jews and Gentiles, and forming a third race (*ἄριτον γένος*). All three worshipped the same God; but both Gentiles and Jews went astray in their manner of worshipping Him. We must not worship like the Gentiles, who took gold and silver and other substances which God had given for man's use, and made them objects of worship; they also worshipped creatures given for man's food, and even worshipped weasels and mice, cats, dogs, and apes. But neither must we worship like the Jews; for they worship angels and archangels; they honour the sun and the moon, and until the moon appears will not keep their first sabbath nor their other feasts. But God has said in the Scriptures, "Behold I make a new covenant, not like the covenant which I made with your fathers on Mount Horeb." This new covenant is that of the Christians; those of the Jews and of the Gentiles are old. This writer evidently is no Ebionite; but has completely separated himself from the Jews, who he declares, though they fancy they alone know God, really know nothing of Him.

The mission to the Gentiles is represented as part of Christ's appointed plan. He is said to have told His apostles after His Ascension to remain for twelve years labouring among the Jews; and after that to go out and preach the gospel through the whole world in order that those who should believe might be saved, and those who should not believe might at least not be able to say in their excuse that they had not heard. Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 18) quotes Apollonius as reporting a tradition, that our Lord had

^a We may perhaps be tempted to suspect an Egyptian origin for this book of the Preaching.

^b A use of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to be indicated here.

directed the apostles not to leave Jerusalem for twelve years; but he does not connect that tradition with the Preaching of Peter.

It would appear that this work introduced Paul as Peter's fellow labourer. Clement (p. 761), when speaking of this work, goes on to say that "besides the preaching of Peter's (πρὸς τῷ Πέτρου κηρύγματι) the apostle Paul also testifies." Now critics are generally agreed that the words put into the mouth of Paul are taken from the same work, which seems to have consisted of two parts, a Preaching of Peter and a Preaching of Paul. Lactantius (*Inst. Div.* iv. 21), to all appearance speaking of the same work, describes it as containing the Preaching both of Peter and Paul, "quae Petrus et Paulus Romae praedicaverunt, et ea praedicatio in memoriam scripta permansit." Pseudo-Cyprian* also (*De Rebaptismate*, 17) has a quotation, presently to be mentioned from the "Praedicatio Pauli." It may be conjectured that after the two separate preachings of Peter and Paul there followed a conclusion relating the joint preaching of the two apostles at Rome. For one of the things alleged by Pseudo-Cyprian, in order to prove the untrustworthy character of the book, is that it represents Peter and Paul meeting in "the city," as if they had not known each other before. The words quoted by Clement as Paul's in the passage referred to, were probably taken from the joint preaching of the two apostles; for what Paul says seems to be a natural supplement to what Clement quotes as Peter's. Peter is represented (*Strom.* vi. 15) as appealing to the prophecies of Christ in the Jewish Scriptures; Paul bids them take also the Grecian books. He alleges the Sibyl as testifying to the unity of God, and also Hystaspes as prophesying of Christ. The substance of what he quotes has been given in the article HYSTASPES (Vol. III. p. 289). The fact that the names of the Sibyl and of Hystaspes are coupled in precisely the same manner by Justin Martyr, suggests a suspicion either that the author of the Preaching used Justin or that the Preaching is old enough to have been known by Justin. In favour of the latter supposition is the fact, that the Preaching seems to show an independent knowledge of Hystaspes. But that there is literary dependence, on the one side or the other, between the two books, is made highly probable, by the existence of two other coincidences.

One of the few statements made by Justin about our Lord, for which we do not find authority in our Gospels, is that at his baptism when he descended into the water a fire was kindled in Jordan (*Trypho* 88). It has often been remarked that Justin has shaped his sentence in such a way as to separate this statement from the things for which he alleges apostolic authority. Now Pseudo-Cyprian (*u. s.*) reports that this statement was to be found in the "Preaching of Paul," and is not in any Gospel.^d He imagines that the book must have

been forged by some heretics, against whom he had to contend, who contrived to give to those whom they persuaded to join them, a literal baptism "with fire." We may accept his testimony, that the book was appealed to by these heretics, without being persuaded that it was they who forged it. The "Preaching of Paul" appears to have included a recital of some of the events of our Lord's history. Pseudo-Cyprian tells us that it related that our Lord was constrained by his mother, almost against his will, to accept John's baptism, and that it represents him as then making confession of sin. We are led to think it likely that the author of the "Preaching" used the Hebrew gospel, which, according to St. Jerome (*Adv. Pelag.* iii. 2), related that our Lord was urged by his mother and his brethren to receive John's baptism, whereupon he answered, "What have I sinned that I should go and be baptised of him, unless indeed this that I have said be ignorance." There is another coincidence with the Hebrew gospel, the discussion of which is not quite free from difficulty. Origen (*De Princ.* Praef. 8) quotes the "Teaching of Peter" as making our Lord say, "I am not an incorporeal spirit." Now Jerome (*De Vir. Illust.* 16; in *Isai.* lib. 18 Prol.) reports that these words were found in the Hebrew gospel. And this report gains confirmation from the fact that Ignatius, who is likely enough to have used an Aramaic gospel (*Ad Smyrn.* 3), when apparently referring to the same incident as that recorded (Luke xxiv. 39), does so in the form, "Ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν ἔφη αὐτοῖς λάβετε, ψιλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἄσματος." We should seem then justified in the inference, that the author of the Preaching used the Hebrew gospel; but the curious point is that Eusebius, whom we have every reason to suppose to have been acquainted both with one work and the other, quotes (*H. E.* iii. 36) the passage from Ignatius, and says that he does not know where Ignatius got those words. We know no other solution of the difficulty than that the memory of Eusebius did not always help him as well as might be desired.

It still remains to be mentioned that Clement three times reports that the Preaching gave to our Lord the titles νόμος and λόγος, and himself combines these epithets. (*Strom.* vii. p. 837.) Now a third coincidence between the Preaching and Justin Martyr is that Justin (*Trypho* 11) applies to our Lord the title νόμος αἰώνιος, interpreting the word νόμος in the prophecy of Isaiah (li. 4) νόμος παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται of our Lord personally. He understands in like manner the word διαθήκη in Jer. xxii. 31 Heb. and xxxviii. 22 LXX.: a prophecy which, we have already seen, was quoted in the Preaching. Comparison here is in favour of the originality of Justin; but it is remarkable that Clement Alex. (*Strom.* i. 29) using the words νόμος and διαθήκη in the same way quotes the Preaching as his authority and not Justin. A very curious coincidence, suggesting a possibility that the Preaching might have derived the idea from another source, is that Hermas also has ὁ νόμος οὗτος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐστίν. Now there seems to be a plain use of the "First Commandment" of Hermas in the language in which Peter in the Preaching proclaims that there is one God

* With respect to the authorship of this tract, see URSINUS AFER.

^d The Eblonite Gospel described by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 13) related that a great light shone round the place, but a "light" and "fire" are by no means to be confounded.

ἀχώρητος ὅς τὰ πάντα χωρεῖ. The use of the word Logos in the Preaching is only worthy of notice, if it is supposed that the author was earlier than Justin.

It is to be regretted that the remains of the Preaching of Peter are too scanty to allow of any such comparison being made with the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions as would enable us to speak positively as to the relations of the Preaching with the latter documents. It is to be observed, however, that the *Recognitions* (i. 12) and *Letter of Clement to James* 23 (20) recognized a previous account of Peter's Preaching as having been sent to James.

The fragments of the Preaching of Peter were collected by Grabe, *Spicilegium* (i. 62), by Credner, *Beiträge*, 349-364, and lately by Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. ext. Can. recept.* Fascic. iv. 51-65, 2nd edit., 1884. [G. S.]

PETRUS (1), aged bishop, accused of misappropriating the church's property. His cause was taken up by Cyril of Alexandria, c. A.D. 442, who wrote in his favour to Domnus, bishop of Antioch (Cyril, *Ep.* 78 al. 59). [J. G.]

Bishops arranged in order of sees or countries.

PETRUS (2), African bishop in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. iv. de Basilide, A.D. 254; *vid.* of Hippo Diarhytus, Cyp. *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

PETRUS (3), bishop of Aleria in Corsica, a correspondent of Gregory the Great. (Gregorii *Epist.* lib. vi. ind. xiv. 22; lib. viii. ind. i. 1, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 813, 903.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (4) I., ST., archbishop of Alexandria, succeeded Theonas, A.D. 300. By one account, which Burton accepts on the authority of Philip of Side (see *Lect. on Eccl. Hist.* ii. 433), he had been president of the catechetical school of Alexandria; but it is hardly likely that, as Burton assumes, he was the Peter who, fifty years earlier, had been a companion of Dionysius of Alexandria, in his dreary Libyan place of retreat amid the storm of the Decian persecution. After his accession he had three years of tranquil administration, which he so used as to acquire the high reputation indicated by Eusebius, who calls him a wonderful teacher of the faith, and "an admirable specimen of a bishop, alike in the excellence of his conduct and his familiarity with Scripture" (Euseb. viii. 13; ix. 6). Then came the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution; and three years later, in the early part of 306, Peter found it necessary to draw up conditions of reconciliation to the church, and of readmission to her privileges, for those who through weakness had in various degrees compromised their fidelity. The date is determined by the first words of this set of "canons" or regulations, "Since we are approaching the fourth Easter from the beginning of the persecution," i. e. reckoning from the Lent of 303. (This is overlooked in Mason's *Persecution of Diocletian*, p. 324, where these "canons" are assigned to 311.)

The substance of these remarkable provisions (which are given at length in Routh's *Reliquiae Sacrae*, iv. 23 ff.) is as follows. I. Those who did not give way until extreme tortures had

overstrained their powers of endurance, and who had been for three years already "mourners," without being admitted to regular penance, might communicate after fasting forty days more with special strictness. (This may remind us of St. Cyprian's equitable judgment on persons who had fully intended to hold out, but had been overcome by intense and complicated torture, *de Lapsis*, 13. The mourners or weepers, as is well known, were "candidates for penance," who besought the faithful as they passed into the church to plead for their admission into the class of penitents; see Basil, *Epist.* 199. 22, and other references in *Notes on Canons of First Four Councils*, Oxford, 1882, p. 37.) II. Those who, as Peter phrases it, had endured only the "siege of imprisonment," not the "war of tortures," and therefore deserved less pity, yet gave themselves up to suffer some affliction for "the Name," although in prison they were much relieved by Christian alms, may be received after another year's penance. (This canon reminds us of the really dreadful "trial" of imprisonment in such dungeons as are referred to in Rev. ii. 10, and also in the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, Euseb. v. 1, in Tertullian *de Resurr. Carnis*, 8, and in the Acts of St. Perpetua, and elsewhere in the authentic martyrologies; see too the description of the "lignum" and "barathrum" in Card. Newman's *Callista*, c. 32. Compare Abp. Trenchard on the *Epistles to the Seven Churches*, p. 99.) III. Those who endured nothing at all, but lapsed under sheer terror, must do penance for four years;—the parable of the barren fig-tree is quoted. (Here again, Peter illustrates the description given by his great predecessor Dionysius, of those Alexandrians whom the mere publication of Decius's edict had scared into apostasy, Euseb. vi. 41; see too Cyprian, *Epist.* 8; Euseb. *Mart. Pal.* 1; Ancyr. can. 6; Nic. 11.) The IVth (canon) is not, strictly speaking, a canon, but a lamentation over *lapsi* who had not repented (Neale, i. 98). Peter cites the cursing of the fig-tree, with Isa. lxvi. 24, lvii. 20. V. Those who, in order to evade the trial of their constancy, feigned epilepsy, or promised conformity in writing, or put forward pagans to throw incense on the altar in their stead, must do penance for six months more, although some of them had already been received to communion by some of the steadfast confessors. There is a fanciful reference to the fact that Christ, Himself a preacher of repentance and of that kingdom of heaven which is "within us" by our faith in Him, was conceived six months after the Baptist. On the right of confessors to plead with the Church for a shortening of the penance-time of the lapsed, and on the abuse of that right, see Cyprian, *Epist.* 22-27; *De Laps.* 12 (or 18); Bingham, xvi. 3, 4. VI. Some Christian masters compelled their Christian slaves to face the trial in their stead; such slaves, having lapsed under such circumstances, must "shew the works of repentance" for a year. VII. But these masters who, by thus imperilling their slaves, showed their disregard for apostolic exhortations (Eph. vi. 9; Col. iv. 1), must have their own repentance tested for three more years. VIII. Those who, having lapsed, returned to the conflict, and endured imprisonment and tortures, are to be "joyfully received to communion, alike in the prayers and the

reception of the Body and Blood, and oral exhortation." On such a return to the "agon," cp. *Cypr. Epist.* 19 (the reader of Euseb. v. 1 will remember how Biblias "fell and rose again," dying a martyr). IX. Those who voluntarily exposed themselves to the trial are to be received to communion, because they did so for Christ's sake, although they forgot the import of "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us," &c., and perhaps did not know that Christ Himself repeatedly withdrew from intended persecution, and even at last waited to be seized and given up; and that He bade His disciples flee from city to city (*Matt.* x. 23), that they might not enhance their enemies' guilt. Thus Stephen and James were arrested; so was Peter, who "was finally crucified in Rome;" so Paul, who was beheaded in the same city. (Here Peter states the Catholic, as opposed to the Montanistic principle of action, as it had been stated by the church of Smyrna in Euseb. iv. 15, and by Cyprian in *Epist.* 8.) It is indicated by a few words of that noble poem in which Milman brings us so wonderfully near to the mind and life of the Church of the Martyrs—

"Hold we all prepared . . .
To give the last and awful testimony
To Christ our Lord. Yet tempt not to our murder
The yet unbloody hands of men."

(*Martyr of Antioch*, p. 41.)

(On exceptional cases, see note in *Cypr. Epist. Lib. Futh.* p. 71.) Hence, clerics who thus denounced themselves to the authorities, then lapsed, and afterwards returned to the conflict, must cease to officiate, but may communicate; if they had not lapsed, their rashness might be excused. (This "canon" refutes Epiphanius's opinion, derived from Meletianising documents, that Peter was in favour of restoring lapsed clerics to their ministry, *Haer.* 68. 3.) XI. Persons who, in their zeal to encourage their fellow-Christians to persevere and win the prize of martyrdom, voluntarily avowed their own faith, were to be exempted from blame; compare Euseb. vi. 41, fin. Requests for prayer on behalf of those who gave way after imprisonment and torture ought to be granted: "no one could be the worse" for sympathising with those who were overcome by the devil, or by the entreaties of their kindred (compare *Passio S. Perpet.* 3, *S. Iren. Sirm.* 3; Euseb. viii. 9, on this form of trial). XII. Those who paid for indemnity are not to be censured; they showed their disregard for money; and Acts xvii. 9 is here quoted. (This indulgent ruling contrasts markedly with Tertullian's bitter denunciation of such a practice, *de Fuga in Persec.* 12.) XIII. Nor should those be blamed who fled, abandoning their homes,—as if they had left others to bear the brunt. Paul was constrained to leave Gaius and Aristarchus in the hands of the mob of Ephesus (*Acts* xix. 29, 30): Peter escaped from prison, and his guards died for it; the Innocents died in place of the Holy Child. Here follows a somewhat mystical application of Isa. viii. 4 to the case of the Magi, and the assertion that the infant John was sought for at the same time, and that his father Zacharias was caught, and then slain between the temple and the altar, a story which in a different form is scornfully set aside by Jerome, in *Matt.* c. 23.

XIV. Imprisoned confessors in Libya and elsewhere had mentioned cases of persons who had been compelled by sheer force to handle the sacrifices. These, like others whom tortures rendered utterly insensible, were to be regarded as confessors, for their will was steadfast throughout; and they might be placed in the ministry. These "canons" were ratified by the Council in Trullo, c. 2, A.D. 692, and so became part of the law of the Eastern church. (Compare Euseb. *Mart. Pal.* 1; *Passio SS. Tarachi et Probi*, c. 8, in Ruinart, *Act. Sinc.* p. 467; C. Ancy. c. 3.)

Very soon after these "canons" were drawn up, the persecution was intensified by the pagan fanaticism of Maximin Daza. Peter felt it his duty to follow the precedents he had cited in his 8th canon, and the example of his great predecessor Dionysius, by "seeking for safety in flight" (*Burton, Hist. Eccl.* ii. 441). Phileas bishop of Thmuis, and three other bishops, were imprisoned at Alexandria; and then it was that, according to the Maffiean documents, Meletius, being himself at large, held ordinations in their dioceses without their sanction "or that of the archbishop," and without necessity (*Hist. Writings of St. Athanasius*, Oxford, 1881, *Introd.* p. xxxix.). The four prelates wrote a letter of remonstrance (see it in Routh, *Rel. Sac.* iv. 91); they reminded him of the rule which forbade one bishop to interfere in another's diocese, and pointed out that they had provided for their flocks by the appointment of "visitors," and that, even if their sees had been vacated by death, he ought to have applied to "the great bishop and father, Peter," for license to ordain outside his own bounds. To this letter, which is significant as to the solid position which the diocesan system had now acquired in Egypt, Meletius made no reply; as another document expresses it, "he did not go to visit either the imprisoned bishops or blessed Peter." They were subsequently martyred (the date of Phileas's death has been matter of some question, but may reasonably be placed in 306); and immediately afterwards the reckless bishop of Lycopolis repaired to Alexandria, fell in with Isidore and Arius, two malcontents who aimed at the priesthood, and at their instigation excommunicated the two visitors or vicars-general commissioned by Peter, and ordained two in their place, one in prison, the other in a mine. Peter, being informed of this lawless procedure, wrote to the faithful in Alexandria to this effect: "Since I have ascertained that Meletius, disregarding the letter of the martyred bishops, has entered my diocese, taken upon himself to excommunicate the presbyters who were acting under my authority . . . and shown his craving for pre-eminence by ordaining certain persons in prison; take care not to communicate with him until I meet him in company with wise men, and see what it is that he has in mind. Farewell." (*Routh, Rel. Sac.* iv. 94.)

Allusion has already been made to the Epiphaniian account of the origin of Meletianism, which is inconsistent with Peter's real opinion as to lapsed clerics. It also supposes Peter and Meletius to have been fellow-prisoners when they disputed as to the case of the lapsed,—Meletius taking a sterner, and his primate a milder view; after which, Epiphanius was informed, Peter hung up his mantle curtain-wise

across the dungeon, and sent word to its other inmates, "Whoever thinks with me, let him come here; whoever thinks with Meletius, let him go to the other side," whereupon the majority sided with Meletius. Epiphanius, we cannot doubt, was misled by the graphic story of a Meletianising romancer, as Athanasius, in his darker picture of the offence of Meletius, must be supposed to reproduce the story which he had heard as a young cleric, and which may have grown out of the resentments of Peter's own clergy, and of others who knew that Meletius had somehow escaped persecution (see *Hist. Writings of St. Athanasius*, p. 40). By all accounts, however, the schism began under Peter (*Athan. Apol. c. Ari. 11*); and Sozomen enables us to connect a statement in the Maffeiian documents with the subsequent alliance between the schismatics and the great heretical party, which was formed some nine years after Peter's death. The interview between Meletius and Arius appears to have been fruitful in trouble for the great archbishop who was a mere boy when it took place, but who in 356 compared the league between their followers to the reconciliation between Pilate and Herod Antipas (*ad Ep. Aegypt. 22*). Arius, we are told, "began to act with Meletius in his career of innovation, but abandoned him, and was ordained deacon by Peter, and again was ejected by him from the church, because, when Peter excommunicated the adherents of Meletius, and did not recognise their baptism, Arius inveighed against this proceeding, and could not bear to hold his peace" (*Soz. i. 15*). If this statement is correct, Peter must have held the rigorous Cyprianic view as to the nullity of all baptism when administered outside the communion of the church, and by acting on it in this case he was "likely to revive ancient dissensions" (*Burton, Ecol. Hist. ii. 298*). A much later story, to the effect that Arius gave expression to his characteristic heresy in Peter's lifetime, and that Peter told his disciples how in a dream he had heard Christ denounce Arius for having rent His garment, betrays its own legendary character. It may be read in the extracts from Severus, embodied by Renaudot in his "History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria" (p. 58), where it is given in full detail,—*"Quis, Domine, vestem tuam ita discidit? Arius, inquit;"* and *"monuit me venturos postredie qui pro Ario intercederent, sed ne illis acquiescerem;"* and again in the "Annals" of that same patriarch Eutychius who wrote six hundred years after Peter's death, and whose credulous untrustworthiness as to the early history of his see had been too often overlooked for the sake of a famous passage which seemed to tell against episcopacy. Renaudot claims the "common tradition of the church" for the vision of the rent garment; and thinks that it really referred to the Meletian schism, and that later transcribers of the story, being ignorant of that chapter in Arius's life, took for granted that the excommunication must have been incurred by his heresy, which accordingly they antedated. Neale also (*Hist. Alex. i. 105*) persuades himself that the tale has elements of truth.

Egypt was part of the dominions of Maximin; and that tyrant, besides presiding over martyrdoms in Palestine (A.D. 306, 307, 308), practised other enormities at Alexandria (*Euseb. viii.*

14; *Burton, ii. 451*). During Peter's retirement, his habits had become more strictly ascetic, while at the same time he continued to provide "in no hidden way" for the welfare of the church (*Euseb. vii. 32*). The phrase *ὄγκ ἀφανῶς* is significant, as it points to the well-understood system of communication whereby a bishop of Alexandria, although himself in hiding, could, like Athanasius in the desert, make his hand felt throughout the churches which still owned him as their "father." Peter must have grieved over the sufferings of many of his flock who were condemned to penal servitude in the "Porphyry quarry" of Thebais: Eusebius mentions two sets of such prisoners, who also suffered various mutilations (*Mart. Pal. 8*), and among them was Paphnutius, one of his own suffragans, who afterwards, at Nicaea, exhibited to Constantine's reverent sympathy the socket whence his right eye had been scooped out (*Soc. i. 11*). Doubtless, also, Peter heard with pleasure of the practical charity which impelled some Egyptian Christians, in the December of 308, to undertake a journey "in order to minister to the necessities of the confessors in Cilicia" (*Euseb. Mart. Pal. 10*), and he may have rejoiced in the martyrdom of two Egyptian bishops, who were burned to death at Caesarea in 310 (*ib. 13*). Probably his own return to Alexandria, and the formal communication of the Meletians as above mentioned, took place after a toleration-edict, which mortal agony wrung from Galerius in the April of 311. This edict constrained Maximin to abate his persecuting energy; but he began again, ere long, to harass his Christian subjects, and to encourage zealous heathen municipalities to memorialise him "that no Christians might be allowed to dwell among them" (*Euseb. ix. 2*). Thus at the end of October, in 311 (*ib.*), "the Christians found themselves again in great peril" (*Burton*); and one of the first acts of Maximin's renewed persecution was to smite the shepherd of the flock at Alexandria. Peter was beheaded, says Eusebius (*vii. 32*), "in the ninth year of the persecution" (311), by virtue of a "sudden" imperial order, "without any reason assigned" (*ix. 6*). This simple statement, by one who knew much of Egyptian affairs at this period, is curiously contrasted with the exuberance of later imaginations, which ascribed the order to Diocletian, incensed—so ran the tale—with Peter for having received at Alexandria the Christian wife of an apostate official at Antioch; (Peter was said to have been miraculously led to recognise as valid the baptism which she had administered to her children during a storm at sea,—as Alexander, in a much earlier story, would not reiterate the baptism administered to his playfellows by the boy Athanasius). Severus (ap. Renaudot) had heard two accounts of Peter's death: by one, he was beheaded while he stretched forth his neck through a hole made in the prison wall, before his people could come to resist the soldiers; by another, he suffered at a place called Bucolia, near the tomb of St. Mark; the Christians, it was said, performed his funeral with great solemnity, the corpse being seated on the patriarchal throne during the celebration of the Eucharist. The "Acts of St. Peter's martyrdom," says Routh, are ignored by Ruinart, and are evidently spurious (*Rel. Sac. iv. 82*). The day of his death

was the 29th of Athyr, or Nov. 25th, on which day he is commemorated in the Ethiopic church. The Greeks honour him on the day preceding.

Besides fourteen canons, we have what is reckoned by Johnson and Routh as the "fifteenth," but is in fact a fragment of a work on the Paschal Festival. In it he says that it is usual to fast on Wednesday, because of the Jews, "taking counsel for the betrayal of the Lord;" and on Friday, "because He then suffered for our sake." "For," he adds, "we keep the Lord's day as a day of gladness, because on it He rose again; and on it, according to tradition, we do not even kneel." The custom of standing at prayer on Sunday was again enforced by the Nicene council (c. 20; Bright, *Notes on the Canons of the First Four Councils*, p. 73). We have also fragments from three other works of his. At the first session of the council of Ephesus (Mansi, iv. 1185), there were read three short extracts from his book on the "Divinity of Christ;" the second of these had already been quoted by Cyril in his *Apol. adv. Orient.* 1. Their purport is to state the fact of the Incarnation; and he excludes such a view of the *κένωσις* as would suppose the Word to have parted with the power or glory of His Godhead when He condescended to become man. And this passage, given by Routh in Greek, from a Bodleian MS., is taken by Leontius of Byzantium, in his first book "against Nestorians and Eutychians," from Peter's treatise "on our Saviour's sojourn among us." It anticipates both the Ephesine and the Chalcedonian theology by saying simply that Christ "was God by nature, and became Man by nature." (In the Latin version of Leontius, in Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* xii. 668, "Filius Dei" is wrongly put for "Filius hominis," in the quotation of Luke xxii. 48 adduced by Peter to show that the Son of God became Son of Man.) Again, of Peter's treatise against the Origenistic theory of the pre-existence of the soul, and of its "having been placed in the body because it had sinned," Leontius preserves a passage in which Peter contends that the body and soul of the first man were contemporaneous in origin, and were not brought together by combination, as if one had existed before the other, and had come from another place to join it (Mai, *Scr. Vet. Nov. Collectio*, vii. 85, from "Leontii et Johannis Rerum Sacrarum," lib. 2; Routh, *Rel. Sac.* iv. 48). Nearly the whole of this passage is quoted by Justinian, *ad Mennam*, Mansi, ix. 504 (among the documents of the Fifth General Council), and he also quotes a few more lines to the effect, that the theory in question is "derived from Greek philosophy, and is alien to the mind of pious Christians" (Routh, *ib.* 50). Routh gives another extract from the work called *Didascalia*, on the authority of Leontius and John,—a lamentation over past forgetfulness of God's observant scrutiny; "I consented to sin, saying to myself, 'God is pitiful and will bear with me,' and since I was not smitten forthwith I did not stop, but rather despised indulgence and exhausted God's longsuffering" (Routh, 82). He treats as doubtful an alleged extract from a work by Peter on "Blasphemy," to the effect that the writer, when vexed by an impious thought which came into his mind, consulted the brave confessor Paphnutius, already referred to, who told him that when he was imprisoned,

and had suffered "fire and tortures for Christ's sake," the devil suggested blasphemous thoughts to his mind, which he shook off "with God's help," saying, "O evil one, . . . this blasphemy against God is thine, and shall recoil on thyself." The passage, says Routh, is the last of certain scholia, from various authors, written on the margin of the Sermons of Isaac the Syrian, and was copied for him from a "codex bibliothecae Coislinianae" (iv. 79).

[W. B.]

PETRUS (5) II., archbishop of Alexandria, succeeded Athanasius in May 373. In order to promote the peaceful succession of an orthodox bishop, on the removal of the great primate, whom an Arian government had found it inexpedient to disturb, Athanasius had been requested to recommend one who could be elected by anticipation: and he named Peter, whom Gregory Nazianzen describes as honoured for his wisdom and grey hairs (*Orat.* 25. 12) "who had been a companion of his labours" (*Theod.* iv. 20), and, in Basil's phrase, his spiritual "nursling" (*Epist.* 133); and who, in conjunction with another presbyter, when they were passing through Italy to Egypt in 347, had accepted from the notorious Arian intriguers Valens and Ursacius a written attestation of their desire to be at peace with Athanasius, when his cause was for the time triumphant (*Athan. Hist. Ari.* 26). The clergy and magistrates assented to the nomination; the people in general applauded; the neighbouring bishops came together to attend the consecration, in which, according to a "fragment" of Alexandrian history, the dying archbishop took the principal part (cf. *Theod. l. c.*; and *Hist. Aceph.* ap. Athan.). Five days afterwards (May 2) Athanasius died, and Peter took possession of "the evangelical throne." But the Arians seized the opportunity for which they had been waiting, and employed, as in 340, the agency of a pagan prefect. Palladius, by means of bribes, assembled a "crowd of pagans and Jews," and beset that same church of Theonas within which Syrianus had all but seized Athanasius in 356. Peter was commanded to withdraw; he refused, the church doors were forced, and the brutal orgies described in Athanasius's "Encyclical" were repeated: a youth in female dress danced upon the altar; another sat naked on the throne, and delivered a mock sermon in praise of vice (compare Peter ap. *Theod.* iv. 22 with *Greg. Naz. Orat.* l. c.). At this point in the profanation Peter quitted the church; Socrates says that he was seized and imprisoned (iv. 21), but his own narrative points the other way. It proceeds to describe the intrusion of the Arian Lucius, who was now to play the part of Gregory in 340 and of George in 356. He had been ordained priest by George, had presided over the Arians of Alexandria after that usurper's death, had been vainly put forward by them as their bishop elect under Jovian ("qui se moqua de lui et d'eux," Tillemont, vi. 582), had re-entered Alexandria in 367, and been ignominiously thrust out, and now, having been consecrated by Arian hands abroad, was escorted into the city by Euzoïus the Arian bishop of Antioch (who many years before had been condemned with Arius by the Nicene council), and by Magnus, high treasurer under Valens. Peter tells us that the pagans esteemed Lucius

as the favourite of Serapis, because he denied the Divinity of the Son: and dwells on the brave confessorship (1) of nineteen priests and deacons whom Magnus, after vain attempts to make them Arianize, transported to the pagan city of Heliopolis in Phoenicia, sending also into penal servitude twenty-three monks and others who expressed their sympathy; (2) of seven Egyptian bishops who were exiled to Diocæsarea, a city inhabited by Jews, while some other prelates were "handed over to the curia," their official immunity from onerous curial obligations being annulled in requital of their steadfastness in the faith. Damasus of Rome, hearing of this new persecution, sent a deacon with a letter of communion and also of consolation for Peter: the messenger was arrested, treated as a criminal, savagely beaten, and sent to the mines of Phenne. Peter adds that children were tortured, and intimates that some persons were actually put to death, or died of cruel usage, and that, after the old usage in pagan persecutions, their remains were denied burial. The narrative illustrates at once the theology, the ritual, and the electoral customs of the Egyptian church. Peter puts into the mouth of the nineteen confessors an argument, quite Athanasian in tone, from the eternity of the Divine Fatherhood (cf. Athan. *de Decr. Nic.* 12): like Athanasius he there insists that God could never have existed without His "Wisdom" (cf. *Orat. c. Ari.* i. 14): like him he disowns a materialistic conception of the $\gammaέννησις$ (cf. *de Decr. Nic.* 11, *Orat. c. Ari.* i. 21): like him he quotes the Arian formula $\etaν \deltaρε οὐκ \etaν$ ("once the Son was not," cf. *Orat. c. Ari.* i. 5, &c.): and like him, also, he represents the Homousion as summarising the purport of many texts (cf. *de Decr. Nic.* 20).

Evidently Peter had not wasted his opportunities as the trusted companion of his great predecessor. In one passage he refers to the invocation of the Holy Spirit at the eucharistic consecration; in another he intimates that monks used to precede a newly arrived bishop, chanting the Psalms. When describing theuncanonical intrusion of Lucius, he refers to the three elements of a proper episcopal election, as fixed by "the institutions of the Church"—(1) the joint action of the assembled bishops of the province, (2) the vote ($\psiήφοι$) of "genuine" clergy, (3) the request of the people ($αἰτήσσει$, the Latin "suffragium," as Cyprian uses it, *Epist.* 55. 7, speaking of the same threefold process, "de clericorum testimonio, de plebis . . . suffragio, et de sacerdotum . . . collegio;" and for the "requests" of the people, sometimes urgently enforced, see Athan. *Apol. c. Ari.* 6. Basil speaks of such requests as embodied in $\psiηφίσματα$, *Ep.* 99). After the fashion of his age he plays with the name of Lucius as one who "took pains to imitate" a wolf ($\λύκου$); as Gregory calls him "a shepherd of wolves" (*Orat.* 25. 11). It appears that Peter remained for some time in concealment, during which time, following the example of Athanasius, he wrote his encyclical (Tillemont, vi. 582): he afterwards made his way to Rome, where he was received by Damasus, as Julius welcomed Athanasius in 340. He remained at Rome five years, gave information as to Egyptian monasticism (Jerome, *Ep.* 127. 5), and was present, as bishop of Alexandria, at a council held by Damasus, pro-

bably in 377, for the condemnation of the Apollinarians. Timotheus, whom Apollinaris had sent to Rome, and Vitalis, bishop of the sect in Antioch, were included in the sentence pronounced against their master (comp. Soz. vi. 25 with Theod. v. 10); and Facundus of Hermiane, in his "Defence of the Three Articles," quotes part of a letter addressed by Peter to the exiled Egyptian confessors at Diocæsarea. "I ask your advice," he writes, "under the trouble that has befallen me: what ought I to do, when Timotheus gives himself out for a bishop, that in this character he may with more boldness injure others and infringe the laws of the fathers? For he chose to anathematize me, with the bishops Basil of Caesarea, Paulinus, Epiphanius, and Diodorus, and to communicate with Vitalis alone" (*Pro Defens. Trium Capit.* iv. 2). Here we see that Peter naturally treats Paulinus, not Meletius, as the true bishop of Antioch, this being the Alexandrian view. His relations with Basil were very kindly; their common love and reverence for Athanasius had drawn them into a correspondence (Basil, *Epist.* 133, written in 373); and a letter of Basil's in 377 associates this act of intimacy with one or two points of interest in the general church-history of the time (*Epist.* 266). It appears that the Egyptian "confessors" had hastily received into their communion the gravely suspected disciples of Marcellus of Ancyra. This had troubled Basil. Peter had heard of it, but not from Basil; and had remonstrated with his exiled subordinates. Moreover Basil's enemy Dorotheus, visiting Rome in order to enlist Western sympathies in favour of Meletius as against Paulinus, met Peter in company with Damasus. The old bishop of Alexandria fired up at the name of Meletius, and in a fit of irritation said, "He is no better than an Arian." Dorotheus, angered in his turn, said something which offended Peter's dignity; and Peter wrote to Basil, complaining of this, and of his silence in regard to the exiles' conduct. Basil answers in effect: "As to the first point, I did not care to trouble you, and I trust it will come right by our winning over the Marcellians; as to the second, I am sorry that Dorotheus annoyed you, but you who have suffered under Arians ought to feel for Meletius as a fellow-sufferer, and I can assure you that he is quite orthodox."

Peter's exile came to an end in the spring of the next year. The troubles in which Valens had involved himself in regard to the Goths encouraged the prelates whom he had banished to act for themselves. Fortified by a letter of commendation from Damasus, Peter returned to Alexandria: the people forthwith expelled Lucius, who went off to Constantinople: but, as Tillemont remarks, Valens had other business on hand than to dream of restoring *ce misérable* (vi. 610), and Peter was thenceforth undisturbed in his see. Jerome taxes him with being too easy in receiving heretics into communion (*Chronic.*); and in one celebrated affair of another kind, his facility brought him no small discredit. Early in 379 he had not only approved of the mission of Gregory of Nazianzus to act as a Catholic bishop in Constantinople, but had formally authorised it, had "honoured" Gregory "with the symbols of establishment" (*Carm. de Vita sua*, 861), and thereby apparently claimed

some supremacy over Constantinople (Neale, *Hist. Alex.* i. 206). Yet ere long he allowed himself to become the tool of the ambitious Maximus, who pretended to have been a confessor for orthodoxy, and thus perhaps reached Peter's weak side. He aimed at "securing the see of Constantinople; and Peter, contradicting himself in writing," as Gregory words it (*de Vita sua*, 1015), commissioned some Egyptian prelates to go to Constantinople and consecrate Maximus. The scheme failed disgracefully: Maximus had to leave Constantinople, and after attempting in vain to propitiate Theodosius, went back to Alexandria and tried to intimidate Peter, "putting the old man into a difficulty" (Greg. *de Vita sua*, 1018), but was expelled by secular force. Peter reconciled himself to Gregory, who panegyricized him as "a Peter in virtue not less than in name, who was very near heaven, but remained in the flesh so far as to render his final assistance to the truth, &c." (*Orat.* 34. 3). Peter in fact died soon afterwards, February 14, 380. It was in ignorance of this event that Theodosius, a fortnight afterwards, named him with Damasus as a standard of Catholic belief in the famous edict of Thessalonica (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 1. 2: see Gibbon, iii. 363). He was succeeded by his brother Timotheus. [W. B.]

PETRUS (6), surnamed MONGUS (Stam-merer), Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, had been ordained deacon by Dioscorus, and is said to have been his agent in some acts of tyranny, and to have taken part in the outrages against Flavian at the Latrocinium (Mansi, vi. 1017). When the latter was deposed and Proterius consecrated in his place, Peter went into schism with Timotheus Aelurus, refused to return to his duties at the new archbishop's bidding, and was in consequence deposed (Liberatus, *Breviarium*, c. 15; comp. P. Felix in Mansi, vii. 1065; *Brev. Hist. Eutychian.* *ib.* vii. 1062). But when the emperor Marcian's death deprived Proterius of a protector, Timotheus was irregularly consecrated, and Proterius was slain by a Monophysite mob. Timotheus then took possession of the see, and made Peter Mongus his archdeacon; but after three years he was deposed and expelled, and Peter fled at the same time (Midsummer, A.D. 457). Timotheus Salofaciolus, who adhered to the Chalcedonian doctrine, was consecrated, and sat undisturbed until A.D. 476, when the brief reign of Basiliscus brought Timotheus Aelurus back to Alexandria. He died, however, in the next year. The orthodox patriarch Salofaciolus had taken refuge in a monastery near Canopus, and in his absence the Monophysites determined to place Peter in the see. According to Acacius of Constantinople, in his letter to pope Simplicius, "Peter, child of the night as he was, finding darkness convenient for the perpetration of a robbery,—while the corpse of him who had subverted the rules of the fathers (Aelurus) still lay unburied,—sur-reptitiously, at midnight, took possession of the see in the presence of only one bishop" (Mansi, vii. 983). The next pope, Felix, appears to have received different accounts. According to Evagrius (iii. 20) Egyptian bishops informed him that Peter had been "ordained by two bishops only, who shared his unbelief," and so Felix describes him as having been appointed by

heretics (*Epist.* in Mansi, vii. 1039) and "by profane persons" (*ib.* vii. 1108) and "at the hands of condemned heretics" (*ib.* vii. 1104); but again he says that Peter with difficulty procured the instrumentality of one bishop for his usurpation (*ib.* vii. 1066), and in a later writing claims Acacius's testimony for the fact that "no Catholics" had made Peter bishop, "for they had all thought with, and held communion with, Timotheus" (Salofaciolus), "but it was the act of one man, an accomplice in Peter's insanity" (Mansi, vii. 1075). So the Breviculus, "Peter was ordained for the Alexandrians by a single heretic" (*ib.* vii. 1063). On the other hand, Liberatus not only says "the heretics ordained for themselves Peter as bishop," which might mean only that they procured his ordination, but speaks of "those who caused Peter to be enthroned," which, taken literally, would imply the presence of several bishops at the ceremony (*Breviar.* c. 16). The text of Evagrius, "the bishops of Alexandria, by their own authority, elect Peter," is amended by Valesius, in his note, to "those of Alexandria . . . elect Peter as their bishop," on the double ground that suffragans could not be called *οἱ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοποι*, and that Peter was ordained by only one bishop; in the next note he variously describes bishops as having "elected" and as having "ordained" Peter. The emperor Zeno, indignant at the boldness of the Monophysite party (Neale, *Hist. Alex.* ii. 17), "imposed on Peter," according to Evagrius, "the penalty of death;" but if so, he must have quickly commuted it for a lesser penalty, for Liberatus says that Anthemius, the Augustal prefect, in obedience to an imperial order, ejected Peter from the bishopric as an "adulterer," a term also applied to him by Acacius (Liberatus, c. 17), Calandion patriarch of Antioch (Evagr. iii. 16), and Simplicius (Liberatus, c. 18), on the ground that he had violated the rights of Timotheus, then legitimately "espoused" to his church, (cf. Chalc. can. 25). The decree also required his expulsion from Alexandria (Mansi, vii. 983-985). Le Quien (*Or. Christ.* ii. 416) and Neale think that Salofaciolus had interceded for Peter's life; but Liberatus, whom Le Quien quotes, only says that this very gentle prelate, who was "charged with being too lenient towards heretics," wrote to Zeno requesting "that Peter should be sent farther off into exile, because he lay concealed in Alexandria, and plotted against the church" (*Brev.* c. 16). Pope Simplicius wrote in the same sense to Zeno and to Acacius, complaining that Peter was still harboured in hiding-places within certain houses belonging to men like-minded with himself (Mansi, vii. 984, 5). Accordingly, Peter was driven out of Egypt; John, surnamed Talaia, steward of the great church, was chosen patriarch, but neglected to announce his accession to Acacius, and thus gave an opportunity to Mongus's agents to represent to the bishop of Constantinople that John was "not a fit man for the bishopric," in that he had Monophysite leanings, and had accepted the see in violation of an oath, whereas Peter was beloved by the people, and would restore internal unity to the Alexandrian church. Acacius, piqued by John's omission, lent an ear to these representations, and prevailed on Zeno to expel John, and to

restore Peter on condition that he should support an attempt to promote doctrinal unity without enforcing the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and should send letters of communion to the other patriarchs, including Simplicius, who, however, showed a firm front, acknowledging that while John Talaia was under accusation he could not be recognised as bishop of Alexandria, but entirely refusing to recognise in that capacity one who had been all along a comrade and a teacher of those who were fighting against the truth. If Peter were now a convert to that truth, let him by all means be received as such; but it was out of the question that he should be placed in high ecclesiastical office at the request of the very persons who had been associated with him in "separation from Catholic fellowship" (Mansi, vii. 992-4). This protest had no effect on the authorities at Constantinople; Zeno gave orders that Talaia should be expelled from Alexandria, and that Peter Mongus should be "enthroned" after he had accepted a document known in church history by a name it ill deserved, the *Henoticon*, or instrument of unity (A.D. 482). It was addressed to the bishops, clergy, monks, and laymen of the Alexandrian patriarchate, it recognised the Creed of "the 318" at Nicaea as "confirmed by the 150" at Constantinople, the decisions of the council of Ephesus, together with the twelve articles of Cyril; it employed language as to Christ's consubstantiality with man which Cyril had adopted in his "reunion with the Easterns;" it also rejected the opposite theories of a "division" and a "confusion" in the person of Christ, and included Eutyches as well as Nestorius in its anathema. Instead of renewing the explicit censure directed by Basiliscus in a previous circular against the council of Chalcedon, Zeno employed an ambiguous phrase, "We anathematize every one who thinks or ever has thought differently, either at Chalcedon or at any other synod," words which might be explained as pointed at those who were admitted to communion at Chalcedon after disclaiming Nestorianism, while, as their adversaries alleged, they were still Nestorians at heart. At the same time all recognition of that council was omitted (Evagr. iii. 14; Liberatus, c. 18, and note thereon, Galland. *Bibl. Patr.* xii. 149). Peter accepted this formula, and was thereupon enthroned, amid a great concourse, at Alexandria. His instructions were to unite all parties, including the "Proterian" adherents of Timotheus Salofaciolus, on the basis of the *Henoticon*. This, for the time, he effected at a public festival, when as patriarch he preached to the people, and caused the *Henoticon* to be read (Evagr. iii. 13; Liberatus, c. 18). In letters to Acacius and Simplicius, he professed to accept the council of Chalcedon (Liberatus); and by playing the part of a time-server (*κόθροπος*, Evagr. iii. 17) he disgusted the thorough-going Monophysite John bishop of Zagyliis in Libya, the abbat Ammon, who had brought the order for his restoration, and various abbats and monks of Lower Egypt, who raised a tumult in the Caesarean basilica (Liberatus, c. 18). Peter could not afford to quarrel with them, and probably thought himself secure enough to show his hand. (See Valesius on Evagr. iii. 16.) He accordingly anathematized the council

of Chalcedon, and the Tome of pope Leo, substituted the names of Dioscorus and the Monophysite Timotheus for those of Proterius and Timotheus Salofaciolus on his diptychs, and gratified his own vindictiveness by taking up the body of Salofaciolus from its place among the buried patriarchs, and "casting it outside the city" (Liberatus; compare Felix ap. Mansi, vii. 1076). This caused a great excitement; the earnest Catholics in their turn renounced Peter's communion; and tidings of this turn of events disturbed the mind of Acacius, who had already been urged by Simplicius either to obtain from Peter a simple adhesion to the council of Chalcedon, or to withdraw from communion with him. Simplicius's death (March 2, 483) relieved him from the necessity of replying; but he saw what mischief might come of a violent policy, and sent to Alexandria for an authentic account. Peter then surpassed himself in a letter, which Evagrius has preserved. Repeatedly acknowledging the "holy council of Chalcedon," he asserted that the story of his having rejected it was an invention of slanderous monks, meaning evidently some who were "Proterians." As for the disinterment story, he calmly contented himself with remarking that such an act would be displeasing "both to God and to the laws." Acacius was glad to accept these explanations; he could not afford to break with Mongus; but he had now to deal with the clear head and resolute will of Felix II. or III., the successor of Simplicius, who listened readily to the complaints of the exiled Talaia and of other Egyptian bishops (Evagr. iii. 20) against Peter, and against Acacius as in league with Peter, and sent two bishops, Vitalis and Misenus, to Constantinople in order to denounce Peter, and summon Acacius to defend himself before a council at Rome. The legates were partly coaxed and partly frightened into communicating with the resident agents of Peter at Constantinople; and they brought back to Rome letters in which Zeno and Acacius assured Felix that Peter was an orthodox and meritorious prelate (Evagr. iii. 20; Mansi, vii. 1055, 1065, 1081). Their weakness was punished by deposition; and Felix, with his synod, proceeded not only to anathematize Peter as an "Eutychian" usurper, but even to excommunicate the bishop of Constantinople as his patron (July 28, 484). He then wrote again to Zeno, desiring him to "choose between the communion of Peter the apostle and that of Peter the Alexandrian" (Mansi, vii. 1066), and taking much the same tone as in a later document, when, by way of meeting the objection, "the Alexandrian people would not allow Peter to be taken from them," he asked, "What if the Alexandrian people were to demand the restoration of idolatry?" (*ib.* vii. 1078). Tutus, his new messenger, absolutely caused a zealous monk to fasten the pope's letter of excommunication on the pallium of the patriarch of Constantinople, while he was entering his cathedral for the liturgy (Liberat. c. 17). Nothing daunted, Acacius for his part broke off communion with Rome, and upheld Peter to the last, although he must have felt that his conduct was highly embarrassing, for Peter again anathematized the proceedings of Chalcedon and the tome of Leo, and those who would not accept the writings of Dioscorus and Timotheus (Evagr.

iii. 22). He expelled certain orthodox bishops, and took from one, named John, the abbacy or hegumenate of Diolchos, which he transferred to his formidable friend Ammon (Liberatus). These proceedings being reported to Zeno, he sent Cosmas to rebuke Peter and to restore peace. Cosmas could only succeed in reinstating the ejected monks. Another attempt at establishing unity, by means of Arsenius as governor of Egypt, was not more successful; conferences took place at Constantinople, and discussions took place in Zeno's presence, with no result, because he would not commit himself to the council of Chalcedon (Evagr. l. c.). It appears that Peter again modified his tone, and wrote to Acacius, as if acknowledging that synod. This double-dealing, on becoming known in Egypt, provoked some of the Monophysite clerics, monks, and laymen to disown him and to meet for worship apart, omitting his name in their diptychs (Liberatus, 18), and these uncompromising dissentients became known as "Accephali" (Leontius *de Sectis*, v. 2), although they obtained as their bishop one Esaias from Palestine (Liberat.). Renaudot quotes from Severus, the Monophysite bishop and "historian," a sample of Monophysite stories relating to this new schism. Acacius, he says, wrote to Peter Mongus, asking him to receive him into communion, as being, in fact, strongly hostile to the council of Chalcedon and to the "blasphemous" tome of Leo. Peter, in reply, asked if this were indeed so, and Acacius sent him a satisfactory profession of faith. Peter therefore acknowledged Acacius; but two bishops, James of Sa, and Menna of Moniel Tama, came to Alexandria and asked why he had done so. "In order to gain him over to orthodoxy" (Monophysitism); and he showed them Acacius's letter. "But being inflated with pride, they would not accept his excuses, and schismatically separated themselves from the communion of the apostolic throne of St. Mark." Their followers kept up two schismatical bishoprics until a Jacobite patriarch, about 808, brought them back into his communion. The tale, says Renaudot, has just this amount of fact in it, that "very many Monophysites" (Leontius says "some," *de Sectis*, v. 2) did secede from Peter's communion; but it was "in consequence of his acceptance of the Henoticon, et dissimulatam concilii Chalcedonensis damnationem." When Fravitas, or Flavitas, succeeded Acacius in A.D. 489, he opened a correspondence both with Felix (Liberat. 18) and with Peter (Evagr. iii. 23); but after four months he died, and was succeeded by Euphemius, who, on discovering Peter's real position in regard to the council of Chalcedon, indignantly broke off all relations with him (Evagr. iii. 23). A new strife between Constantinople and Alexandria was imminent, when Peter Mongus, respected by none, died at the end of October in 490 (Le Quien, ii. 422), leaving behind him numerous works (Neale, ii. 24).

[W. B.]

PETRUS (7), bishop of the Jacobites of Alexandria. He was chosen after Theodosius (who died in 568) and in opposition to Theodoros, who had been secretly consecrated by Longinus just before himself. The year of these proceedings was 575, a considerable time after the

death of Theodosius, and not immediately after it as is assumed in *L'Art de Verifier* (iii. 476). The *History* of John of Ephesus, discovered not long ago, settles the date. Peter was a simple and ignorant old man, a deacon only, who had been a companion of Theodosius in his exile at Constantinople. In consequence of a false report believed by the party of Peter, that one of the secret consecrators of Theodorus was Paul patriarch of Antioch, the official head of the whole Jacobite sect, Peter was induced to issue a sentence declaring Paul deposed, and the result of that intemperate act was to divide the whole Jacobite world into two bitter factions, the Syrian half of it chiefly siding with Paul, and the Egyptian with Peter. Jacob Baradaeus, after whom the Jacobites were named, and who had great authority among them, strongly disapproved of Peter's conduct, and visited Alexandria with the hope of restoring harmony, but while there he was gained over by Peter's party, and went so far as to join in the condemnation of Paul, A.D. 578. Peter died before his rival Theodore, but in what year is not known. His successor was Damianus (John of Eph. *H. E. tr.* by Dr. R. Payne Smith, pp. 266, 277, 328).

[C. H.]

PETRUS (8), Melchite patriarch of Alexandria when that city was taken by the Arabs, A.D. 640-654. He was opposed by Benjamin, the Monophysite patriarch. Peter was a Monothelite, and in consequence was anathematized by pope Martin in the Lateran council, and in a letter written by that pope to Joannes of Philadelphia, his vicar in the East. In that letter (Mansi, x. 811) Martin calls Peter the pretended bishop of Alexandria. After the capture of Alexandria, Peter fled to Constantinople, leaving the Monophysites henceforth triumphant in Egypt. From this time there was a vicar of the see of Alexandria kept at Constantinople, to represent that see in all official documents. Cf. the signatures to the Acts of the 6th General Council A.D. 680 (Mansi, xi. 334, 687). The Arabs always favoured and protected the Monophysite patriarch and party as being hostile to the Melchites or adherents of Constantinople [MELCHITES]. (Le Quien, ii. 450; Neale, ii. 71.)

[G. T. S.]

PETRUS (9), bishop of Altinum, sent to Rome in A.D. 500, according to Baronius, but in A.D. 503, according to Pagi, by Theoderic, as visitor to arbitrate between the parties of SYMMACHUS and LAURENTIUS, and to inquire into the charges by Ennodius against the former, (*Liv. pro Syn.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxiii. 198) is accused of neglecting Theoderic's orders to visit St. Peter's immediately on his arrival in Rome, and of having been won over by the adherents of Laurentius. Symmachus afterwards assembled a Synod of 115 bishops, by whom Petrus was condemned, as having violated the rights of the Holy See (Anastasius, *Vita Symmachi* in *Patr. Lat.* cxviii. 451). [F. D.]

PETRUS (10), (surnamed FULLO, The FULLER), intruding patriarch of Antioch, 471-488, a Monophysite, took his surname Πέτρος ὁ Γραφεύς or Κναφεύς, "Petrus Fullo," from the trade he at one time exercised as a Fuller of cloth, though whether before he became a monk or

after he had embraced a religious life is uncertain. The accounts of his earlier life are somewhat various, but they admit of being harmonised. According to Acacius of Constantinople, in the *Breviarium* of Liberatus, c. 18 (Labbe, vi. 449), Petrus had been the hegumenos or abbat of a monastery at Constantinople, and having been compelled to abdicate his post on account of certain unspecified charges "hoc propter crimina derelicto," he made his escape to Antioch (Labbe, v. 1082). Theodorus Lector (*H. E.* i. c. 20, pp. 554, 555), followed by Theophanes and Cedrenus, describe him as having been a presbyter of the Church of St. Bassa at Chalcedon. On the other hand, he is described as a monk at the monastery of the Acoimetæ at Constantinople by the Cyprian monk Alexander in the *Laudatio Barnabæ* (c. iii. § 32), found in the *Acta Sanctorum* (Jun. vol. ii. p. 447), and in the *Synodica Vetus* (Labbe, iv. 1009; Fabric. *Bibl. Græc.* vol. xii. p. 396). Tillemont shows considerable skill in harmonising these various statements (*Empereurs*, tom. vi. p. 404). He regards Petrus as having been originally a member of the convent of the Acoimetæ, which he places in Bithynia on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, and having been expelled thence for dissolute life and heretical doctrine, passing over to Constantinople, where he attached himself as a parasite to persons of distinction, by whom he was introduced to Zeno, the future emperor, the son-in-law of Leo, whose favours he was skilful enough to secure, obtaining through his means the chief place in the church of St. Bassa, at Chalcedon. Here his true character having speedily become known, he consulted safety by flight, and attached himself to Zeno, who was then setting out for Antioch, as commander of the East. Having arrived at Antioch, A.D. 463, his unbridled ambition soared to the patriarchal throne, which was then filled by Martyrius, and having gained the ear of the rabble, he adroitly availed himself of the powerful Apollinarian element among the citizens, and the considerable number who favoured Eutychian doctrines, to excite suspicions against Martyrius as a concealed Nestorian, and thus succeeded in causing his tumultuous expulsion and his own election to the freshly vacated throne. This took place in 469 or 470 (Theod. Lect. p. 554; Labbe, iv. 1009, 1082). When established as patriarch Peter at once declared himself openly against the Council of Chalcedon, and added to the Trisagion the words "who wast crucified for us," $\delta \sigma \tau \alpha \upsilon \rho \omega \theta \epsilon \iota \varsigma \delta \iota' \eta \mu \acute{\alpha} \varsigma$, which he imposed as a test word upon all within his patriarchate, anathematizing those who declined to accept it. According to the *Synodicon* he summoned a council at Antioch to give synodical authority to this novel clause (Labbe, iv. 1009). The deposed prelate Martyrius went to Constantinople and laid his complaint before the emperor Leo, by whom, through the influence of the patriarch Gennadius he was courteously received, and a council of bishops having reported in his favour, his restoration was decreed (Theod. Lect. p. 554; Liberat. c. 18, p. 122). But notwithstanding the imperial authority Peter's personal influence, supported by the favour of Zeno, was so great in Antioch that Martyrius's position was rendered intolerable, and wearied out by the violence and contumely to which he was subjected, he soon abdicated his see and quitted

Antioch, leaving his throne to be again occupied by the unscrupulous and heretical intruder. The indignation of Leo was naturally excited by this audacious disregard of his commands, of which he was apprised by Gennadius, and he despatched an imperial decree for the deposition of Peter and his banishment to the Oasis (Labbe, iv. 1082). According to Theodorus Lector, he evaded the execution of this sentence by flight, and Julian was unanimously elected bishop in his room, A.D. 471, holding the see until Peter's third restoration by Basiliscus in 475 (Theophan. p. 99; Theod. Lect. p. 533). During the interval Peter, who found his way to Constantinople, remained there in retirement in the monastery of the Acoimetæ, his residence in the imperial city being connived at on his having given a pledge that he would not create any further disturbance (Labbe, iv. 1009, 1082; Theophan. p. 104). During the short reign of the usurper Basiliscus (Oct. 475–June 477) the fortunes of Peter revived. Under the influence of his wife Basiliscus declared for the Monophysites, recalled Timothy Aelurus, patriarch of Alexandria, from exile, and by his persuasion issued an encyclical letter to the bishops calling on them to anathematize the decrees of Chalcedon (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 4). Peter gladly complied with the emperor's mandate, and was rewarded by his restoration for the third time to the see of Antioch, A.D. 476 (*ibid.* 5). Julianus was deposed, and did not long survive his deposition and disgrace [JULIANUS (29)]. Peter, on his restoration, enforced the addition to the Trisagion, and behaved with great violence to the orthodox party, crushing all opposition by an appeal to the mob, whom he had secured by his unworthy arts, and who confirmed the patriarch's anathemas by plunder and bloodshed. Peter, once established on the patriarchal throne, was not slow to stretch its privileges to the widest extent. He ordained bishops and metropolitans for Syria, among whom was John Codonatus [JOANNES (35)], a deposed presbyter of Constantinople, who had accompanied him on his return to Antioch, whom he appointed bishop of Apamea, metropolis of Syria Secunda. The people of Apamea refused to accept him, and he had to return to Antioch (Labbe, iv. 1042, 1082; Theod. Lect. p. 555; Theophan. p. 110; Liberat. *Brev.* c. 18). The fall of Basiliscus, A.D. 477, naturally involved the ruin of all those who had supported him, and had been promoted by him. Peter was one of the first to fall. His former associate John, the rejected of Apamea, leapt into his place. This however he occupied for only three months, having been deposed and condemned by a synod convened at Antioch (Theophan. *Chronog.* p. 107; Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1042, 1151). He was succeeded by Stephen, who was speedily followed by another of the same name, on whose murder Calandria was appointed bishop, A.D. 482 [CALANDRIO]. John Codonatus, who had been a second time elected to the patriarchate by the Oriental bishops, assembled at Antioch (Vict. Tunun. *sub ann.* 488) was again deposed, satisfaction being made to him by his election to the see of Tyre by Acacius, who found it convenient to forget his previous condemnation of John, and his appeal to pope Simplicius against him. Meanwhile Acacius the patriarch at Constantinople convened a synod A.D. 478, at which Peter and

John were again condemned. Acacius laid the whole story of their persecution and violence before pope Simplicius, and obtained the confirmation of his sentence of condemnation (Labbe, iv. 1082, 1125, 1223; *Liber. Brev.* c. 18). An order was given by Zeno for the banishment of Peter to Pityus. On his way thither he managed to elude the vigilance of his guards, and took refuge in a church dedicated to St. Theodore, whence he seems to have returned to Antioch, where he secretly conducted the machinations of his party against the orthodox prelates (Labbe, iv. 1033; Theophan. p. 107; Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 8). The order of succession in the events of this troubled time is confused, and cannot be recovered with any certainty. There is however no doubt that Calandio was deposed and banished in 485, ostensibly on political grounds, as the favourer of the rebellion of Illus and Leontius, but really through the theological animosity of Acacius [CALANDIO], and that for the last time Peter was replaced on his unstable throne by Zeno on his signing the Henoticon (HENOTICON, p. 895 b.) This last restoration may be placed in A.D. 485 (Theophan. p. 115; Theod. Lect. p. 569; Labbe, iv. 1207; Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 16). Peter at once resumed his career of violence, expelling from their sees orthodox bishops who refused to sign the Henoticon, and performing uncanonical ordinations, especially that of the notorious Xenaias (Philoxenus) to the see of Hierapolis (Theophan. p. 115). He was condemned and anathematized by a synod of forty-two Western bishops held at Rome A.D. 485, and separated from Christian communion (Labbe, iv. 1123-1127). This Western anathema however in no way affected his position at Antioch, of which he retained the patriarchate till his death, which took place three years afterwards, A.D. 488, or according to Theophanes in 490 or 491. One of his latest acts was the revival of the claim of the see of Antioch to the obedience of the island of Cyprus as part of the patriarchate. This question after long debate had been formally settled at the council of Ephesus in 431, and the church of Cyprus had been declared autocephalous. Peter, strong in his recovered favour with the emperor, and relying on his liberal bribes, urged his pretensions with much vehemence, and might have gained his point but for the opportune alleged discovery of the body of St. Barnabas in a grave near Salamis, with the Gospel of St. Matthew written by his own hand on his breast. Anthemius the metropolitan of Salamis, accompanied with his suffragans, conveyed the sacred volume to Constantinople, and laid the whole case before Acacius and Zeno. Peter's claims were annihilated by so indubitable a proof of the apostolic origin of the church of Cyprus, which thus preserved its ancient independence (Vict. Tunun.; Theod. Lect. p. 558). Peter is accredited with several changes in the ritual of the church of Antioch. With the exception of the removal of the words "Christ our King," appended by Calandio to avoid the Theopaschite heresy, to Petrus's own addition to the Trisagion, "who wast crucified for us," these alterations appear generally unexceptionable if not commendable. According to Theodorus Lector he introduced the public benediction of the chrism; the benediction of the baptismal fonts on the evening of the Epiphany instead of as previously at mid-

night; and the recitation of the Nicene creed at every celebration of Holy Communion instead of once a year only. He is also said to have caused the name of the Blessed Virgin to be mentioned in all prayers (Theod. Lect. pp. 563, 566; Theophan. p. 115). There is extant a large collection of letters purporting to be addressed to Peter by various Eastern and Western prelates (Labbe, iv. 1052-1072, 1098-1122). Their genuineness is more than doubtful. The question has been fully discussed by Valesius (M. de Valois) in his notes on Evagrius (pp. 177, 178), and his decision against their authenticity, which is followed by Tillemont (*Mém. Eccl.* xvi. 375) and other modern critics is generally accepted. (Tillemont, *les Empereurs*, tom. vi. pp. 404-407; *Mém. Eccles.* tom. xvi. *passim*; Theod. Lect. pp. 554, ff.; Theophan. *Chronograph.* pp. 104, 107; *Liberat. Breviar.* c. 18; Evagr. *H. E.* lib. iii. 4, 16; Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, vol. ii. append. p. 553.)

[E. V.]

PETRUS (11), 4th Jacobite bishop of Antioch (Le Quien, *Or. C.* ii. 1359), surnamed Callinicus, succeeded on the deposition of Paulus, A.D. 578. He visited Alexandria and fell into controversy with the bishop Damianus upon the doctrine of the Trinity. He died A.D. 591. (Greg. *Bar. Chron.* i. 250 sq. in *Assem. Or. C.* i. 486, ii. 69 sq., 332.)

[J. G.]

PETRUS (12), bishop of Apamea, the metropolis of Syria Secunda, under Anastasius, c. 510, a Monophysite, a warm partisan of Severus the intruding patriarch of Antioch, the leader of the Acephali, and charged with participating in the violent and sanguinary transactions by which the Monophysite creed was sought to be forced on the reluctant Syrian church. Our principal knowledge of Petrus is derived from the various acts of accusation (libelli) against him, presented by the clergy and monks of his diocese to the civil and religious authorities of the district, and the synod and councils of the time. With all the deductions to be made for party rancour, the account is sufficiently scandalous. Peter was accused of having taken forcible possession of his see, in violation of all ecclesiastical order, though he had not received canonical ordination either as a monk or as a presbyter (Labbe, v. 120). What is reported of him as a bishop recalls the charges against Paul of Samosata. He is stated to have had a lofty throne erected, on which he sat ostentatiously, and to have swaggered pompously through the forum with a band of attendants, rudely pushing aside the crowd to make way for him (*ibid.* 124). Definite charges were also made of rapacity, venality, gluttony, a dissolute life, gross irreverence, and violent and abusive language. The first formal complaint against Peter was that made before Count Eutychianus, governor of the province, by the clergy of Apamea, substantiated by their affidavits (Labbe, v. 219, 243). In these he is charged with declaring himself the enemy of the Chalcedonian decrees, and erasing from the diptychs the names of orthodox bishops and fathers of the church, and substituting those of Dioscorus, and Timothy Aelurus and other heresiarchs. Evidence is given of insulting language and overbearing conduct toward his clergy, acts of violence and

grossness, as well as of intercourse with females of loose character, especially a figurante (*περοβόλος*) named Stephana, and a certain actress, Mary of Emesa, whom he is accused of having introduced into the baptistery at the most solemn times, and of having conversed with them alone there for hours together. A second "libellus" was presented by the abbat and monks of the province to their bishops (*ibid.* 244-250), reflecting on Peter's ignorance—for which he deserved to be sent back to an elementary school (p. 245. 13)—and licentious life, and detailing various murderous attacks made on the monasteries of the province and the orthodox inmates, whom he is stated to have replaced with women of infamous character. In conjunction with Severus he was accused with having hired a band of Jewish banditti, who attacked, from an ambush, a body of 350 orthodox pilgrims, slew them all, and left their corpses unburied by the roadside (*ibid.* 119). Clergy were violently dragged from the altar by his emissaries, and ruthlessly butchered if they refused to anathematize the Chalcedonian faith. On the accession of Justin, A.D. 518, the Monophysite Timothy having been succeeded by the orthodox John in the patriarchal chair of Constantinople a few months previously, the bishops of Syria Secunda were emboldened to lay their complaints against Peter, as well as those against Severus, before the council assembled at the imperial city, July 518, inviting the emperor's authority to deliver them from so intolerable a tyranny (*ibid.* 215). Their prayer was granted; and Peter was deposed and sentenced to exile as a Manichee—by which opprobrious name the Monophysites were popularly designated—at the same time with Philoxenus (Xenaias) of Hierapolis (Theophan. p. 142). Nothing seems to be known of Peter between the time of his banishment and his reappearance at Constantinople, in company with his friend and master Severus, on the temporary revival of the fortunes of the Monophysites, through the influence of the Empress Theodora. The interval may not improbably have been passed with Severus at Alexandria. He accompanied Severus, or at any rate, speedily followed him, on his obtaining the emperor's permission to return to Constantinople, where he took a leading part in his schismatical proceedings, "setting up altar against altar and font against font, even in private houses" (*ibid.* 11). In 535, Anthimus of Trapezus, a secret Monophysite, succeeded the orthodox Epiphanius as patriarch of Constantinople, and the triumph of the Acephali seemed secured. The next year, however, pope Agapetus, on his embassy from Theodahad, succeeded in opening the eyes of Justinian to the deception that had been practised on him. Anthimus was deposed, and on the recommendation of Agapetus, Mennas was appointed to the vacant chair. The new patriarch lost no time in summoning a council to pronounce the condemnation of Monophysitism and its chief leaders, A.D. 536. Various acts of accusation against Peter, in conjunction with his first master Severus, were laid before the synod, together with petitions from the monks and clergy of the province, addressed to Justinian and the new patriarch for their condemnation

as avowed heretics (Labbe, v. 100, 106). The sentence of excommunication passed upon them as obstinate depravers of the faith by Anthimus's predecessor Epiphanius, was read (*ibid.* 251). This was confirmed by Mennas and the synod, who cut off from communion Peter and Severus, as men who had "voluntarily chosen the sin unto death," and had "shown no signs of repentance and a better mind" (*ibid.* 253). This sentence received confirmation from Justinian. Peter was forbidden to reside in Constantinople, or its vicinity, or any of the more important cities, and commanded to live in complete retirement, and abstain from association with others, lest he should poison them with his heresy (*ibid.* 267). Nothing more is known of him. Letters, addressed to him by Severus exist, among the Syriac MSS of the British Museum (Wright, *Catal.* p. 559, no. 5, no. 20). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 913; Labbe, *Concil.* vol. v.; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclés.* livre 31, 40, 44; livre 32, 52, 54, 57.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (13), bishop of Arcavica or Ercavica, subscribes the canons of the third council of Toledo in A.D. 589. He had then been some years bishop, and signs before thirty-one bishops. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 254.) Two letters were addressed to him by abbat EUTROPIUS (13), afterwards bishop of Valencia, q.v. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 9; Isidorus, *de Vir. Ill.* 45, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1106.) He subscribes second among the suffragans the canons of the synod of Toledo in A.D. 597. (*Esp. Sag.* vii. 70; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte in Spanien*, ii. 2. 15, 25.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (14), bishop of Barca, in Africa, addressed by Gregory the Great, in January A.D. 593. (*Epp.* iii. 16.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (15), Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded PYRRHUS before the middle of A.D. 655. On his accession he sent, according to custom, a synodical letter to Rome. Its language was exceedingly obscure, and avoided the question of the Single or Double Will and Operation. The clergy and laity refused to allow Pope EUGENIUS to receive it. (*Lib. Pont., Vita Eugenii.*) With the view of reconciling the Monothelites and the orthodox party, he put forward the novel theory of the existence of Three Wills and Operations, namely, of the One that the Monothelites, and of the Two that the orthodox acknowledged, and thus induced the Pope's apocripharii at Constantinople to communicate with him. (*Rel. Mbtionis*, 7; Anastasius, *Ep.*, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xci. 121, 133, 135; Agatho, *Epp.* 1, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 1203, 1205.) [EUGENIUS (1).] His letter to Pope Vitalian on the subject was partly read at the thirteenth session of the council of Constantinople (Mansi, xi. 571), but was condemned, on the ground that the passages cited in it from the fathers in support of his views were falsified, and the reading was discontinued. Petrus presided at the synod which condemned MAXIMUS (23) and his companions to mutilation and exile in A.D. 662. (*Acta Maximi*, in *Patr. Gr.* xci. 170; Mansi, xii. 358.) Petrus died in A.D. 666. (*AA. SS. Aug.* i. 81*; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* i. 231.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (16), bishop of Coriath, in succession to Erasistratus who was a member of the *Latrocinium* in 449. In 450 he joined (Labbe iv. 675) Abundius and the three other legates of pope Leo [LEO (5), p. 658 b]. In 451 he declared for Flavian and subscribed the condemnation of Dioscorus at Chalcedon (Labbe iv. 177, 449), and in 457 he was one of the fifty-eight metropolitans (iv. 891) addressed by the circular of the emperor Leo. (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 161; Tillem. xv. 651, 688, 799). [C. H.]

PETRUS, of Cuenca; *vid.* of Arcavica.

PETRUS (17), bishop of Damascus at the time that Severus was inducted into Flavian's seat at Antioch in the year A.D. 512. He was orthodox, and when Severus was endeavouring to compel the bishops of his province to accept his synodical letters anathematizing all who held the two natures in Christ, he left his see and fled to Palestine, together with Julian of Bostra (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 33; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* tom. ii. col. 834). [E. V.]

PETRUS (18), bishop of Damascus in the middle of the 8th century, a contemporary of John of Damascus. It was in obedience to his directions that John drew up his *Δίβελλος περί ὀρθοῦ φρονήματος*, a profession of orthodox faith to be recited by Elias the Maronite bishop of Jadruba, on his reception into the church by Petrus. These facts are preserved in the title of the work given by Leo Allatius. Another work, written by John at the suggestion of his bishop, is the *Disputatio contra Jacobitas*, address to the Jacobite (Eutychian) bishop of Daraea, with the view of his conversion to the orthodox faith. Theophanes informs us that Peter had his tongue cut out by the orders of Waivalid, and was banished to Arabia Felix, where he continued to celebrate the Eucharist, with a distinct voice, until he sealed his faith by martyrdom (Theophan. p. 349). He is commemorated by the Greeks on the 24th of February (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* tom. ii. c. 836). [E. V.]

PETRUS (19), bishop in the East. [DOMITIANUS (15).]

PETRUS (20), bishop of Edessa, succeeded Cyrus on his death, June 5, A.D. 498. During his episcopate Mesopotamia was ravaged by Cabades (Kawad), king of Persia, in his endeavour to wrest the province from Anastasius. Of the horrors of this terrible time of war, pestilence, and famine, in which Edessa had a full share, being more than once besieged by Cabades, we have a moving account from a contemporary witness in the *Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite*. Peter signalized the entrance on his episcopate by several ritual reforms. He was the first to institute the Feast of Palm Sunday in the church of Edessa, as well as the benediction of water on the eve of the Epiphany, and the consecration of chrism on Maundy Thursday, and he regulated the observance of the other festivals (Jos. Stylit. c. 32). An earthquake having occurred at Edessa A.D. 500, he instituted public processional litanies of the whole population (*ib.* 36). The same year, the city and province suffering grievously from famine, Peter visited Constantinople to petition Anastasius

personally for a remission of taxes. In this he was only partially successful (*ib.* 39). The famine returning A.D. 505, Peter, not disheartened, made a second application to the emperor, who received him with frowns and rebuked him for leaving his distressed flock at such a time. However, feeling the justice of his request, he remitted the taxes for the whole of the province, sending the order by another party, without informing Peter (*ib.* 78). He died on Easter Eve, A.D. 510. (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* tom. i. pp. 268 ff. 279; 406 ff.). [E. V.]

PETRUS (21), one of three Egyptian bishops who accompanied Athanasius in 335 to Constantinople and into the presence of Constantine (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* 87; Tillem. viii. 62, 666). [C. H.]

PETRUS (22), an Egyptian bishop who assisted in the ordination of Timotheus Salota-ciolus to the see of Alexandria (Leo. *Mag. Ep.* 173; Tillem. xv. 823). [C. H.]

PETRUS (23), bishop of Gangra, the metropolis of Paphlagonia. His predecessor Callinicus, after having been ordained at Constantinople by Proclus, died almost immediately after his return to Gangra. On Peter's election in 449, Eusebius, bishop of Ancyra, metropolitan of Galatia, was urged by the people of Gangra to ordain him. He declined to ordain out of his own province, and recommended his being ordained, as his predecessors had been, at Constantinople. They assented, and Peter was ordained by Proclus. These facts came out in the discussion as to the prerogatives of the see of Constantinople, in the last session of the council of Chalcedon (Labbe, iv. 815), Peter himself admitted that he had followed precedent, and had felt no scruple in being ordained at Constantinople (*ib.* 814). Peter had previously been present at the "*Latrocinium*" in 449 (*ib.* 117), and was concerned in the condemnation of Flavian (*ib.* 310). His name appears also at the council of Rome under Symmachus in 503 (*ib.* 1370). [E. V.]

PETRUS, of Gaza; *vid.* of Majuma.

PETRUS (24), possibly the same as number 2; suffrag. 72, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii.; called in later MSS. "martyr"—bishop of Hippo Diarrhythus or Zaritus, in the proconsular province which under Tiberius was a "*Libera Colonia*." *hod.* Binsert (Aug. *De Bapt. c. Don.* lib. vii. c. 36, § 70). [E. W. B.]

PETRUS (25), earliest known bishop of Hippos, on the south-west of the sea of Galilee, present at the council of Seleucia in 359 (Hard. i. 725; Wiltsh. i. 224). In the council of Antioch, 363, he occurs as Πέτρος Σίππων (Soc. iii. 25), where as Valesius believes the reading should be Πίππων. The Latin version (Hard. i. 742) has Petrus Hipponius. (Le Quien, iii. 709; Tillem. viii. 764.) [C. H.]

PETRUS (26), bishop of Hydruntum (Otranto). Gregory the Great, early in A.D. 596, commits to him the care of the three vacant sees of Brundisium, Lippiae, and Gallipoli, directs him to visit them and to cause the clergy and laity of each to choose a fit person not a layman as bishop. (*Ep.* vi. 21, 62.) [F. D.]

PETRUS (27), a bishop in Istria, together with another named Providentius, were in schism on the Three Chapters' question. They had expressed to the notary Castorius their wish to go to Rome to discuss the matter with Gregory the Great, if it was promised that they should receive no illtreatment. Gregory therefore, in August A.D. 595, wrote to send them the desired assurance, and to exhort them to come (*Epp.* v. 51).

PETRUS, of Iturbica; *viâ.* of Arcavica.

PETRUS (28), patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 524-544 (Clinton, *F. R.*; Niceph. *Chron.* p. 410) was born at Eleutheropolis, and succeeded John II. (omitted by Evagrius, *H. E.* iv. 37) in A.D. 524. He manifested the same reverence for the celebrated ascetic St. Sabas, as his predecessors had done, and frequently visited him in his desert home. When his sister Hesychia was dangerously ill, and had been given over by the physicians, Peter sent for St. Sabas, who signed her three times with the cross, on which she began to recover (Cyrill. *Seythop. Vit. S. Sab.* no. 68). On the death of the abbat Theodosius, Jan. 11, A.D. 529, Peter, with other bishops of the province, hastened to the monastery to be present at the funeral of the holy man. During his episcopate took place the sanguinary insurrection of the Samaritans against the Christians, goaded to madness by the persecution of Justinian, offering only the alternative of baptism or rebellion (Gibbon, ch. 48). Many of the Christians lost their all and were reduced to beggary. Peter therefore begged St. Sabas to repair to Constantinople and lay before the emperor Justinian a petition for the remission of the taxes. His mission was successful, and he was received with much joy on his return by Peter and his flock (*ibid.* no. 70-76). Visiting him a short time afterwards in his cell, Peter found the holy man worn out with fatigue and hunger and almost at the last gasp. He tenderly placed the aged ascetic in a litter, and had him carried to his episcopal residence, where he attended upon him personally, until his strength being a little restored, he was, at his own request, conveyed back again to his cell to die, and was buried by Peter with great pomp, A.D. 532 (*ibid.* 78). On the deposition of Anthimus, the Monophysite patriarch of Constantinople, by the single authority of pope Agapetus, then present on state business at the imperial city, and the appointment of Mennas as his successor, early in A.D. 536, Agapetus issued a synodical letter dated Mar. 13 of that year announcing these facts, and with true occidental pride calling on the Eastern church to rejoice that for the first time a patriarch of New Rome had been consecrated by the hands of the bishop of Old Rome, and, together with the errors of Anthimus, stating and denouncing those of Severus, Peter, and Zoaras. On the receipt of this document Peter summoned a synod at Jerusalem and subscribed the condemnation, Sept. 19, 536, Agapetus having died on the 21st of the preceding April (Labbe, v. 47, 275, 283). [ANTHIMUS; AGAPETUS; MENNAS.] The rapid spread of Origenistic opinions in some of the monasteries of Palestine under the influence of Nonnus, as vehemently opposed by the members of other

monastic bodies, gave rise to serious troubles which Peter was unable to allay. The monasteries were mutually denouncing one another, and expelling tainted members from their society. There were frequent quarrels, and affrays sometimes ending in bloodshed. The Origenists were supported by a powerful court party, headed by the abbats Domitian and Theodore Ascidas, who had managed to curry favour with the imperial pedant Justinian, and obtain bishopricks, the one of Ancyra, the other of the Cappadocian Caesarea (Evagr. *H. E.* iv. 38). The dignity and authority of Peter, a decided enemy of Origenistic doctrines, being seriously weakened, he found himself compelled to make concessions which compromised his position. His predecessor in the patriarchal chair, Ephraim, had issued a synodical letter condemnatory of Origen, and the Origenistic party clamoured to have his name removed from the diptychs. Peter was convinced that Justinian had been hoodwinked by the powerful abbats, and was ignorant of the real character of these doctrines. To open his eyes to their danger he conceived the following device. He instructed two of his own abbats, Gelasius and Sophronius, to bring before him a formal complaint, setting forth the heresies of Origen in detail. This document he forwarded to Justinian, with a letter describing the disturbances created by the Origenistic monks, and beseeching him to take measures to quell them. The emperor, flattered by this appeal at once to his ability as a theologian and his authority as a ruler, the petition being supported by a Roman deputation, headed by Pelagius, then at Constantinople on ecclesiastical business, granted the request, and issued a decree condemning the heresies of Origen, and ordering that no one should hereafter be created bishop or abbat without first condemning him and other specified heretics. The emperor's edict was confirmed by a home synod, *σύνδος ἐδημοῦσα*, convened by Mennas, and it was sent for signature to Peter and the other patriarchs. These proceedings took place in the year 541 (*Vit. S. Sab.* no. 84; Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 23; Labbe, v. 635; *Vit. S. Euthym.* p. 365). The object however was thwarted by the chiefs of the party subscribing the edict aimed at them, thus sacrificing truth to self-interest. Theodore maintained his position at court, and threatened Peter that he would cause him to be deposed if he continued to refuse to receive back the Origenistic monks who had been expelled (*Vit. S. Sab.* no. 85). To divert the emperor's attention from the Origenistic controversy, an attack was craftily organised by Theodore Ascidas and his fellows against certain writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia Theodoret and Ibas of Edessa, supposed to savour of Nestorianism. They had little difficulty in persuading the emperor, backed as they were by the powerful influence of the empress Theodora, an avowed favourite of Monophysitism, to issue an edict condemnatory of these writings, for which the three points on which it specially dwells, obtained the name of "edictum de tribus capitulis," *περὶ τριῶν κεφαλαίων*, or "the three chapters" by which the whole controversy became subsequently known. As this edict was published on the sole authority of the emperor, without any synodical authority, great stress

was laid on its acceptance by the bishops. The acquiescence of the four Eastern patriarchs was the most important point. If they agreed to it the other bishops would follow. This, however, was not gained without extreme difficulty. No one of them was disposed to sign a document which seemed to disparage the conclusions of the council of Chalcedon. Mennas was the first to yield [MENNAS]. Peter's signature was obtained after a longer struggle. On the first publication of the edict, he solemnly declared in the presence of a vast crowd of turbulent monks clamouring against its impiety, that whoever signed it would violate the decrees of Chalcedon. But the threats of deposition with which Justinian enforced compliance with his wishes weighed with him against his conscientious convictions, and in common with the other equally reluctant patriarchs he signed the document (Facundus, lib. iv. c. 4). He did not long survive this disgrace, and died, A.D. 544, after a twenty years' episcopate. (Vict. Tunnen. ap. Clinton, *F. R.* ii. 557; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclés.* livre 33; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 264 ff.; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* vol. ii. 189 sq.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (29), bishop of Laodicea about the 7th century, but not given by Le Quien or Gams. He wrote *Commentarium in quatuor Evangelia*, of which Migne (*Pat. Graec.* lxxxvi. 3321 sq., from Mai, *Bibl. Nov.* t. vi. 543) has given a few extracts, but Mai has found the whole commentary at the Vatican. His *Expositio in orationem dominicam* (Migne, 3329 sq. from *Bibl. Patr.* xii. 222) is better known (Binius, *Vet. Patr.* 777-80; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 787-8). [J. G.]

PETRUS (30), of Iberia, ordained bishop of Majuma, in Palaestina Prima, by Theodosius, who had seized on the see of Jerusalem in 452 (Evagr. *H. E.* ii. 5). He was one of the two consecrating prelates who laid hands on Timothy Aelurus (Labbe, iv. 893, 899; Evagr. *H. E.* ii. 8). [E. V.]

PETRUS (31), bishop of Majuma, a contemporary of John of Damascus, who pronounced his eulogy on his death. Peter was on very intimate terms with the leading Arabians, and in his last sickness, feeling himself near his end, made a last effort for the conversion of his friends, which led to his own martyrdom. In his zeal for their souls, deaf to their friendly warnings, he denounced the creed of Islam with such uncompromising vigour, and pronounced such violent anathemas on Mahomet and all who followed his teaching, that it was impossible to overlook his impiety, and he died by the sword of the executioner. He is commemorated by the Greek church on Feb. 21 (Theophan. *Chronogr.* pp. 349, 350). [E. V.]

PETRUS (32), twenty-fifth bishop of Metz, succeeded Villicus, and ruled ten years, c. A.D. 568-78. Bouquet (*Rec. Hist. des Gaul.* iv. 79) gives a letter to him from Gogus, who is supposed to have been the mayor of the palace of king Sigebert. His feast is 27 Sept. (*Gall. Christ.* xiii. 689; *Boll. A.A. SS.* Sept. vii. 351, and Oct. xii. 671; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 333). [J. G.]

PETRUS (33), metropolitan bishop of Myra, one of the fifty-eight to whom the emperor Leo sent the circular letter (Labbe, iv. 937, 940) Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, mentions him (Phot. *Cod.* 231) with the epithet *διδάκταρος*. (Tillem. xv. 799.) [C. H.]

PETRUS (34), claimed to be bishop of a Numidian see, and went to Rome to assert his rights before Gregory the Great, who in A.D. 596 remitted the investigation of the case to the Numidian bishop Columbus (*Epp.* vi. 37). [F. D.]

PETRUS (35), first bishop of Parembole in Palestine (*τῶν παρεμβολῶν τῶν Σαρακηνῶν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ*, i.e. of the military stations of the Saracens in Palestine). According to the biography of St. Euthymius by Cyrillus Scythopolitanus, Peter was originally a Greek in the service of the Persians, with the very un-Greek-like name of Aspebetus, under Izdegird. A persecution of the Christians having been set on foot by the Magian party, Aspebetus was commissioned to occupy the passes to prevent the escape of the fugitives. Out of compassion for the innocent victims of religious intolerance Aspebetus executed his duty remissly, and even assisted the Christians in their flight. This being reported to Izdegird, Aspebetus, in fear for his life, deserted to the Romans with his son Terebo, his relatives and all his property. Anatolius, then prefect of the East, gladly welcomed him, stationed him in Arabia, and put him in command over all the tributary Saracen tribes in those parts. His son, Terebo, still a boy, had suffered from paralysis before his father's flight, and had lost the entire use of one side. After reaching Arabia, the boy was warned in a dream to apply to Euthymius for cure. As narrated in another article [EUTHYMIUS (4)] the application was successful. The boy recovered the use of his side, and the grateful father, with his brother-in-law Maris and all his Saracen followers became believers in Christ and received baptism, Aspebetus taking the name of Peter (Cyrill. Scythop. *Vit. S. Euthym.* c. 18-24; Coteler. *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* ii. pp. 216-222). The new disciple devoted himself to a religious life; and as the number of converts from the Arabians had become so large as to require a bishop of their own, he was recommended by Euthymius to Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, by whom, in defiance of the canonical rights of the old metropolitan chair of Caesarea, the new see was created, and Aspebetus (or Peter) appointed its first bishop (*ibid.* c. 39; Cotel. p. 231). The exact date is uncertain, but Tillemont gives reasons for placing it before 428 (Tillemont. *Mém. Ecclés.* xv. 196). He attended the council of Ephesus in 431. On his way thither he visited Euthymius, who counselled him to follow the guidance of Cyril of Alexandria and Acacius of Melitene in all things at the synod (*ibid.* c. 55, p. 236). At Ephesus he was one of the four bishops deputed to notify the time of the synod to Nestorius, and to invite him to appear and clear himself of the charges against him (Labbe, iii. 454). He was also one of the three sent to apprise John of Antioch on his arrival, of the decisions of the synod (*ibid.* 639). His name appears among those subscribing the de-

position of Nestorius, and the decrees of the council (*ibid.* 541, 692). On his homeward journey he again visited Euthymius, and informed him of all that had taken place at the council (*Vit. Euthym.* c. 55, p. 246). Peter's death must be placed before 451, in which year his second successor John attended the council of Chalcedon, his immediate successor Auxolaus, a Eutylian, having had a very brief episcopate (*ibid.* c. 72, p. 260). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 767; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xiv. 378, 392, 432, 451, xv. 196, 203.) He had successors of the same name in 473 and 536. (Le Quien, iii. 767, 770.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (36) I, bishop of Pavia, was cousin of king LUITPRAND and his father Ansprand, and after the civil war that followed the death of Cunipert was banished to Spoleto by the victorious Aripert II. (c. A.D. 702), and after ten years' exile was recalled by his kinsmen after the defeat and death of Aripert (c. A.D. 712). During his exile, St. Sabinus was said to have appeared to him and predicted his appointment to the see of Pavia, where he built a basilica dedicated to the saint. Paulus Diaconus (*Hist. Lang.* vi. 58) praises him for his chastity and other virtues. According to his epitaph, he was fifty-four at his death, and assuming he was twenty when he was banished, his birth would be c. 680, and his death c. 734. He is said to have been bishop thirteen years, which would place his elevation c. 721. He is commemorated May 7th (*AA. SS.* Mai. ii. 194). [F. D.]

PETRUS (37) II, bishop of Pavia, mentioned in the letter of Pope Hadrian to EGILA, as being a *missus* of Charles. The letter was written between A.D. 781-785 (*Jaffé. Bibl. Rev. Germ.* iv. 244). Cappelletti (xii. 407) is therefore mistaken in placing his episcopate between A.D. 795-800. [F. D.]

PETRUS (38) I, bishop of Ravenna, succeeded Ursus, c. 396, and is said to have died about the beginning of the reign of Valentinian III., c. 425. The order in Agnellus of the bishops of Ravenna in the 5th century is Petrus I., Neon, Exuperantius, Joannes I. (Angeloptes), Petrus II. (Chrysologus), Aurelianus. Now Petrus II. was consecrated between A.D. 432 and 440. Neon was alive in Oct. 458, and from 477 the order is known to have been Joannes, 494 PETRUS III., 519 or 20 Aurelianus. The true order is, therefore, probably :

Petrus I., c. 396-425.	Exuperantius, c. 460-477.
Joannes I., c. 425-432 or 440.	Joannes II., c. 477-494.
Petrus II., 432 or 440-450.	Petrus III., c. 494-519 or 520.
Neon, c. 450-460.	Aurelianus, 520

and the confusion arose from Agnellus identifying Joannes I. and Petrus II., with Joannes II. and Petrus III., whom he omits altogether, attributing their actions to their namesakes. It is possible that Agnellus getting Neon out of the right order, but knowing his predecessor was a Petrus, invented Petrus I., of whom nothing is known *alimunde*. (Agnellus, *Lib. Pont.* in *Mon. Ger. Hist., Script. Rer. Lang.* 289-91.) [F. D.]

PETRUS II., bishop of Ravenna [CHRYSOLOGUS.]

PETRUS (39) III., archbishop of Ravenna, became bishop after June 5, A.D. 494, the date of the death of his predecessor Joannes (*Corpus Insc. Lat.* xi. 304). He was bishop at least as late as the consulship of Eutharic in A.D. 519, when he was unable to check an attack on the Jews at Ravenna (*An. Vales.* 81), but must have died soon afterwards, as his successor Aurelianus died in May A.D. 521. (Agnellus 53, note in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 315.) He took a prominent part in the councils held at Rome between A.D. 500 and 504, to decide the disputes arising from the double election of SYMMACHUS and LAURENTIUS. Like his colleague Laurentius of Milan, though he avoided any intercourse with Symmachus while the case was pending, he did not omit his name when celebrating mass (Ennodius, *Lib. Apol.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 197). He subscribes the acts of the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th Synods convened by Symmachus (Mansi, viii. 252, 268, 299, 314). The exact dates of these Synods are disputed. [LAURENTIUS (10).] He is probably the bishop of that name to whom Avitus writes for information about the disputes between the churches of Rome and Constantinople in A.D. 517 (Avit. *Epp.* 37, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 253), and may be the one charged by one Thomas with wrongfully detaining his share of his deceased father's property (Cassiodorus, *Var.* iii. 37, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxix. 597). The chronology of the bishops of Ravenna in the 5th century is exceedingly perplexed, as Agnellus not only omits this Peter altogether, confounding him with an earlier Peter who probably died in A.D. 425, with St. Peter Chrysologus, and Peter IV. consecrated in A.D. 569 or 570, but makes two Johns into one. [F. D.]

PETRUS (40), bishop of Rhesina or Theodosiopolis, a Monophysite, one of the six bishops who in the year A.D. 533 held a conference with the orthodox party at Constantinople. He was expelled by Justin. Bar Hebraeus mentions his death about the same time as that of Severus of Antioch (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* tom. ii. pp. 89, 327; Asseman. *de Monophysitis*; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* tom. ii. col. 981). [E. V.]

PETRUS (41), bishop of Sebaste, the youngest brother of Basil the Great and Gregory Nyssen. He was the last of the ten children of Basil the elder and Emmelia. His father died almost immediately after his birth, which must be placed before A.D. 349 (Greg. Nyss. *de Vit. S. Macr.* ii. 185). His sister Macrina, more than twenty years older than himself, adopted her infant brother as her own special charge. She took him from his wet-nurse, and kept him constantly by her side, proving herself, in Gregory Nyssen's words, "not only his sister, but his father, mother, tutor, and warder" (*παιδαγωγός*) (*ib.* 186). She was his sole teacher, and a very strict one, leaving the boy little or no time for vain amusements. The religious mind of that age had only one ideal of perfection, the ascetic life. For this Macrina trained her young brother, and with joy she saw her care rewarded. When Macrina and her mother retired to their religious retreat on the banks of the Iris, Peter accompanied them, where, according to his brother, he proved all in all to them, working with them towards the angelical life.

Peter shared in the high physical and mental endowments of the family. His acquirements were very varied, and he had a natural gift for handicrafts, in which, without any direct instruction, he excelled as much as in intellectual pursuits (*ib.* 186). He contributed by his manual labour to the support of his mother and sister and their establishment, as well as of the large crowds who in time of scarcity were drawn thither by their reputation for charity. For some years his brother Basil was his near neighbour on the other side of the Iris, where he had established a monastery for male ascetics, in the presidency of which he was succeeded by Peter, when in A.D. 365 he was finally recalled to Caesarea by the bishop Eusebius. He was ordained presbyter by Basil, c. A.D. 370 (Greg. Nyss. ii. 187). He seems to have been employed by his brother on delicate missions requiring tact and discernment. A letter of Basil's to Eustathius of Sebaste, c. A.D. 371 (*Ep.* 119 [307]), as well as that to the bishops of Pontus, whom he was desirous to bring back to his communion (*Ep.* 203 [77]), were carried by one of the name of Peter, whom he styles his brother; but it is not certain whether the relationship was natural or spiritual. In A.D. 375 Basil revisited his old monastery, and stayed "in his brother's little house" (*οικιδιον*) for repose, in the midst of his arduous episcopal life (*Ep.* 216 [272]; 210 [64]). As recorded in another place [MACRINA (2), the younger], he was present with his sister Macrina at his mother's death-bed, A.D. 373, and was offered by her as her tenth to God (Greg. Nyss. ii. 186). Peter continued to reside in his monastery till after the death of his brother Basil and of his sister Macrina in A.D. 379. Gregory Nyssen records that, on reaching his dying sister's house, he found that Peter had started four days before by another road to meet him. He consequently missed being present at her death and funeral. The following year, A.D. 380, he was ordained bishop, probably of Sebaste, in Lesser Armenia, which had been vacated by the death or deposition of Eustathius. That Peter was bishop of Sebaste is accepted without question by Tillemont, who remarks (*Mém. Eccles.* ix. 574) that "by a remarkable providence the brother of St. Basil was placed on the throne of his most dangerous enemy." Nicephorus, however, a somewhat untrustworthy authority, is the first writer who names his see (*H. E.* xi. 19). Theodoret (*H. E.* v. 8) and Suidas (*sub voc.* Βασίλειος, i. 539) simply style him a bishop, without naming his diocese. He took part in the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381 (Theod. u. s.). Olympias, the deaconess, the friend of Chrysostom, entrusted large funds to him for distribution to the poor (Pallad. p. 166). His death is placed by Tillemont between A.D. 391 and 394. His brother Gregory survived him, and took part in the first commemoration of his death at Sebaste (Greg. Nyss. *ad Flav.* iii. 645). He is commemorated in the Roman calendar on the 9th of January. The genius of Peter seems to have been rather practical than literary. Rufinus, instituting a comparison between the three brothers, says that the two younger combined equalled Basil; Gregory in word and doctrine, and Peter in the works of faith (*Rufin.* ii. 9). Theodoret remarks that, though Peter had not received

such a training in classical literature as his brothers, τῆς θύραθεν παιδείας οὐ μεταληχὼς οὖν ἐκέλευσεν, he was equally conspicuous with them in the splendour of his life (*H. E.* iv. 30). But though undistinguished in theological literature himself, we are indebted to him for several of his brother Gregory's most important works, which were undertaken at his instigation. It was at his request that, as we learn from the proems, the two treatises supplementary to his brother Basil's "*Ἑξαήμερον*," the "*Explicatio Apologetica*," and the "*De hominis officio*" were undertaken (Greg. Nyss. *Opp.* i. 1, 44). The latter treatise was sent to Peter as an Easter gift. Gregory's great doctrinal work against Eunomius was also due to his brother's entreaties that he would employ his theological knowledge for the refutation of that heretic, and at the same time to disprove the charges brought by him against their brother Basil (*ib.* ii. 265, 266). Gregory's original intention was to limit his refutation to the first of Eunomius's two books. But Peter wrote a letter to him, the only literary production of his that is preserved to us (*ib.* 268), entreating him with the zeal of a Phinehas to strike through both the heretical books with the same spiritual sword, which he knew so well how to wield. The language and style of this letter show that Peter was in no way the intellectual inferior of the more celebrated members of his family (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* ix. 572-580).

[E. V.]

PETRUS (42), bishop of Terracina, reproved by Gregory the Great for his conduct to the Jews. He died in A.D. 592. (Gregorii *Epist.* lib. i. ind. ix. 35; lib. iii. ind. xi. 13, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 489, 614.) [F. D.]

PETRUS, of Theodosiopolis; *vid.* of Rhesina.

PETRUS (43), bishop of Tricala, was charged with the care of the see of Agrigintum during its vacancy by Gregory the Great, who directed that he should receive the bishop's fourth of its revenues in A.D. 594. In 601 Gregory the Great directed that he should be paid forty solidi out of the revenues of the monastery of Lucusia (*Epp.* v. 12, xi. 49.) [F. D.]

Presbyters.

PETRUS (44), a priest of Cabarbaricha, one of the originators of the Archontic heresy, c. 360 (*Epiph. Haer.* 20 vel 40, cap. 1; Tillem. ii. 296, 322, ix. 653, x. 490, 491.) [ARCHONTIC.] [C. H.]

PETRUS (45), archpresbyter of Alexandria, expelled by the patriarch THEOPHILUS. [SIDORUS (28).] [E. V.]

PETRUS (46), a priest of Ptolemais in the Libyan Pentapolis, addressed by his bishop Synesius (*Ep.* 13; Tillem. xii. 549, 688.) [C. H.]

PETRUS (47), a Spanish priest, at whose house Vincentius Victor saw a work by St. Augustine on the origin and derivation of the soul, a subject in which he took much interest, and which is mentioned in more than one of his letters, but especially in one to St. Jerome, A.D. 415 (*Ep.* 166, see also 143, 159, 162).

Vincentius took upon himself to reply to this work, and asserted that it was at the suggestion of Peter that he had done so. To this Augustine replied in the work *de anima et ejus origine*, in four books, of which the second is addressed to Peter, and in which he speaks of the book of Vincentius as verbose and superficial, warns him against accepting all its statements, and exhorts him to persuade him to correct them. The work of Augustine was probably written in 419 or 420. (Aug. *Retract.* ii. 45, 56; *De anima*, &c. ii. 1; Cellier, vol. ix. p. 466.) [RENATUS, VINCENTIUS.] [H. W. P.]

PETRUS (48), priest of Alexandria and primicerius of the notaries, promoter of the suit against Nestorius at the council of Ephesus A.D. 431 (Labbe, iii. 451, 530, 613, 624, 671, 673); Tillem. xiv. 379, 396, 399, 429, 430, 442. [J. G.]

PETRUS (49), a priest at Rome who, in the time of pope Coelestine I., founded the church of St. Sabina in the Aventine, according to an ancient inscription on the church cited in Baronius (Baron. *Ann.* 432, xxxvii.; Tillem. ii. 251, xiv. 157). [C. H.]

PETRUS (50), one of the priests and archimandrites of Constantinople addressed with MAGNUS (5). [C. H.]

PETRUS (51). A presbyter well skilled in medicine, a friend of Theodoret. (Theod. *Epp.* 114, 115.) [E. V.]

PETRUS (52), priest, sent by Flavian from the council at Constantinople, A.D. 448, to enquire in the city about Eutyches having sent to the monasteries there a treatise for signature regarding the faith [FAUSTUS (28)]. He and the deacon Patricius were sent at the third session, and reported at the fifth that the tome had been delivered, but was not signed (*Conc. Chalced.* act. i. ap. Binium, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 81, 85). [J. G.]

PETRUS (53), a priest of Edessa of the 5th century. From Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* cap. lxxiv. in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1102) we learn that he wrote treatises on various subjects, and composed psalms in Syrian metre in imitation of St. Ephraem (Trithemius, *de Script. Eccl.* c. 167; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 442; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* tom. ii. col. 926). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (54), archdeacon, author of sixty-nine questions with answers explaining difficulties in the prophet Daniel. The work was first published by order of Charlemagne, and is given in *Pat. Lat.* xvi. 1347. Some have thought that this Peter is the same as the questioner in Gregory's *Dialogues*, but there is no clear evidence to connect the two. [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (55), a deacon of Langres, elder brother of Gregory of Tours the historian, who relates his miraculous cure through the intercession of St. Julian, and his eventual murder in 577 (*Mirac. S. Jul.* ii. 24, *Hist. Franc.* v. 5). [S. A. B.]

PETRUS (56), deacon and one of the Scythian monks addressed by Fulgentius of Ruspe [FULGENTIUS (3)]. [C. H.]

PETRUS (57), a deacon, or according to some MSS an archdeacon. He was an intimate friend of Gregory the Great, and had been his companion in studying the Scriptures. From the first book of the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great (*Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. 149), we learn that it was Petrus who induced his friend to write the book, and the dialogue is represented as being carried on all through with him. [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (58), subdeacon of Rome. From the first letter of the first book of the epistles of Gregory the Great we learn that he was appointed Gregory's vicar in Sicily. Many letters are found in the first, second, and third books of epistles giving him instructions on various matters. In the thirty-second letter of the second book Gregory recalls him to Rome with many expressions of affection. The letters of the third book point to his having been employed in Campania in the same capacity as in Sicily (cf. *Epp.* 1, 5, 19). We find passages of reproof and exhortation to more vigorous work, as well as of commendation, in several letters (cf. lib. i. 56, ii. 32). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (59), deacon of Naples, was a candidate for the bishopric on the death of FORTUNATUS (21) in A.D. 600. Gregory the Great had heard that he was a moneylender, and directed that the fact should be inquired into, declaring that he was ineligible, if it was true. Paschasius was ultimately chosen (*Epp.* x. 62). He was perhaps the same as the deacon of the same name, who had taken the side of PAULUS, bishop of Nepi, during a previous vacancy (*Epp.* ii. 15). [F. D.]

PETRUS (60), reader in Alexandria, ring-leader of the mob in murdering HYPATIA (1) A.D. 415 (Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* vii. c. 15; Fleury, *E. H.* xxiii. 25). [J. G.]

PETRUS (61), an acolyte of the Roman church, who had fled from his post to the church of Jerusalem. Gregory the Great (lib. viii. ep. 6) writes instructions to Amos, bishop of Jerusalem, concerning him. [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (62), cleric of Naples, had been accused of immorality. The bishop, without trying the case, had suspended him from accompanying him. Petrus appealed to Gregory the Great, who blamed the bishop's action, and directed him and the subdeacon Anthemius to hold a strict inquiry (*Epp.* x. 40, 41). [F. D.]

PETRUS (63), a Galatian anchorite, who lived near Antioch with an Egyptian of the same name (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 28). [G. T. S.]

Monks.

PETRUS (64), a solitary commemorated by Theodoret in his *Religiosa Historia*. He was by birth a Galatian, embraced a monastic life when seven years old, and lived to the age of ninety-nine. After visiting the holy places at Jerusalem and Palestine, he fixed his habitation at Antioch, making his home in an empty tomb. Here he supported life on bread and water, keeping a strict fast every other day. He had for his companion and attendant a man named Daniel, whom he had delivered from an evil spirit.

Theodoret relates that his mother, when a beautiful young woman of twenty-three, being unable to obtain any relief from a malady in her eye from any oculist, was induced by one of her female servants to apply to Peter. Going to him dressed richly in accordance with her station, and resplendent with gold ornaments and gems, the solitary upbraided her for presuming to attempt to improve on the handiwork of her Maker, and by his earnest words having cured her of the malady of vanity and the love of dress, he signed her eye with the cross, and she was speedily healed. Other members of her household were cured by him in a similar manner. When, seven years after the cure of her eye, she became the mother of Theodoret, and was given over by the physicians, Peter having been summoned, prayed over her with her attendants, and she speedily revived. As he grew older she was accustomed to bring her child once every week to receive the old man's blessing. Peter would take the little boy on his knees and feed him with raisins and bread. But, great as was his love for him, he very discreetly refused to allow him to become a sharer of his cell and a helper of Daniel in his attendance upon him. Peter made the young Theodoret a present of half his linen girdle, which was believed to have the miraculous property of relieving pain and curing sickness. For this purpose the amulet was frequently lent, and at last, being kept by one of its borrowers, the family was deprived of the precious gift. (Theod. *Hist. Rel.* c. ix.; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xv. 209-213.)

[E. V.]

PETRUS (65), the head of a monastery near Antioch early in the fifth century. He was a brother of Alexander, the founder of the *Acemetae* at Constantinople, in whose *Vita* (cap. vi. § 37 in Boll. *Acta SS.* 15 Jan. ii. 308, new ed.) is related a visit he paid to Peter's monastery (Tillem. xii. 492, 494).

[C. H.]

PETRUS (66), monk addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. ep. 15).

[J. G.]

PETRUS (67), an orthodox archimandrite of Constantinople, addressed by Leo the Great (see under **EMMANUEL**, Manuel). (Leonis *Epp.* li. lxxi.)

[C. G.]

PETRUS (68), abbat in the African province called Tripolitana, and author of a commentary or catena on the Pauline Epistles selected out of the writings of S. Augustine. Cassiodorus (*Inst.* c. 8) commends it to the monks (cf. Migne, *P. L.* t. lxx., col. 1120).

[G. T. S.]

PETRUS (69), an African abbat who refused at the council of Carthage, in 525, to recognise the jurisdiction of Liberatus, primate of the Byzacene province, pleading a decision of a council of Arles held in 455, which recognised the spiritual independence of monasteries. This is one of the earliest instances of the claim for freedom from episcopal supervision afterwards successfully made by the monastic orders (Mansi, *Concil.* t. viii. 648-656; Hefele's *Councils*, 238).

[G. T. S.]

PETRUS (70), abbat of SS. Andrew and Lucy at the date of Gregory the Great's Dia-

logues, had his tomb constructed by that of a monk named Merulus who had died 14 years before, from which he declared a wonderful fragrance issued (*Dial.* iv. 47).

[F. D.]

PETRUS (71), monk of Iberia, who, according to Gregory the Great, was restored to life after beholding the torments and flames of hell (*Dial.* iv. 36).

[F. D.]

PETRUS (72), the first abbat of the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul, commonly called St. Augustine's, Canterbury. He was probably one of the monks who accompanied Augustine on his first journey, and therefore may be supposed to have been a monk of the monastery of St. Andrew at Rome. He is first mentioned by Bede (*H. E.* i. 25) as joined with Laurentius in the mission which Augustine after his consecration sent to Rome to announce that the Gospel had been accepted by the English, and that he had been made bishop, as well as to put before the pope the questions which drew forth the famous "Responiones Sancti Gregorii." He must have returned some time before the death of Augustine, and been either appointed by him and Ethelbert, or designated as the future head of the monastery, which at his request Ethelbert was building outside the walls of Canterbury. The building was not finished when Augustine died, but Laurentius, his successor, consecrated the new church, and Peter became the first abbat. The Canterbury tradition, as presented by Elmham, was that Peter stayed three years at Rome, and that he survived the archbishop one year, seven months, and three weeks. Nothing certain however can be stated about him beyond what we learn from Bede, namely, that he was sent as envoy to Gaul and was lost at sea off Ambleteuse, a few miles north of Boulogne. His body was cast ashore and buried by the natives in an obscure place, but a heavenly light, appearing over the grave, revealed the anctity of the abbat's body; and on inquiry made for the purpose of identifying him, his remains were translated to Boulogne. The Count Fumertius is said by modern authority to have directed the removal, and to have deposited the body in the church of St. Mary, where it may still rest under the guardianship of the canons of Boulogne (Gotselinus, *ut infra*). An epitaph is given by Elmham. The Canterbury monks kept the obit of Peter on the 30th of December, on which day he is commemorated in the Benedictine martyrology. In the English martyrology and by Ferrarius the 6th of January is assigned to him, possibly as the day of the translation (Smith's note on Bede *H. E.* i. 33). The year of his death is uncertain. If the Canterbury computation be accepted, and on such a point it is not necessary to regard it as baseless, Peter must have perished in the winter of 606, or of 607 at the latest. Abbat John, his successor, was believed to be in office in 610, when the bull of Boniface IV. to Ethelbert was concocted (*Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 67); but nothing definite can be inferred from this.

Eadmer, the Canterbury hagiographer, wrote a life of Abbat Peter, which is still in MS., but which was no doubt in the hands of Thorn and Elmham, who have really put nothing on record that is not found in Bede, except the computa-

tion above referred to. There is a notice of him in Mabillon's *Acta SS. O.S.B.* saec. i. p. 1. page 1, and the Bollandist acts, January, tom. i. pp. 335, 336. Peter's name appears in the charter of Ethelbert to the monastery and in the Privilege of St. Augustine, both documents unfortunately and hopelessly spurious (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 4, 5; *Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 57, 59).

See Gotselinus *de Translatione Sti. Augustini*, ap. Mab. *Acta SS. O.S.B.* tom. ix. p. 760; Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 92-126; Thorn cc. 1761, 1766; Hardy, *Catalogue of Materials, &c.*, i. 206, 207; *Monasticon Angl.* i. 120. [S.]

PETRUS (73), a confessor in Egypt in the Decian persecution [PAULUS (100)]. (Euseb. vi. 40, vii. 11; Tillem. iv. 247, 248.) [R. J. K.]

PETRUS (74), May 15. Martyr at Lampsacus, in the Decian persecution with Paul, Andrew, and Dionysia. They suffered under a proconsul Optimus. Their acts have all the marks of authenticity, and are often quoted by Le Blant to illustrate his argument in *Les Actes des Martyrs*, Paris, 1882, e.g. cf. pp. 159, 166. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 147; Ceill. ii. 118.) [G. T. S.]

PETRUS (75), a eunuch in the household of Diocletian, and one of the earliest victims of the persecution (Euseb. viii. 6; Tillem. v. 280, 281, 655). Tillemont reckons the date as Mar. 12, 303. [C. H.]

PETRUS (76), an ascetic, surnamed Abselamus. Jan. 11, martyr at Caesarea, A.D. 309. He suffered with Asclepius, a Marcionite bishop on the third day before the Ides of January. He belonged to the neighbourhood of Samaria. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* cap. x.; Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 344.) By some he has been confused with PETRUS BALSAMUS, cf. Ruinart, *l.c.* p. 556. [G. T. S.]

PETRUS (77) BALSAMUS, Jan. 3, is by some identified with Petrus Abselamus. Like him Balsamus belonged to the neighbourhood of Samaria. He suffered in Palestine by crucifixion, probably about A.D. 311, under the president Severus. His Acts were translated out of Greek into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius. They have all the marks of antiquity, and are often quoted by Le Blant in his *Actes des Martyrs* to illustrate ancient legal customs. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 556.) [G. T. S.]

PETRUS (78), a notary addressed by Gregory the Great (lib. ii. *Epp.* 1, v. 9, in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. 539, 751). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (79), vir illustris, to whom pope Martin addressed his tenth epistle (*Pat. Lat.* lxxxvii. 174). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (80), vir illustris to whom St. Maximus of Chrysopolis addressed two letters (*Patrol. Graec.* xci. 509, 534). [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (81), an advocate to whom Theodoret wrote, thanking him for the assistance he had rendered to the inhabitants of Cyrrhus (*Theod. Ep.* 46). [E. V.]

PETRUS (82), secretary to the emperor Majorian, and addressed in a highly laudatory ode by Sidonius Apollinaris, about A.D. 458 (*Sidon. Apoll. Carm.* no. 3; ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 638; Tillemont, *Hist. Emp.* vi. 131, 132; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 396). [J. G.]

PETRUS (83), notary of the Roman church Pope Leo II. sent him into Spain to get the signatures of the Spanish bishops to the decrees of the 6th council. (*Letter of Leo II.* in Mansi, xi. 1058.) Benedict II. addressed a letter to him, urging him to execute his commission at once. (Mansi, xi. 1085.) [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (84), a layman who lived about the end of the 3rd century. Peter being on his way to Jerusalem, and fearing Eastern heretics, begged Fulgentius of Ruspa to give him a rule of faith. This was given to him in a treatise consisting of forty articles, *De fide, seu de regula verae fidei.* (*Pat. Lat.* lxxv. 671.) [G. W. D.]

PETRUS (85), one of the coloni on the church estate of Vitelae, made defensor by Gregory the Great, who forbade that his sons should quit that estate, on which they were *adscripti glebae*, or marry any one who did not belong to it (*Epp.* xii. 25). [F. D.]

PETRUS (86), a youth, on whose behalf and in that of his brother Phocas, Gregory Nazianzen addressed a poem to their father Vitalian in 375, supplicating kinder treatment for them (*Greg. Naz. lib. ii. sec. 2, carm. 3, cf. vers. 79* in *Pat. Gr.* xxxvii. 1480, 1486; Tillem. ix. 380). [C. H.]

PETRUS (87), major-domo of Gregory the Great's monastery, died four years before he wrote his *Dialogues*, in which he relates (iv. 36) how a soldier in a vision saw Petrus in the world of the departed, suffering torments, because when ordered to inflict punishment he did so not from obedience, but from the cruelty of his disposition. [F. D.]

PETRUS (88), mentioned in a letter of Gregory the Great to JANUARIUS (25) (*Epp.* iv. 9). [F. D.]

PETRUS (89), a Sicilian noble or official of high rank, to whom Gregory the Great commended ROMANUS on his appointment in A.D. 599 (*Epp.* ix. 2). [F. D.]

PETRUS (90), vir clarissimus, vicedominus or manager of the property of the great lady RUSTICIANA, complained to Gregory the Great that men belonging to the church of Syracuse had forcibly entered upon her estate in Sicily, and that he could get no redress from the bishop (*Epp.* xi. 43). [F. D.]

PETRUS (91), conductor on property of the Roman Church in Sicily. (*Epp.* i. 44, xiv. 5.) A conductor was a middleman between the owner and the actual occupier. [F. D.]

PETRUS (92), son of LUCILLUS (3), had appropriated much of the property of the church of Malta. Gregory the Great ordered that he should be compelled to restore it (*Epp.* x. 1). [F. D.]

PETRUS (93), a converted Jew of Cagliari, was baptized on Easter-eve A.D. 598, and the next day took possession of the synagogue there against the bishop's prohibition, and erected a cross and an image of the Virgin in it. Gregory the Great ordered the cross and image to be reverently removed, and the synagogue to be restored to the Jews (*Epp.* ix. 6). [F. D.]

PETWIN. [PECTWINE.]

PEUCETIUS (Πευκέτιος: Valesius takes the name to be the Greek form of PICENTIUS), chief favourite of the emperor Maximin Daza, and through his favour three times consul, was put to death on the change of Government following the death of his master (Euseb. *H. E.* ix. 11). [G. S.]

PHACIDAS, bishop of Edessa, ruled ten years and abdicated in A.D. 409 (Assemanus, *Bibl. Orient.* i. 400, 424; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 958). [J. G.]

PHAEDIMUS, bishop of Amasea in Pontus. According to the singular and not very probable story told by Gregory Nyssen, it had been revealed to Phaedimus, who had the gift of prophecy, on the return of the young Theodore, better known as Gregory Thaumaturgus, to his native city, that he was destined to be its bishop. He, therefore, sought an opportunity of laying his hands upon him and ordaining him surreptitiously. Having been baffled in this, he is said to have resorted to the strange expedient of ordaining him by prayer alone, without imposition of hands, when he was three days journey away, an ordination which Gregory is stated to have considered binding. (Greg. Nyss. *Vita Greg. Thaum.* in *Pat. Gr.* xlv. 909; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecl.* iv. 326.) [E. V.]

PHAGANUS, *Mon. Angl.* i. 1. [FAGANUS.]

PHANTASIASTAE. [JULIANUS (47) Vol. III., p. 474^a.]

PHARETRIUS, bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea at the time of the deposition and banishment of Chrysostom, A.D. 404. He was evidently a timid man of no force of character or steady principle, anxious to side with the stronger party, and secure his personal safety. His behaviour to Chrysostom was ungenerous in the extreme when, on his way to his place of exile, his exhausted strength required him to make a few days' halt at Caesarea. [CHRYSOSTOM, Vol. I. p. 530]. Chrysostom, writing afterwards to his lay friend Paeanius, acknowledges that Pharetrius's conduct towards him was such as admitted of no excuse. At the same time, lest there should be a breach between the clergy of Caesarea, who had manifested the warmest affection for him, and their bishop, he begs Paeanius to inform Pharetrius that he has heard of his having expressed sorrow for what had occurred. (*Ep.* 204.) [E. V.]

PHARHÂD, otherwise Aphraates, Jacob, and Sapiens Persa. The author thus variously denominated has been generally confounded with Jacob of Nisibis, to whom his works have been attributed [JACOBUS (4)]. It was only in our

own time that the distinction between them has been discovered. The discovery is due to the late Canon Cureton, who found the homilies of Aphraates among the Nitrian MSS. of the British Museum, and intended their publication to be the crowning labour of his life. Death overtook him before he carried out his intention, which, however, Mr. W. Wright fulfilled in 1869 by publishing the Syriac original, promising to add an English translation, which, however, has not yet appeared. Since the publication of this work, Aphraates has attracted much attention among scholars, because he must be regarded as the oldest father and writer of the Syrian church. The time of his birth is not exactly known, but it must have been towards the conclusion of the 3rd century, as we find him a writer in high repute about the year 355. He seems to have been born on the borders of Persia, if not within that empire, as he dates several of his homilies by the years of the reign of Sapor II., as well as by the era of the Greeks commonly used in Syria. The details of his life are almost unknown. From his writings we can deduce that he was a monk, and probably a bishop of the monastery of St. Mattheu, near Mosul, which continued from the earliest times down to 1820 to be the seat of the metropolitan of Nineveh (Asseman. *De Syris Monophys. Dissert.* Romae, 1730, p. 100; Rich, *Residence in Koordistan*, t. ii. p. 74). Some have thought that he was a disciple of Ephraem Syrus, which, however, is not possible, as Ephraem must have been by many years his junior, not having been born till after the year 306. Pharihâd flourished, according to the date furnished by himself in dissertation *de Acino*, till the year 345 at least. He seems to have been present at the council of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, held A.D. 344, where he was selected to draw up the encyclical letter of the council. Concerning the remainder of his life we know nothing, as he must be clearly distinguished from an Aphraates mentioned as one of the ancient martyrs in Wright's *Syriac Martyrology*, where the words "ancient martyrs" indicate those who suffered prior to the time of Simeon Bar-Sabba'e, ninth bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, who himself suffered while our Aphraates (Pharihâd) was composing his later homilies. Another Aphraates is mentioned by Theodoret (*H. E.* iv. 22) and in the *Hist. Reliq.* where his life and famous interview with the Arian emperor Valens, A.D. 373-377, are described at some length.

The writings of Aphraates are important from several points of view. (a) From the point of view of Biblical criticism. Wright regards his quotations of Holy Scripture as so important that he collects them in a separate index. He thinks Aphraates quotes the Peshito, but usually from memory. Others again have maintained that our author used Tatian's Diatessaron alone for his gospel quotations, and never used the Canonical Gospels. (Hilgenfeld's *Zeitsch. für wissenschaft. Theolog.* 1882-83, p. 115; Zahn's *Forschungen zur Gesch. des Neutestam. Kanons*, Th. i. p. 84.)

(b) From a historical point of view. His *Dissertatio vi. de Monachis*, throws light on the organisation and abuses of monasticism in his time. The monks of Mar Mattai in Eastern Syria lived, as Rich describes them sixty years

ago, in separate cells or houses of their own. The anchorite not the coenobite life was the usual type of monasticism in his time, else Pharhád would not have been obliged to rebuke the monks for wishing nuns to live with them in the same cells, "justum, decens atque decorum est unum quemque etiamsi afflictione prematur, solitarium manere." If they wish for female society, he very wisely advises them to get married. St. Cyprian, a century earlier, had to rebuke the same abuse (*Epist.* iv.). Again they witness to the religious state of eastern Syria in the middle of the 4th century. The controversy with the Jews is still the all-important one. Thus while Hom. i.-x. deal with topics like charity, prayer, and fasting, Hom. xi.-xxii. are almost wholly taken up with the Jewish controversy. The Jews had in the 3rd century established flourishing schools at Edessa, Nisibis, and other cities in that neighbourhood, where they cultivated the Christian controversy with great diligence. Aphraates himself engaged in personal controversy, as he tells us in Hom. xxi. *de Persecutione* that it was an argument with a Jew which led to its composition. Among heretical sects he mentions the activity of Valentinians, Manichaeans, and Marcionites, but never once alludes to Arius or Arianism. Upon two points his opinions were remarkable. He maintains that the world would come to an end 500 years after the incarnation, and that the human soul sleeps between death and the resurrection. His Christological statements, too, sometimes are ambiguous or deficient from the standpoint of Nicene orthodoxy.

The literary history of his works has been a curious and a chequered one. He was very celebrated in his own time and country. His works were highly valued in succeeding centuries, and frequently republished. Thus one of the British Museum MSS. of his work is the fourth earliest-dated MS. in existence, bearing the date equivalent to December A.D. 474. George, bishop of the Arabs [GEORGIUS (25)] in the 8th century, discusses the doctrines of Pharhád in a letter to a presbyter, Joshua. This letter is translated in Couper's *Syriac Miscellanies*, p. 61. The Homilies of Pharhád were translated into Armenian about the 5th century, probably by the disciples of Mesrobes [MESROBES]. Through this version alone his works were known to the West till the discovery of the Nitrian MSS. For a copious list of references about him the reader should consult Wright's preface, or an exhaustive memoir by Jacobus Forget, *De Vita et Scriptis Aphraetis*, Lovanii, 1882. The homilies of Aphraates are disposed, according to a common custom of that age and country, after the order of the Syriac alphabet. [G. T. S.]

PHARNERSES (PHARHNERSECH, PHARNESEC), Catholicus of Armenia, about the middle of the 4th century. Saint Martin in his *Mém. sur l'Arménie*, i. 437, fixes this date A.D. 336-340. This seems too early, according to the narrative of Moses Choren. (*Hist.* iii. 16.) He tells us that Pharneses was chosen as head of the Armenian church on account of the failure of the family of Gregory the Illuminator [ARMENIANS, t. i. p. 164]. [G. T. S.]

PHEBADIUS. [FOEGADIUS.]

PHELIM, bishop of Armagh. [FEDLIMIDH (3).]

PHERBUTHA, otherwise Tarbula, April 22, sister of St. Simeon, bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, who suffered under Sapor, April 21, A.D. 343. She was put to death, together with her sister, on suspicion of having poisoned the queen, and at the instigation of the Jews. (Sozomen. *H. E.* ii. 12; Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 632.) [G. T. S.]

PHIBIONITES, given by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 25, p. 77) as the name of a Gnostic sect. Nothing is known as to their special tenets or as to the derivation of the name. [G. S.]

PHILAGRIUS (1), prefect of Egypt A.D. 335-340. St. Athanasius brings all kinds of charges against him in his *Epistola Encyclica*, his *Apologia contra Arianos*, and in his *Historia Arianorum*, all contained in Migne, *P. G.* t. xxv. He accuses him of apostasy from Christianity and of immorality. His charges must be regarded with some suspicion, as Philagrius supported the Arian party in Alexandria, and assisted in the installation of their bishop Gregory in 340. Gregory and Philagrius were both of them from Cappadocia. [GREGORIUS (8)]. [G. T. S.]

PHILAGRIUS (2), an intimate friend and fellow student of Caesarius, the brother of Gregory Nazianzen, who regarded him with much affection, and wrote to him frequently, especially after his return from Constantinople in 342, when he and Gregory were fellow sufferers from gout and rheumatism, which to their mutual regret prevented their meeting as often as they desired. Philagrius remonstrated with Gregory on his leaving Constantinople and resigning the bishopric, for which Gregory defends himself on the ground that it was not really his see, that being Nazianzus, but only one which he had held temporarily and most reluctantly. (*Epp.* 64-67, 70.) [E. V.];

PHILAGRIUS (3), a solitary near Jerusalem, of whom an uncommon act of honesty is recorded (Coteler. *Mon. Gr. Ecc.* i. 796; Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* v. 6, § 15; Tillem. x. 468). [C. H.]

PHILAGRIUS (4), a person addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. vii. ep. 14; Tillem. xvi. 230). [C. H.]

PHILAGRIUS (5), a blind man, into whose complaints Gregory the Great in A.D. 599 directed the bishop of Milan to inquire and to see that justice was done. (*Epp.* ix. 126.) [F. D.]

PHILASTER (PHILASTRIUS), bishop of Brixia (Brescia), in the latter part of the 4th century. Augustine uses both forms of his name, but preferably Philastrius; the form Philaster is used in the acts of the council of Aquileia. His successor in the see, Gaudentius, used every year to preach a panegyric sermon on the anniversary of his death (July 18). One of these sermons, preached on the fourteenth anniversary, has come down to us, and from its vague laudatory statements we have to extract the scanty information we possess concerning the life and

work of Philastrius. We learn from it that he was not a native of Brescia, but had, like Abraham, left his country and his father's house. From what country he came we are not told. Spain or Africa has been conjectured. Schröckh considers that his Greek-sounding name is probably derived from the later Latin "filiaster" a stepson (see Ducange, s. v.). He is commended for his zeal not only in the conversion of Jews and heathen, but also in the confutation of heresies, especially of Arianism; and he is said to have even incurred stripes by the vehemence of his opposition to that sect, which was dominant at the time. He is said to have travelled much. At Milan he withstood the bishop Auxentius, the Arian predecessor of St. Ambrose; and at Rome also he was highly successful in his defence of orthodoxy. Finally he settled down at Brescia, where he is said to have been a model of all pastoral virtues. We may judge of the impression he produced by the care taken by his successor to perpetuate his memory; and his cult was revived with great splendour in the 9th century, Rampertus, who was then bishop, having made a great translation of his relics, which, we are told, was attended with many miracles. Rampertus counts him as seventh bishop of Brescia, and he is still regarded as one of the patron saints of that city.

The only data we have for fixing the date of Philaster's episcopate, or the duration of his life, are that he took part as bishop of Brescia in a council held at Aquileia in 381 (see the proceedings of that council in the works of Ambrose, ii. 802, or p. 935, Migne); and that he must have died before A.D. 397, the year of the death of Ambrose, since that bishop interested himself in the appointment of his successor. The year 387 has been frequently named as the date of Philaster's death, but there is really no evidence that he did not live longer. St. Augustine mentions that he had seen Philaster at Milan in company with St. Ambrose; and this was probably some time during the period A.D. 384-387, during which Augustine was at Milan. It is likely that Philaster had been commended to the church of Brescia by Ambrose, who would have known of Philaster's opposition to Auxentius. The notices of Philaster to be found in ecclesiastical writers are collected in the Bollandist life. (*AA. SS.* July 18, vol. iv. p. 299.)

Philaster is now chiefly interesting as the author of a work on heresies, portions of which, having been copied by St. Augustine, became stock materials for haeresiologists. Augustine having been asked by Quodvultdeus to write a treatise on heresies refers him in reply (*Ep.* 222) to the works of Epiphanius and Philastrius, the former of whom had enumerated twenty heresies before our Lord's coming and sixty since the Ascension, the latter twenty-eight heresies before and 128 after. Concerning this difference of enumeration, Augustine refuses to believe that Epiphanius, whom he accounts far the more learned of the two, could have been ignorant of any heresies known to Philaster; and he explains the difference as arising from the fact, that the word heresy is not one of sharply defined application, and that accordingly the one counted opinions as heresies which were not so reckoned by the other. To a certain extent this explanation may be accepted; for Philaster

in his excessive eagerness to swell his list of heresies, has included many items which must be struck out unless we count every erroneous opinion as a heresy. In fact when he has completed his list of heretical sects called after the names of their founders, he adds a long list of anonymous heresies, apparently setting down all the theological opinions with which he disagreed, and branding those who held them as heretics. Thus, to give a few examples, those are set down as heretics (c. 108) who imagined, as many excellent fathers did, that the giants of Gen. vi. 2 were the offspring of angels, those (c. 112) who thought that any uncertainty attached to the calculation of the number of the years since the creation of the world, those (c. 94) who denied the plurality of heavens or (c. 115) who asserted an infinity of worlds, those (c. 133) who imagine that there are fixed stars, being ignorant that the stars are brought every evening out of God's secret treasure houses, and as soon as they have fulfilled their daily task are conducted back thither again by the angel who directs their course. It is to be feared he regards those as heretics (c. 113), who call the days of the week by their heathen names, instead of the scriptural names first day, second day, &c.; and some of his transcribers have rebelled on being asked to write down those as heretics who believe (c. 154) that the ravens brought flesh as well as bread to Elijah, who surely would never have used animal food. On the other hand, it is not true that all the heresies enumerated by Philaster, but unnoticed by Epiphanius, are such that omission can be accounted for by a difference of opinion as to what is heresy. When Augustine, at length yielding to his correspondent's request, wrote a short treatise on heresies, he first gives an abstract of the sixty post-Christian heresies discussed by Epiphanius, and then adds a list of twenty-three more taken from Philastrius, remarking that this author gives others also, but that he himself does not regard them as heresies.

The question of the relation between Philaster and Epiphanius has of late years become important, in consequence of the theory of Lipsius which is now generally accepted, and which has been explained in the article HIPPOLYTUS, Vol. III. 94, viz., that both writers drew from a common source, namely, the earlier treatise of Hippolytus against heresies. In order to establish this theory it is necessary to exclude the supposition of a direct use of Epiphanius by Philaster, which might seem the more obvious way of accounting for coincidences between the two writers.

From what has been said above as to the duration of Philaster's life, it is seen to be chronologically possible for him to have read the treatise of Epiphanius which appeared in 376 or 377. At what period of his life his own work was written we cannot tell. The notes of time in it are confusing. In c. 112 he counts bad chronology as a heresy; but if so, his own orthodoxy is questionable: for he places his own date (c. 106) over 400 years after Christ, and (c. 112) about 430. Possibly his transcribers are in fault, but the blunder is as likely to have been his own. In c. 83 he speaks of the Donatists, "qui Parmeniani nunc appellatur a Parmenione quodam qui eorum nuper successit

erroribus et falsitati." Parmenianus became Donatist bishop of Carthage about A.D. 368, and died in 391; and the "nuper" would lead us to think that Philaster wrote early in this episcopate. But the form Parmenio, if it be not a transcriber's error, seems to show that Philaster knew little of African affairs. The mention of Praxeas and Hermogenes as African heretics (c. 54) is accounted for by Lipsius through Philaster's having got their names from Tertullian. Philaster's anonymous heresy (c. 84) seems plainly to have been identified by Augustine (*Haer.* 70) with Priscillianism, the breaking out of which is dated in Prosper's Chronicle A.D. 379. But Philaster's silence as to the name Priscillian seems to indicate an earlier date.

But whether or not it were chronologically possible for Philaster to have used the work of Epiphanius, the complete independence of his treatment shows that actually he did not use it. Eager as he was to swell his list of heresies, he makes no mention of Archontici, Severiani, Encratitae, Pepuziani, Adamiani, Bardesianistae, and others, with whom Epiphanius would have made him acquainted; and in the discussion of all heresies later than Hippolytus, which are common to Epiphanius and Philaster, the two writers neither agree in their matter nor in the order of arrangement. Hence Lipsius inferred that the agreements in the two writers as to earlier heresies is to be explained by the use by both of a common source. This also accounts for a striking common feature, namely, the enumeration by both of pre-Christian heresies. Hegesippus (see Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22) had spoken of seven Jewish sects (*τῶν ἑπτὰ αἰρέσεων*), and had given their names. And it would seem from the opening of the tract of Pseudo-Tertullian that Hippolytus began his treatise by declining to treat of Jewish heresies. His two successors then might easily have been tempted to improve on their original by including in their plan pre-Christian heresies.

Concerning the New Testament Canon, Philaster states (c. 88) that it had been ordained by the apostles and their successors that nothing should be read in the Catholic Church but the law, the prophets, and the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, 13 Epistles of St. Paul, and the seven other epistles which are joined to the Acts of the Apostles. The omission from this list of the Apocalypse and the Epistle to the Hebrews seems intended only to exclude them from public church reading. In c. 60 he treats as heretical the denial that the Apocalypse is St. John's, and in c. 69 the denial that the Epistle to the Hebrews is St. Paul's. He accounts for difficulties raised as to the reception of the latter as arising from its speaking of our Lord as "made" (c. iii. 2), and from the apparent countenance given to Novatianism in cc. vi. 4, x. 26. Consequently the public reading of this epistle is not universal: "[leguntur] tredecim epistolae ipsius, et ad Hebraeos interdum."

The first printed edition of Philaster appeared at Basle in 1539; the most noteworthy of subsequent editions are one by Fabricius in 1721 containing an improved text and a valuable commentary; and one by Galeardus in 1738, giving from a Corbey MS. now in St. Petersburg, chapters on six heresies, which had been omitted in previous editions, but which are required to

make up the total number of heresies to the 156 mentioned by St. Augustine. This complete text has been reprinted by Oehler in his *Corpus Haeresiologum*, vol. i. [G. S.]

PHILEAS, Feb. 4. Bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, and martyr A.D. 306. He was a very learned man. He suffered under Calcianus, as told in his acts in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 548; cf. Le Blant, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 55, 113, where their authenticity is defended. (Combes. *Lecti Triumphi*, p. 185.) Eusebius (*H. E.* viii. 10) quotes a description of the sufferings of the martyrs from an Epistle addressed by Phileas to his own church. This Epistle may relate to the severe measures of Armenius, governor of Egypt, described in the Coptic Acts of St. Coluthus, published by Georgius. [MARMENIA.] We conclude from Eusebius's words, *l.c.* cap. ix., "the judge himself entreated them that they should have compassion on their children and wives," that Phileas was a married man. [PHILOROMUS.] He is probably the Phileas mentioned again by Eusebius (viii. 13). [G. T. S.]

PHILEMON (1), March 8. A flute player who was converted by the patience of the martyr Apollonius. He suffered torture with him at the city of Antinoüs. Their constancy converted the magistrate Arianus who tortured them. All three were thence transferred to Alexandria, where the prefect ordered them to be drowned, probably about A.D. 303. (Rufin. *de Vitis Patr.* cap. 19; Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 539; Ceill. iii. 49; Le Blant, *Actes des MM.* p. 48, 157.) [G. T. S.]

PHILEMON (2), extolled by St. Nilus (*lib. ii. ep. 183*), and another addressed by St. Nilus (*lib. ii. ep. 190*). [G. W. D.]

PHILEMON (3), one of two presbyters of Rome who, probably in a vacancy of the see, corresponded with Dionysius bishop of Alexandria, on the question of re-baptism (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 5, 7). [G. W. D.]

PHILETUS, the tenth bishop of Antioch, A.D. 218-229 (Clinton), the successor of Asclepiades, succeeded by Zebinus (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 21; Clinton, *Fest. Rom.* ii. 548). [E. V.]

PHILIBERTUS (PHILBERTUS, FILIBERTUS), ST., founder and first abbat of Gemeticum (Jumièges) in the diocese of Rouen and Herense (Hermoutier, now Noirmoutier) in Poitou, and founder or assistant-founder of the priory of Quinciacum (St. Benoît-de-Quincy), near Poitiers and the nunneries of Pauliacum and Villare (Montivilliers), lived in the 7th century (circ. A.D. 616-684). We have a biography of him, as to which the critics are divided. Dom, Rivet, and others believe it to have been written by a monk of Jumièges within twenty-five years of Philibertus's death, who, though not an eyewitness, derived his information from one who was, with the style retouched by another author of about the same date. The version we have is this improved one, with, however, the original prologus (*Hist. Litt.* iv. 43-44). Others think the biography the work of Ermentarius, or Hermentarius, a monk of Hermoutier in the 9th century, who undoubtedly wrote an account of

the miracles performed by the saint's relics (Ceillier, xii. 552-553). It was published by Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ord. S. Bened.* ii. 818-825, Paris, 1669), and is also to be found in *Boll. Acta SS. Aug.* iv. 75-80.

According to its story, Philibertus was born in the district of Elusa (near Eauze in Gascony) and was brought up at Vicus Julius (Aire), where his father Filibaudus was bishop. Sent in boyhood to king Dagobert's court, he came under the notice of St. Ouen. At the age of twenty he elected to become a monk, and received the tonsure from Agilus, abbat of Rebais, a monastery built by Ouen, and on Agilus's death was chosen to fill his place. To acquaint himself with the best monastic institutions, he visited many foundations through France, Italy and Burgundy, under different rules, and on his return, having resolved to build a monastery of his own, begged from Clovis II. and his pious queen Baldechildis (Balthildis) a spot called Gemeticum in the district of Rouen, and there founded the well-known monastery of that name (A.D. 655). Later on he built the nunnery of Pauliacum at about 10 miles distance, and made Austroberta first abbess. His example caused monasteries to spring up in Neustria, while his own flock was constantly swelled by fresh accessions of priests and men of rank. A quarrel with Ebroin, by whom he was first imprisoned and then driven into exile extended his influence into Poitou. The letters he brought from St. Ouen induced Ansoaldus, bishop of Poitiers, to permit the foundation of a monastery in the isle of Herium. Here he remained till the death of Ebroin (A.D. 681) opened Neustria again to him, when he returned to Jumièges. The gift of a township in the Caux district, now enabled him to found another nunnery, Villare (Montivilliers). He soon, however, returned to Ansoaldus at Poitiers and then visited Quinciacum, near Poitou, where he helped to found a priory, Saint-Benoît-de-Quincy (cf. *Gall. Christ.* ii. 1289 for this foundation). The rest of his life he spent at Herium, setting Aicadrus over Jumièges, and another disciple over Quincy. The day of his death and commemoration is given as Aug. 20, on which he is marked by Usuard and other ancient hagiologists (see *Boll. ibid.* p. 67). The year is conjectured to be 684.

From allusions to him in the biographies of contemporary saints we learn that he made large gifts to Rebais, where he served his novitiate (*Vita S. Agili*, Mab. *ibid.* p. 324), that he was a friend and guest of St. Wandrigrisilus at Fontanelle (*Vita S. Wand.* Mab. *ibid.* p. 542), and that his influence with queen Balthildis obtained considerable endowments for Jumièges (*Vita S. Balth.* Mab. *ibid.* p. 780), while the biographer of his successor Aicadrus calls him "omnium sanctorum in Neustria famosissimus" (*Vita S. Aicadri*, Mab. *ibid.* p. 957), and in an inscription by Alcuin for an altar he is coupled with St. Agatha, and characterized as "plurima construxit qui loca sancta deo" (*Carm.* lxxvi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* ci. 747).

For the history of the saint's relics, which is almost as eventful as his life, see the narrative of Hermentarius (*Boll. ibid.* 81-95; cf. Ceillier, xii. 552, 3), and the supplementary account of Falco, who lived in the 11th century (p. 73, cf.

Ceillier, xiii. 464). They finally rested at Tournus. [S. A. B.]

PHILIMATIA (FILIMATIA), a Gallic lady of rank, whose epitaph was written by Sidonius Apollinaris. He eulogizes her as wife, mistress, mother, and daughter (*Epist.* ii. 8). [S. A. B.]

PHILIMATIUS, a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, who writes to advise him to accept the post of assessor of the prefect of Gaul which had been offered him (*Epist.* i. 3). Another letter written to Eripius, contains an account of the festival of St. Justus at Lyons, a most interesting picture of the social life of the 5th century in Gaul. Philimatus, though advanced in age, bears a part in the youthful sports, which follow the service, and is gently quizzed by Sidonius (*Epist.* v. 17). [S. A. B.]

PHILIPPICUS (PHILEPICUS, originally called BARDANES), emperor of Constantinople from Dec. 711 to June 713. He was a Monothelite, and therefore deposed the orthodox patriarch Cyrus, and put the heretic John in his stead. He imprisoned Cyrus in the monastery of Chora, which he had founded. [CYRUS (5)]; [JOANNES (128)]. He abolished and burned the official copy of the acts of the sixth General Council, and reinstated in the diptychs the anathematized names of Sergius and Honorius. His political history will be found in the *DICTIONNAIRE OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOG.* (Theophanes, pp. 311, 316-321; Ceill. xii. 23.) [G. T. S.]

PHILIPPUS (1), of Tralles, Asiarch at the time of the martyrdom of POLYCARP; see p. 429. In the place referred to it is stated that the historic reality of this Philip has been confirmed by an inscription found at Olympia. It may here be added that Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, i. 613) has printed two new inscriptions relating to this Philip, and also by means of his full name, Caius Julius Philippus, given in the first mentioned inscription, has identified him with the subject of three other previously known inscriptions. Philip is thus proved to have been a well-known man of great wealth and munificence. Lightfoot (*u. s.*) shows that the date of his tenure of office indicated by these inscriptions is quite reconcilable with the date otherwise determined, of the martyrdom of Polycarp; and without any necessity to have recourse to the perfectly admissible supposition, that Philip held the office of Asiarch more than once. Concerning the office, see Lightfoot, ii. 990, where among other things it is shown that the holder was 'high-priest of the province of Asia,' and that his tenure of office was probably four years. [G. S.]

PHILIPPUS (2), the ninth bishop of Jerusalem, of the purely Jewish succession. According to Eutychius and the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, his predecessor Tobias held office for three years from A.D. 121, and his successor Seneca began his episcopate in A.D. 125, so that Philip's episcopate was limited to four years (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5; *Chron. Armen. Euseb.*). [E. V.]

PHILIPPUS (3), interlocutor with Barlesanes (Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* vi. 10; Tillem. ii. 455). [BARDAISAN, p. 257 a.] [C. H.]

PHILIPPUS (4), bishop of Gortyna, in Crete, at the beginning of the last quarter of the second century, and author of an able confutation of the heresy of Marcion, a work now only known to us by the favourable report of Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 21, 23, 25). He was mentioned as bishop in the letter addressed by DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH to the church of Gortyna (see that article). [G. S.]

PHILIPPUS (5), THE ARABIAN, emperor, a native of Bostra in Trachonitis, was a man of low birth. His father was said to have been a famous robber chief (Victor, *Epitome*). Having been made pretorian prefect he supplanted the younger Gordian in the affections of the soldiers, and caused him to be deposed and put to death in March A.D. 244. [GORDIANUS (1).] After making peace with Sapor the Persian king, he proceeded to Rome. To strengthen his authority he made his brother Priscus and his relation Severianus respectively commander of the troops in Syria and in Macedonia and Moesia. He attacked the Carpi, a barbarous tribe, who had committed ravages on the Danube, and defeated them, but granted them a peace on easy terms. In A.D. 248, the games to celebrate the thousandth anniversary of the foundation of Rome were celebrated with great splendour. In the summer of the following year Philip was defeated by Decius near Verona and slain, and his young son Philip, whom he had associated with himself in the empire, was also put to death. [DECIVS.] The authorities for the reign of this emperor are of the most meagre and conflicting character. The only thing that makes it important is the report that he was the first Christian emperor. Almost the only foundation for this is the narrative which Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 34) gives without vouching for its truth, namely, that Philip being a Christian wished at Easter to join in the prayers with the congregation, but that on account of the many crimes he had committed the bishop of the place refused to allow him before he had confessed and taken his place among the penitents, and that he willingly obeyed. Here neither the place nor the name of the bishop is mentioned. The latter is supplied by Leontius, bishop of Antioch about A.D. 348 (quoted in *Chron. Pasch.* 270, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xcii. 668), who states it was St. Babylas, of Antioch. He also gives a very inaccurate account of Philip's crime—that he had been praetorian prefect under Gordian, who at his death had left him guardian of his son, and that Philip had murdered the latter and seized on the empire. Philostorgius (*H. E.* vii. 8, in *Patr. Gr.* lxxv. 545) tells a similar story, but according to him the emperor was Numerian or Decius, who were certainly heathens. Similarly in St. Chrysostom (*Liber in S. Babylam*, 5, in *Patr. Gr.* l. 560), the emperor is the one that put St. Babylas to death, and is therefore Decius. We are also told that Origen wrote to Philip and the empress (*Eus. H. E.* vi. 36), but the letters are not preserved, nor do we know what they contained. St. Jerome also (*Chronicon* and *de Viris Ill.* 54) calls Philip the first of all Christian emperors, in which he is followed by Orosius; and Dionysius of Alexandria (*Eus. H. E.* vii. 10) speaks of emperors before Valerian who were reputed to be Christians, but does not mention their names. Against this doubtful testi-

mony must be set the following facts. (i.) Constantine is called by Eusebius (*V. Cons.* i. 3) the first Christian emperor. (ii.) No event, with the exception of his alleged penitence at Antioch, is recorded of Philip that implies he was a Christian. (iii.) He celebrated the millennial games with heathen rites. (iv.) He deified his predecessor and was himself deified after death. (v.) No heathen writer mentions that he was a Christian. (vi.) A year before Decius issued his edict against the Christians, and therefore while Philip was still reigning, a violent persecution had broken out at Alexandria (*Eus. H. E.* vi. 41), which would not have been allowed to go on had the emperor really been a Christian. It seems therefore safest to conclude with Clinton, who sums up the whole of the evidence (*Fasti Rom.* ii. 51), that Philip was not a Christian. It may be asked is there any foundation for the story of Philip and St. Babylas? An indirect confirmation is given by the date, as Philip may very possibly have been at Antioch at Easter, A.D. 244, on his return to Rome after Gordian's death. The form which the conversion of Constantine assumes in the narrative of Zosimus (ii. 29), the bitter enemy of Christianity, shows in what a distorted aspect the Christian doctrine of remission of sins might appear to the eyes of a pagan. It is possible that Philip, feeling remorse for the way he had treated Gordian, and believing that Babylas was able to purify him from his guilt, really did make some application to him, and that this is the kernel round which the story has grown up; but it seems impossible to say with any certainty what parts of it, if any, are genuine and what are fictitious. It should be mentioned to Philip's credit that he was the first emperor who tried to check the grosser forms of vice at Rome (Lampridius, *V. Heliogabali*, 31; *V. Severi*, 23), though his efforts were unsuccessful (Victor *de Caesaribus*, c. 28). (Zosimus, i. 18-22; *Vita Gordiani Tertii*, c. 28-33; Tillemont, *M. E.* iii. 262; Gibbon, c. 7, 10, 16.) [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (6), Oct. 22. Bishop of Hecalea in Thrace and martyr in the Diocletian persecution about A.D. 304 with Severus, a presbyter, and Hermes a deacon. His acts present one of the most vivid and minute pictures we possess of that persecution, and are often quoted as such by Le Blant in his *Actes des Martyrs*, e.g. pp. 12, 41, 52, 54, &c., where many incidental marks of authenticity are pointed out. The various steps adopted in this persecution can be clearly traced in this narrative, the arrest of the clergy, the seizure and destruction of the sacred writings and vessels, and finally the torture and death of the martyrs. Philip was arrested and examined by a president Bassus, who then committed him to the free custody of one Pancratus (c. vii.). Bassus was soon succeeded by a certain Justinus, who was much more stern towards the Christians than his predecessor, whose wife was a Christian. After some time Justinus brought them to Adrianople, and there burned Philip and Hermes on the same day. (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 442.) [G. T. S.]

PHILIPPUS (7), FLAVIUS, pretorian prefect of the East, an Arian, and hostile to Athanasius (*Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* 51) in the reign of Constantius, described by Socrates as wielding

immense power and styled *δεύτερος μετα βασιλέα*, second to the emperor alone. He was addressed as pretorian prefect in a law of June 9, 340, was consul in 348, and in 350 acted in the campaign against Magnentius (Clinton, *F. R.* i. 402, 412, 420). In 342 (Tillem. vii. 256) he received instructions at Constantinople from the emperor at Antioch for the expulsion of the orthodox patriarch (Soc. ii. 16; Soz. iii. 9). [PAULUS (18).] Athanasius (*Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 51) speaks of him as an enemy to him after the death of Constans. In less than a year from the death of Paulus, which may be placed on Nov. 6, 350 (Tillem. vii. 359), in 351, therefore, Philippus was deposed from his dignities, exposed to public insults, and died miserably (Athanasius, *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* 7). Tillemont (vii. 698, 699) discusses the chronology, in which he differs from Valesius (in his notes to Soc. and Soz.) and Baronius. [C. H.]

PHILIPPUS (8), superior of a coenobium at Jerusalem in 362, who sent some of the supposed relics of St. John the Baptist to St. Athanasius at Alexandria. (Rufin. *H. E.* ii. 28; Tillem. vii. 361, viii. 213.) [C. H.]

PHILIPPUS (9), of Side, an ecclesiastical historian who flourished at the commencement of the fifth century. He was a native of the maritime town of Side in Pamphylia, the birthplace of Troilus the celebrated sophist, whose kinsman he was proud of reckoning himself. Cave states (*Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 39) that Philip while still a young man presided over the ecclesiastical school at Alexandria in which he had been taught, and subsequently removed to his native place Side, but there appears to be no sufficient ground for this statement. The transference to Side seems to have been effected by Philip's teacher, Rhodon the successor of Didymus, led thereto probably by his pupil's influence. The removal was fatal to the prosperity of the school, of which (Schröckh, *Christlich. Geschichte.* vii. p. 8) we hear no more. We find Philippus afterwards at Constantinople, where he enjoyed the intimacy of Chrysostom, by whom he was admitted to the diaconate. Tillemont says of him that he was rather the imitator of Chrysostom's eloquence than of his virtues, and that the imitation was a very poor one. Philippus entertained a very high opinion of his own learning and of his claims to ecclesiastical advancement. On the death of Atticus, A. D. 425, by whom he had been ordained presbyter, Philippus was a candidate for the vacant see, and found a number of influential supporters (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 27). The preference of Sisinnius caused him extreme mortification, which he had the weakness to publish to the world in his "Christian History," into which he introduced a violent tirade reflecting on the character both of the elected and the electors, more particularly the lay supporters of Sisinnius. The bitterness of his invectives and the rashness of the charges alleged are noticed by Socrates, who regarded them as undeserving of the slightest mention in his history (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 26). Not discouraged by his failures Philippus was again put forward as a candidate, both after the death of Sisinnius, A. D. 428, and on the deposition of Nestorius in A. D. 431. On both occasions

he had a considerable and energetic party in his favour (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 29, 35). On neither occasion, it is needless to say, was he successful in obtaining the position for which he was eminently unfitted, and he died a simple presbyter. The chief work written by Philippus was entitled, "a Christian History," *Χριστιανική Ἱστορία*. It was a vast and elaborate work divided into thirty-six books, each containing between twenty and thirty chapters, making full a thousand in all. It began with the creation, and was carried down to his own times. With the exception of one or two fragments the whole is lost. The description of it given by Socrates (*H. E.* vii. 27) and Photius (*Cod.* 35) shows that its loss is not to be regretted on literary grounds; and though if it had come down to us we should have known much more of the times in which he lived, his credit for veracity is so small that in him we should have had a very untrustworthy guide. His history is described as a very diffuse, ill-managed collection of heterogeneous materials, gathered from all sources and piled together rather for the display of his multifarious reading and his universal knowledge than for the purpose of instruction. Socrates describes it as a medley of theorems in geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and music, together with descriptions of islands and mountains and trees and other matters of little moment. The chronological order of events being constantly disregarded, the result was a very loose work valueless alike to the learned and the unlearned; the latter being incapable of appreciating the ornate and pompous style, while the former were disgusted with his wearisome tautology. Photius's estimate of the book is equally low—"diffuse; neither witty nor elegant; written more for display than usefulness; wearisome and unpleasing; full of undigested learning, with very little bearing on history at all, still less on Christian history" (Phot. *Cod.* 35). A rather important fragment relating to the school of Alexandria and the succession of the teachers, has been printed by Dodwell at the close of his dissertations on Irenaeus, Oxon. 1689. Of this Neander writes: "The known untrustworthiness of this author; the discrepancy between his statements and other more authentic reports; and the suspicious condition in which the fragment has come down to us, render his details unworthy of confidence" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 460, Clark's transl.). Another considerable fragment is reported to exist in the Imperial Library at Vienna, entitled *de Christi Nativitate, et de Magis*, giving the acts of a disputation held in Persia concerning Christianity between certain Persians and Christians, at which Philip was himself present. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xii. 431; *Hist. des Empereurs*, vi. 130; Cave, *Hist. Lat.* i. 395; Photius, *Cod.* 35; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* vi. 112, lib. v. c. 4 § 28.) [E. V.]

PHILIPPUS (10), one of Chrysostom's adherents who died in exile in Pontus before 408. (Pallad. p. 196.) [E. V.]

PHILIPPUS (11), an ascetic, presbyter of the schools of the clergy at Constantinople, deprived of his employment for his adherence to

Chrysostom, from whom he received a consolatory letter (Chrys. *Ep.* 213). He retired to Campania, where he was reported to be sick when Palladius wrote in 408. (Pallad. p. 196.) [E. V.]

PHILIPPUS (12), a priest, present as legate of pope Zosimus with Faustinus and Asellus at the council of Carthage, held on May 25th, A.D. 419, the canons of which he subscribes. (Mansi, iv. 433.) [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (13), prefect of Eastern Illyricum, to whom an edict was directed in 421 ordering that if any question arose about ecclesiastical affairs it was to be referred to the patriarch of Constantinople, as enjoying all the rights and privileges of Old Rome (*Cod. Theod.* t. vi. lib. xvi. tit. ii. lex 45, ed. Gothofred; lib. xvi. tit. viii. l. 21, *de Judeis*), is also addressed to him. It orders him to protect the Jews from violence. [G. T. S.]

PHILIPPUS (14), a priest, present as legate of pope Celestine with the bishops Arcadius and Projectus at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431 (Mansi, iv. 1281). They were not in time for the first session on June 22nd, at which Nestorius was deposed, but were present at the second on July 10th, and ratified the proceedings of the first. He was afterwards one of the deputation sent by the council to the emperor (Mansi, iv. 1458). The Nestorians afterwards circulated a letter forged in the name of Philippus, asserting that pope Sixtus was displeased at the deposition of Nestorius (Mansi, v. 326). This Philippus is probably the same person as num. (12). [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (15), priest, who according to Gennadius (*Vir. Ill.* 62) was a disciple of Jerome, and died in the reigns of Marcian and Avitus, i.e. A.D. 455-6, having written a commentary on Job and some familiar letters. The interlinear commentary on Job printed with Jerome's works (*Pat. Lat.* xxiii. 1401 and the *Admonitio* prefixed) is believed by some to be that of Philippus; but there is another, which used to be attributed to Bede, in the early folio editions of whose works it may be seen (Basil. 1563, t. iv. p. 602; Colon. 1612, t. iv. p. 447), and this is cited as Philippus's by Bede himself in cap. iv. *De Rat. Unciarum*, of his *De Rat. Temporum* (*Opp.* ed. Giles, t. vi. p. 148). See more in Fabric. *Bibl. Lat.* ed. Mansi, v. 295; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 434; Ceill. vii. 564, x. 472; Bede, *Opp.* ed. Giles, t. ix. *Praef.* p. x.; Tille. xii. 351, 661. [C. H.]

PHILIPPUS (16), bishop, to whom with four other bishops of Epirus, Gregory the Great in A.D. 595 signified his approval of the election of Andreas as bishop of Nicopolis and metropolitan (*Epp.* vi. 8). [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (17), priest apparently in Palestine, to whom Gregory the Great wrote in May A.D. 603, acknowledging his letter, which announced the death of the priest Andreas, sending him 50 solidi, and asking for his prayers (*Epp.* xiii. 29). [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (18), comes excubitorum, or commander of the imperial body-guard. Gregory the Great wrote to him early in A.D. 591, ex-

plaining why he had accepted the pontificate (*Epp.* i. 32). [F. D.]

PHILIPPUS (19), a monk of the monastery of St. Vitus in Rome, set up in opposition to the usurping pope Constantine after the death of Paulus, A.D. 768. For an account of the temporary intrusion of Constantine into the see by his brother Toto, duke of Nepi, see CONSTANTINUS II., p. 658. The Primicerius Christophorus and his son Sergius, who had gone to the Lombard king Desiderius to solicit aid against the usurper, had returned to Rome, and had succeeded in entering the city, July 29, accompanied by a presbyter called Waldipert, apparently a Lombard, and other Lombards, who had joined them. Duke Toto, with his brother Passivus, being in Rome at the time, had attacked the invaders; but the former had been slain, and the latter had fled to his remaining brother, the usurping pope, in the Lateran, and both had been seized and placed under guard. During the confusion that ensued Waldipert, with a party of Romans, but without the knowledge of Christophorus and Sergius, entered the monastery of St. Vitus, and brought out thence a presbyter called Philip, whom they elected and proclaimed as pope. Why this man was selected we are not told: he may have been a Lombard, known to Waldipert, who hoped thus to elevate one of his own nation to the papal chair. The poor man's greatness was, however, of very short duration. He was conducted with the usual forms to the Lateran, gave the accustomed blessing to the people from the pontifical chair, and afterwards entertained at table some of the notables of Rome. But shortly (probably on the following day), Christophorus, having become aware of what had been done, arrived in great wrath, and swore before the people that he would not depart from Rome till Philip was expelled from the Lateran. He was accordingly forthwith expelled, and, in great trepidation, "descending by a ladder that led to a bath," returned to his monastery. After this no more is heard of him. Having been, apparently, only a passive tool, he seems to have escaped the vengeance that afterwards fell on others, including Waldipert, who is said to have taken refuge in the Pantheon, to have been condemned to have his eyes and tongue pulled out, and to have died in consequence. The whole account, as above given, is from Anastasius. (*Lib. Pontif.* in vit. Stephan. III.) [J. B.—Y.]

PHILO (1) (*Φίλων*), better known as PHILO JUDAEUS (Hieron., *de viris illustr.* c. 11).^a In Jewish writings—where, very significantly, his works are not mentioned from the time of Josephus to Azaryah de Rossi (1511-1578), who treats of him in his celebrated work *Meor Enayim*^b—he is called Yedidyah ha-Alakh-

^a There was an older Jewish Philo, and yet others of that name, notably the deacon Philo, from Cilicia, and also a bishop, mentioned by Polybius in his life of Epiphanius (c. 49), probably the same as the *Φίλων Καρπάσιος* whom Suidas mentions as the author of a commentary on Canticles. This Philo was made bishop of Carpasia in the island of Cyprus in A.D. 401.

^b Part II. (Imré Bihnah) Sect. I. (Per. III.-VI.), and also Sects. III. and IV. The notice of Philo in the work known as *Shalsheth ha-Kabbalah* is without any value.

sanderi. But we do not imagine that Philo really had this as his second or Jewish name; still less, that the name Philo was intended as the Greek equivalent for Yediyah, since the use of foreign (Greek) names was so common, especially among extra-Palestinian Jews, that it was an admitted legal principle: "The names of Israelites outside Palestine are like those of the Gentiles" (Jer. Gitt. 43b, lines 4 and 5 from top). The vindication of a survey of the life, and of the writings and system, of Philo in a work on *Christian Biography and Doctrines*, lies not only in the copious references and the important place assigned to him by Eusebius, by St. Jerome, and other church-writers, but in the relation between the works of Philo and the Apostolic writings; in the bearing of his teaching on the church in the time of her planting; and, lastly, in the influence which he exercised on a certain direction of Christian thought.

I. Predecessors of Philo: Historical Development of Hellenism.

As the interest attaching to Philo greatly depends on his connection with Hellenism, of which he was the last and fullest exponent, it seems desirable to preface this account of him by a sketch of the theological direction of which he was the most distinguished representative. We have called it a direction rather than a system, because it was not so much the outcome of independent thinking as the issue of a current of thought. There was nothing strictly systematic about it, unless it were in the application of its principle, which was that of Judaic-Hellenic eclecticism. Its underlying idea was to combine two apparently incompatible directions: the faith of the synagogue and the thinking of Greece. To the Hellenists both were very real. Neither one nor the other could be surrendered. It can scarcely be said that in the issue the substance and spirit were derived from Judaism, the form from Greece. Rather does it often seem as if the substance had been Greek and only the form Hebrew. Yet not in its fundamental theologumena, which were of the Old Testament. In truth, the educated Jews of the West found themselves Hebrews by birth, upbringing, religious profession, and even conviction—at least in its negative aspect, with reference to heathenism. On the other hand, they had by association and education become Grecian in the modes and results of their thinking. The welding of these two was Hellenism or Alexandrianism.

If it be true that every special theological view forms part of, and influences, all others, and again that a theological direction cannot be fully understood apart from the whole current of contemporary thinking; this holds specially good of Hellenism. The Jewish world had issued from the Babylonish exile in two directions—not only geographically, but, partly in consequence of it, mentally also and theologically. One branch of the old Hebrew stock returned to Palestine. They were in every sense the minority: in numbers, in wealth, influence, and culture. On the other hand, they represented the intense religious element in Israel. Yet they could neither reproduce the old, nor restore it, even if they had clearly ap-

prehended its character. The old development had come to a close with the deportation to Babylon. The exiles had been torn from their old associations; their former religious worship had been rendered impossible; and they had to find for themselves not only new forms but a new direction, suited to the new conditions. They had gone into exile Hebrews; they returned Jews. But the very earnestness of religious purpose, which alone could prompt their return to Palestine in the then condition of the land and people, might prove misleading. Close adherence to the law might lead to one-sided elaboration of its letter; separation from the heathen to narrow-minded exclusiveness; and belief in the divine calling, instruction, and mission of Israel to what afterwards became the worst characteristics of Pharisaism. And this direction once entered upon, all the surrounding circumstances would favour its progress. Even the physical condition of Judaea, shut off from the busy world by walls of limestone-rock or by dreary wilderness, would discourage free intercourse, be unfavourable to agriculture or commerce, and turn mind and imagination inwards. When it was attempted to force on Israel heathen manners, and to modify, if not suppress, their God-given religion, it would only rouse to more fierce resistance. If Israel was despised, down-trodden, and hardly bestead of the Gentiles, all the more intense would grow the consciousness of spiritual and even moral superiority, of a divine dignity that could never be brought into comparison with aught in the heathen world, and of a future, transcendent not only in spiritual but even in outward glory. Pride, not to say boast, of nationality was only one consequence. The other and far wider reaching was intense occupation with all that was Jewish, and the development of Judaism in every possible direction. The system of Rabbinic traditionalism which was its outcome was a kind of theological hypochondria in which every conceivable danger had been anticipated and sought to be avoided, and in which every symptom was watched and provided for. And the man who was learned had to know the true medicine, especially the Rabbi. For the real priesthood of this religion were the Rabbis. Naturally the unlearned, the "country people," were despised and hated. The ignorant could not be thoroughly Jewish, and their direction would eventually approximate to heathenism. The saying recorded in the New Testament: "This people who knoweth not the law are cursed" (St. John vii. 49), has its exact counterpart in that which, significantly, is ascribed to the great Hillel, the father of Jewish traditionalism: "The unlettered cannot fear God, nor yet the ignorant [the *am ha-arets*] be pious" (Ab. ii. 5). For, in truth, if they had been pious, they would not have been ignorant of that which to the Pharisee contained everything worth knowing. When the near kinsman of a great Rabbi enquired of him whether having mastered all Jewish lore he might not turn to that of the Gentile world, the teacher, referring to Ps. i. 2, bade him enquire what hour was not of the day nor night, that he might devote

* Even in theological controversy it seems almost incredible boldness on the part of Jewish writers to ignore this saying of Hillel.

it to study that was not of the law. For to Judaism the exclusion of everything non-Jewish was a condition of its existence. To have admitted the foreign element would have been to begin a contest in which, as all experience, past and present, has shown, traditionalism must have been fatally worsted. In all sober earnest and conscientious sincerity, the last word of Palestinian Judaism to the Gentile world must be: *Non possumus!*

If this holds true of Palestinian Judaism and of the Eastern branch of the "dispersion," another stream of the Jewish "diaspora" flowed in a quite different direction. It were impossible to trace the beginnings of the Jewish settlements in the West. Commercial intercourse, local circumstances, political necessities, and the love of wandering or the search after wealth, may all have contributed to increase their number. In that direction was the centre of power; thither flowed the wealth and learning of the world, and thence pulsed its life-blood. Already a century and a half before our era the Western diaspora could be described as "covering every country and every sea" (*Orac. Sibyll.* III. 271). It was only natural that these Jewish strangers should cling with every heart-fibre to the religion of their fathers, brooding with fond memory upon the glories of the past, or dreaming of those of the future that stood out in such bright contrast to their present. Jerusalem was not only the home of their fathers and the capital of their people, but also their religious centre. There was the only place of lawful sacrifice; thence issued the law; and thither turned their thoughts, even their attitude, in prayer. Some time or other to visit it in religious pilgrimage must have been a pious hope to which few could have been strangers, even as all shared in the sacred duty of contributing to its temple, in the services of which all had a part, since its sacrifices were offered not only for the worshippers present but for all Israel, however widely dispersed. Yet there were influences at work which widely separated the Western Jews from the home and centre of their faith in Palestine. To begin with, the language which they heard and spoke was different. Few of them could have any real knowledge of Hebrew, and it is probable that the services of the synagogue and the reading of the Scriptures were in Greek, even as we know this to have been the prescribed language for the more private and personal offices. Nor could foreign culture be shut out. In Palestine what first met, and continually compassed them, was Jewish; in the Western dispersion it was Greek. In these circumstances the Palestinian *non possumus* was itself and absolutely impossible.

When once this point was reached, perhaps unconsciously, its logical sequences could not be avoided or evaded. The cultured Jew could not withdraw himself from the influence of Greek thought. The better he knew, the more he liked it. Its very novelty and strangeness had attractions. There could not be doubt that much in it was true, divine. But then he was a Jew, and the law which Moses had brought had come directly from God; Israel had been called of God; their whole history, especially in its beginnings, had been under the direct

guidance of God, and hence eternal in its lessons. The synagogue had stood on one side from the heathen world, and condemned it. That might apply to the outside appearance of it, as represented by the populace. But it was not true as regarded its inner meaning and deeper Divine truths. One Divine revelation could not contradict the other. Penetrate beneath the letter of Scripture, understand the import of its allegoric teaching which adapted Divine truth to the capacities of men—to their intellectual standpoint, and it would be seen that the revelation to Israel and the truths of Greek philosophy accorded. They had come from the same Divine source; only, all fulness was in revelation, strictly so called, and merely partial or broken rays in Greek philosophy. The synagogue might look only at the letter of the Scriptures, and at the outside of the Greek world, and shrink back with its *non possumus*. The Greek world might similarly look at the outside of the Scriptures and the surface of the Jewish world, and contemptuously turn aside with a *non volumus*. But there was higher and deeper truth than either found on the surface. He was the true Israelite who penetrated beyond the letter to the spirit. And the further he penetrated, the richer the ore that was laid bare to him, and the more did he perceive that it was the true precious metal, which was also the riches of philosophic thinking.

And yet the Hellenist would deem himself only the better Jew for this discovery. For if to cleave to the letter alone would have been purblindness, still to relinquish the letter which itself was true, and which opened up much deeper truths, would have been madness and sin. Thus, although in quite another manner, and in a far different spirit from St. Paul's, Hellenism would show that although the Jew had every way the vantage, yet He was the God, not of the Jew only, but also of the Gentile. Hellenism was noble in its aim, however faulty in its method. It sought to conciliate the two developments which for long centuries had proceeded independently, separately, as it might seem, hostilely. Standing between the *non possumus* of Palestine and the *non volumus* of the Greek world, it stretched a hand to each, and would fain have brought them together. That could not be, and so Hellenism failed of the success it sought, although certainly not of all success. St. Paul achieved what Alexandrianism aimed at. He began, not by combining the two, but by acknowledging the Divine in each, and he traced it, through the common poverty, the common need, and the common aspirations of both, up to the common provision of the God and Father of us all.

It will have been noticed that the method by which Hellenism reached its results was that of allegorical interpretation. We can scarcely call this Greek, since it is more or less common to all ancient religions. It was certainly applied to Homer before the time of Philo. The Stoics, who would fain have combined adhesion to the popular faith with their own philosophic results, were fond of this 'θεραπεία of myths.' Indeed, it was of absolute necessity if they were to be retained, while its application would elevate the myths into mysteries, and show that beneath the coarse but fragile surface of the seeming

there was absolute and sublime meaning of truth. The only drawback was that the method itself was not true. It was an afterthought, and the truths which were inferred had been carried into, before they were carried out of, the myths. But Jewish Hellenism had no myths to interpret, and in this also lay its superiority to the heathen world. But in place of these myths it had the letter, true indeed, but shallow and poor, if only literally understood. Taken by itself it might have been almost as great a difficulty to the Grecian Jew as were the popular myths to the philosophers. But here also the allegorical method brought light and meaning by importing into the letter of an event or command certain preconceived thoughts. The Palestinians had also a method which must be called allegorical; only it began at the other end from that of the Alexandrians. It is a common thing in Jewish writings to find a verse of Scripture cited and then allegorically applied to certain persons or events in Jewish history. On the other hand, Alexandrianism found an event or person, and allegorically carried into it a philosophical truth, or what it regarded as such.^d And more than this, it otherwise also imitated the heathen mode of allegorism. For in its hands the patriarchs and heroes of Jewish history became a veritable philosophic Olympus and their history an ethical mythology.

From what has been said it will be inferred that, after all, resort to the allegorical method was prompted by apologetic motives. It is indeed mostly so. In the hands of these philosophers allegory was the *ἀντιφάρμακον τῆς ἀσεβείας* (the antidote of impiety), by showing the *ὕπόνοια*—the hidden thought and deeper sense—of the myths. In the hands of the Hellenist Jews it would not only vindicate the letter of Scripture against attacks, or it might be doubts, but also reveal a *ὕπόνοια* which was in accordance with those philosophical truths to which no doubt could attach; nay, it would present them much more fully, purely, and truly. Thus Jew and Greek were to be elevated in Hellenism into a higher unity. We shall presently see how closely the Hellenistic rules of allegory followed those of the Greeks. But where the underlying idea was such as we have described it, and its method of application so similar, it appears natural to infer that the object must have been not only to meet a felt want in the Jewish, but if possible to reach also the Gentile, world. We here recall that, although the Greek translation of the Old Testament may have been necessary for the Greek-speaking Jews, yet it was begun under the patronage, and, as some think, at the instance, of the Ptolemies, the Greek rulers of Egypt. But we have even stronger evidence of the desire to approach the Greek world. Those extensive falsifications by Jewish hands of historical notices and of poetry as from ancient Greek writers and classic poets, which Eusebius

^d When St. Paul used allegory (as in 1 Cor. ix. 9; Gal. iv. 21, etc.), it appears to me that he applied it in the Palestinian, rather than the Alexandrian manner. On the other hand, it is impossible to read the Epistle to the Hebrews without feeling that its writer had been trained in Alexandrian modes of thinking, although we cannot fail to recognise the immeasurable difference as regards the substance of what was conveyed in Alexandrian form.

and others have quoted in all good faith (*Praepar. Evangel.* ix.; *Clemens Alex. Strom.* i.; *Præp. Ev.* xiii.; *Clem. Strom.* v.; *Pseudo-Justin, Cohort. ad Gr. and de Monarchia*)*; the almost incredible Jewish forgery of Sibylline books; and the supposed Gentile but probably Jewish works to which Josephus refers (*Ag. Ap.* i. 23, comp. 22); even so un-Palestinian a production as a "drama" on the Exodus by an Alexandrian Jew, Ezekiel (*Ens.* u. s. ix. 28, 29), whatever we may think of its poetry and versification: these and other writings of similar kind must have been intended far more for Gentile than for Jewish eyes. Nor probably would the reference to heathen philosophers have been so frequent or emphatic if the object had not been to attract Greek readers.

We have designated this direction as Hellenism from its tendency, but also as Alexandrianism from the city which was its head-quarters, and, indeed, the capital of the Western "dispersion." Antioch may have had as numerous a Jewish population, if we include its floating portion. But it did not represent Western Judaism, being rather an intermediate link with Palestine, nor could its Jewish inhabitants compare with those of Alexandria in wealth, culture, or influence. This is not the place to describe the magnificence of a city which at the time was the commercial centre of the world and the home of literature and science. Suffice it, that, besides its mercantile importance, it had special attractions to the Jews. Its founder, Alexander the Great,^f had accorded them equally exceptional privileges with the Macedonians. These were confirmed and even enlarged by the Ptolemies, the successors of Alexander, and afterwards by Julius Caesar. Originally one quarter had been assigned to them; afterwards two quarters are named as specially Jewish, although not in the sense of the Jews being confined to them. The vast trade of Alexandria was chiefly in their hands, and there were synagogues in all parts of the city. But their chief glory was that great central synagogue, built in the shape of a basilica, and furnished with seventy chairs of state for the eldership, of the magnificence of all which even the Palestinians were never weary of boasting. It was a strange relationship that between the Rabbis of Palestine and the Jews of Egypt, with their schismatic and yet non-schismatic temple at Leontopolis—of independence and yet dependence and homage on the part of the Alexandrians; of disavowal and yet acknowledgment and even incorporation on the part of the Palestinian authorities. Palestinian Rabbis taught and exerted authority in Alexandria, and Alexandrians resided in Jerusalem, and were even represented among their Rabbis. But, without laying stress on the fact, that these strangers were gathered in a special synagogue (*Acts* vi. 9), it is surely significant that even in the early apostolic church the deep-rooted suspicions and misunderstandings between 'Grecians' and 'Hebrews' could make themselves felt (*Acts* vi. 1). Evidence to the same

* On this whole subject see Delitzsch, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Poesie*; Freudenthal, *Hellenist. Stud.* 1, 2; Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes*.

^f In *Ber. R.* 23, the words: "They call their lands after their own names" (*Ps.* xlix. 11), is applied to the naming of Alexandria after Alexander the Great.

effect comes to us from such notices as that the work done in the temple by Alexandrian artificers proved unsatisfactory (Yoma, 38a; Er. 10b), and that the self-sufficiency of the Alexandrians had become so proverbial that it was said of a Rabbi on a certain occasion that he was a true Alexandrian.

This self-assertion may probably be accounted for by the circumstances of the Jewish community in Alexandria. If the Jews in other of the Grecian cities were under semi-independent *Archontes* or rulers of their own, those of Alexandria were under the government of their *Ethnarch*, whose authority was, however, transferred by Augustus to the whole "eldership" (Philo in *Flacc.* ed. Mangey, ii. 527). "Another," presumably Roman office, though for obvious reasons often filled by Jews, was that of the *Alabarch*, or rather *Arabarch*, who probably collected the revenue derived from the Arab population. Among others, Alexander, the brother of Philo, held that post. The firm of Alexander was probably as rich as the great Jewish banking and shipping house of Saramalla in Antioch. Its chief was entrusted with the management of the affairs of Antonia, the much respected sister-in-law of the emperor Tiberius. It was a small thing for such a man to lend King Agrippa, when his fortunes were very low, a sum of about 7000*l.*, with which to resort to Italy. Two of the sons of Alexander married daughters of King Agrippa, while a third, at the price of apostasy, rose successively to the posts of Procurator of Palestine and finally of Governor of Egypt. The temple at Jerusalem bore evidence of the wealth and munificence of this Jewish millionaire. The gold and silver with which the nine massive gates were covered, which led into the temple, were the gift of the great Alexandrian banker."

The prosperity and culture of the Jewish community at Alexandria, the peculiarly eclectic spirit characteristic of that city, and the singular opportunities which it afforded for acquiring knowledge and coming into contact with then modern thought, will explain how the direction known as Hellenism originated and developed there. It has already been stated that Philo was only its last and fullest representative. It would perhaps be too much to assert that many distinct traces of it are to be found in the LXX. version of the Old Testament. The number of really or presumably distinctive Hellenistic expressions has been reduced to two (Gen. i. 2, and Is. xlv. 18), and even these are open to some doubt. It is quite true that there is a marked endeavour to remove in the rendering of the Old Testament all anthropomorphisms and anthropopathies,¹ but neither is this quite consistently carried out,² nor yet is it peculiar to the Alexandrian translators. It is equally noticeable in the Targum Onkelos, in the Talmud,³ the Midrash, perhaps even

in the last revision which the Hebrew text itself may have undergone.⁴ And it has been argued,⁵ with great show of reason, that it needed not the Philonic nor any other system to suggest the desirableness of avoiding anthropomorphisms; that this had been taught by older thinkers; and indeed would appear natural and necessary to educated Greeks at that period. On the other hand, this Greek "time-spirit," manifesting itself in the translation of the LXX., is itself evidence of the tendency which issued in Hellenism.⁶ Nor should we here overlook the introduction of certain words and expressions in the LXX. (as in Job vii. 18, Ps. li. 12), which recall the terminology of the philosophical schools.

We advance another step in Hellenism with the work of Aristobulus, a Jewish peripatetic philosopher, of which Eusebius (*Praepar. Evang.* vii. 14; viii. 10; xiii. 12) and Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 342; v. 595; vi. 632) have preserved fragments.⁷ The book was a commentary on the Pentateuch addressed to King Ptolemy Philometor about 160-150 B.C. Its object was peculiar. As Hermippus (about 200 B.C.) had traced some of the doctrines of Pythagoras to Jewish sources (*Jos. ag. Ap.* i. 22), so Aristobulus sought to explain the accordance of the best teaching of the Greek philosophers with the law of Moses by their having derived their knowledge from the Jewish lawgiver. Accordingly there must have been, long before the version of the LXX., another translation of the law into Greek from which the most ancient and celebrated of the Greek poets and philosophers (Plato and also Pythagoras) had drawn. As previously stated, these quotations (from Orpheus, Linus, Homer, and Hesiod) are impudent forgeries, the bold assertion of which it is not easy to understand, although it is not certain whether Aristobulus himself or some other Jewish apologist was the author of these frauds. Apart from this, there cannot be question that Aristobulus not only derived from Platonic, Peripatetic, and Stoic philosophy the views which he expressed in his commentation on the Pentateuch,⁸ but also that as a Jew he remained, or thought he remained, within the boundary lines of his creed. Quite irrespective then of the question whether on some of the leading points in Philo's system he approximated that thinker, his use of Greek philosophy, his combination of it with, and derivation from, the teaching of the Old Testament, and his subordination of Greek wisdom to the Law, mark

did God come down from heaven nor man go up to it. (Sukk. 5a.)

¹ Compare here especially Geiger, *Urschr. u. Uebersetz. d. Bibel*. But his conclusions must be received with great caution.

² Zeller, *Philosophie d. Griech.* (3rd. ed.), vol. iii. p. 254.

³ On the distinction between Hellenism and Rabbinism in that respect, comp. *Life and Times of Jesus*, i. pp. 28, 29.

⁴ All notices about him are collected in L. C. Valckenauer's learned *Diatribē de Aristobulo Alexandrino Judaeo*, reprinted in Gaisford's (Oxford) ed. of Eusebius' *Praepar. Evang.* t. iv. pp. 339-451. For the genuineness of these fragments, against the objections of Jewish writers and of Kuenen, see Zeller, *u. s.* pp. 257-259, notes.

⁵ Comp. Zeller, *u. s.* pp. 262-264. See also *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, p. 36.

⁶ The quotation is from *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*.

⁷ Comp. Frankel, *Palaeost. Exegese, passim*; Siegfried, *Philo von Alex.* pp. 17, 18.

⁸ Thus the Theophanies are taken literally. Comp. the admissions of Dähne, *Gesch. Darstell. d. Jüd. Alexr. Religionsphil.* ii. pp. 33, 39.

⁹ Thus in connection with the history of Elijah the principle is almost indignantly enunciated—although perhaps not without an anti-Christian object—that never

a distinct advance in the development of Hellenism.⁹

In truth it is only what might be expected that Hellenism, as finally represented by Philo, should have passed through a process of development, although its fundamental principles would from the first find expression. For the philosophic ideas which it was intended to incorporate into, or rather to find in, the Old Testament had been expressed long before Philo. To say therefore that the statements of Aristobulus do not go beyond what may be traced to the influence of Platonic, Peripatetic, and Stoic philosophy, does not settle anything as regards his relation to Philo. For the essence of the system consisted in the peculiar theological use made of Greek philosophy; and differences could only obtain in the varied, or else in the more extensive, application of this fundamental principle. And Aristobulus already knew, and employed the allegorical method in the explanation of the Old Testament. On these points, however, we are under the disadvantage of possessing only a very scanty knowledge of Philo's predecessors. His own writings do not give the impression of originality. Besides, he repeatedly refers to the allegorical interpretations of others, as well as to canons of allegorism apparently generally recognised. He also enumerates differing allegorical interpretations of the same subjects.⁷ All this affords evidence of the existence of a school of Hellenist interpretation. Its leading characteristics appear in the epistle of Pseudo-Aristeas,⁸ in which he professes to inform his friend Philokrates of the circumstances connected with the LXX. translation of the Old Testament. It is not necessary to discuss the details of this legendary story. For our present purpose it suffices to note that this Aristeas, who passes himself off as a Greek, was really a Jew. His "Hellenism" is very advanced. Witness here his reference to the relation of "the part-Gods" to the supreme God, his identification of Zeus with the God of the Jews, and his identification of wisdom with piety. Nay, Aristeas ventures to put Alexandrianism even into the mouth of the Jewish high-priest Eleazar, not only as regards God and the Law, but in an allegorical interpretation of such special enactments as those concerning unclean animals which might have been regarded by the Greeks as superstitious if only literally interpreted.

This is not the place further to discuss the question of the presence of Alexandrian elements in other works of that period.¹⁰ They appear very fully, and closely approximating to the teaching of Philo, in the apocryphal "Wisdom of Solomon," and in what has been misnamed the fourth book of the Maccabees. In the former work we specially mark what is said about Wisdom (vii. 22—viii. 5; ix. 4, 9), when this property of the Almighty is so distinguished

⁹ See the Extracts from Aristobulus in Eusebius, *Præpar. Evang.* viii. 10, and xiii. 12.

¹⁰ The proof-passages for this and the preceding statement in Zeller, pp. 265, 266.

⁷ Most conveniently referred to as printed in Haverkamp's ed. of Josephus, vol. ii. (after the *Variae Lectiones*), pp. 163-132.

⁸ Doubtfully in the oldest portions of the Sibylline Books and in 2 and 3 Macc.—more clearly perhaps in Ecclus.

from Him as to be almost separated and hypothesised, while that which the Old Testament ascribes to God is there attributed to Wisdom (comp. also specially ch. x.). Similarly, we find there the same dualism as in Philo, as regards creation and man, as well as the same Stoic enumeration of the four cardinal virtues (viii. 7). But the so-called "Wisdom of Solomon" probably dates from about the time of Augustus, while it seems likely that what is known as the fourth book of the Maccabees—a stoic treatise on the supremacy of pious reason over the emotions—dates even later, possibly from about the time of Philo himself. We therefore proceed, so far as it is possible, to sketch it:

II. The Life of Philo.

Our scanty information is here chiefly derived from notices in his own writings (such as *Legat. ad Cai.* i. 22, 28; *de Leg. Allegor.* ii. iii. *passim*, for example, ii. 21, iii. 53; *de Spec. Leg.* ii. 1; *de Provid.* ed. Aucher, ii. § 107), from Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 8, 1; xix. 5, 1; xx. 5, 2), and from more or less authentic statements by later writers (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 4 sq.; *Præpar. Evang.* viii. 13 sq.; Jerome, *de viris illustribus*, c. 11; Photius, *Biblioth. Cod.* ciii. civ. cv.; Suidas, s. v. Φίλων). The scion of a distinguished and wealthy family, which had probably for generations taken a leading part in the commerce of Alexandria, and, at any rate, in its Jewish affairs, Philo was born in that city. So far as we can judge, he was a constant resident there, with only the exception of occasional journeys or of retirement for ascetic purposes (see the latter for example *de Leg. Allegor.* iii. 21). According to St. Jerome, Philo was of priestly descent. His own writings afford no evidence of it.¹¹ But of the worldly position of his family there cannot be doubt. Reference has already been made to the circumstance, that Philo's brother¹² occupied the high post of Alabarch. In his youth the latter had been in Rome and gained the friendship of Claudius. Afterwards he managed the affairs of Antonia, the mother of Claudius and the sister-in-law of Tiberius. We again recall that at a critical period in the life of Agrippa he was able to supply the Jewish king with the means needful

¹¹ I can scarcely see indication of it in the dignity which Philo attaches to the Levites (Ewald, *Gesch.* vi. pp. 258, 259), although I venture to think that, especially in Temple-times, some distinction would attach to such descent even—nay, in some respects, especially—outside Palestine. The statement (*de Provid.* § 107) that he had been sent by his countrymen as their representative to the temple: *ad orationem hostiasque offerendas* does not convey to me, as to Hausrath (*Neutest. Zeitg.* ii. i. p. 148), that he had offered them himself. Nor does it seem to me (as to Ewald) that this is materially affected by the recension in Eusebius (*apud Richter*, vi. p. 200): *εὐχομενός τε καὶ θύσανος*. There are many and weighty reasons against understanding this of the priestly functions.

¹² This is expressly stated by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 8, 1), and the fact that a nephew of Philo is also mentioned as bearing the name Alexander (in the *De Rat. animal.*, edited by Aucher, § 1, 72) does not prove that the Alabarch was the nephew, and not the brother, of Philo (so Ewald and Zeller). The suggestion of Bishop Pearson, that this Alexander was he of the high priest's kindred mentioned in Acts iv. 6, scarcely deserves serious discussion.

for prosecuting his cause; and that his sons afterwards intermarried with the family of that monarch. So close was his connection with the imperial house, that he gave to his son the name Tiberius Alexander. But it was not only worldly greatness which distinguished the family of Philo. Josephus, who records that by the munificence of the Alabarch the nine massive gates which opened into the temple were covered with silver and gold (*War*, v. 5, 3), also speaks of his religiousness (*Ant.* xx. 5, 2). Of this, however, he offers no further proof than that, unlike his son Alexander, he remained faithful to the Jewish faith. But such outward profession and even munificence to the temple would in no way be incompatible with great laxity of religious belief. That he specially occupied himself with religious philosophy appears even from the treatise "On Providence" which Philo addressed to him,⁷ and which must be regarded as embodying their discussions and the views urged upon him by Philo. On the other hand we learn from another tractate of Philo (*De Rat. animal.*),⁸ that in the view of the Alabarch, supported by the results of his observations and investigations, animals possessed the same kind of reason as man. Widely divergent as such notions were, not only from Judaism, but from all that Philo himself cherished and laboured to set forth, they afford instructive insight into the ferment of ideas on religious subjects in the higher ranks of Jewish society in Alexandria, into the causes which contributed to the formation of Hellenism, and into the process through which Philo must have passed in the development and construction of his own system.

Assuredly Philo himself was far removed from materialism. Again and again, and most earnestly, does he impress on us⁹ that pleasure must be considered the enemy of all true wisdom and piety, and that the body is the principle of evil and of death.¹⁰ All that we know of his outer and inner life accords with these views.¹¹ Of his training and culture, as indicating the sources of his system, we shall have occasion to speak in the sequel. Meantime suffice it that his acquaintance with so much of Greek poetic and philosophic literature, and his thorough appreciation of it, indicate to what pursuits his youth, if not his life, must have been devoted. At the same time he displays equally the fullest knowledge of the sacred writings of his people, mainly, indeed in their Greek rendering, yet implying at least some acquaintance with the Hebrew and Chaldee originals. Of his ardent, even enthusiastic, faith in the Jewish religion, it is scarcely necessary to speak.

⁷ Preserved (although Book I. not in its original condition) in a translation into Armenian, and edited in Latin by Aucher (*Venet.* 1822). Our quotations are from the reprint in Richter's ed. of the works of Philo (*Lips.* 1829-1830, viii. small vols.).

⁸ Also only preserved in Armenian translation and in the Latin of Aucher (a reference to it in Hieron. *u. s. ii.*).

⁹ So, for example, often and at great length in *de Legg. Alleg.*

¹⁰ So also in *de Legg. Alleg.* See for example, iii. 22.

¹¹ We are the more desirous of establishing this as Hausrath (*u. s.* p. 149), repeating the language of Delaunay (*Philon d'Alexandrie*, p. 16), charges Philo with luxurious self-indulgence and unreality in his professions to the contrary.

Indeed, if the teaching of the Old Testament was what Philo considered it: the basis and the crown of all that was wise, true, and lofty, in that Greek literature, of which he was so enamoured—it must have held charmed alike mind and heart of such an one as our philosopher. Again, his writings give also evidence of close and keen observation of nature, and of considerable attention to natural science. But a man whose mind was so constituted and so cultivated, and who was so copious an author, could not have lived in self-indulgence or the pursuit of pleasure. Indeed, occasionally we have a glimpse into his inner life.¹² Having, as he tells us, implanted in him from earliest youth a desire for learning, he describes his mental development, making in his own fashion allegorical application to it of the history of Sarah and Hagar in their relation to Abraham—although in very different use of it, both there and in other passages (*de Congr. quær. erud. gratia*, § 14, and again *de mutat. nom.* § 44), from that of St. Paul (*Gal.* iv. 22-31). Philo has it that before we reach that stage when we become the fathers of children by wisdom, which is virtue (Sarah), she seeks to benefit us by others. Thus Sarah gave to Abraham Hagar, that is, encyclical knowledge, yet ever retaining her own rule and place as the legitimate wife and mistress. So had it been in his own experience. Some were so attracted by the handmaidens as to forget the mistress, but he, when he came to woo and wed philosophy, had brought to her the offspring of those handmaidens, to whom, when "very young," he had successively joined himself—language and literature, geometry, and the science of music. In glowing terms he describes (*De spec. Legg. ad vi. viique Dec. c.* § 1) with what intense delight his whole being was filled during his study of the divine oracles and doctrines, "never entertaining any low or grovelling thoughts, nor wallowing in desire after glory or wealth, or the pleasures of the body," but dwelling far aloft in fellowship with the great Kosmos, and removed from all earthly paltriness and evil. Yet Philo always remained firmly attached to his Jewish faith, and that in the face of scoffers, such as the one over whose self-destruction he exults as fit punishment (*De mutat. nom.* end of § 8). If therefore Philo took part in the amusements of Alexandria, as seems only natural from his standpoint, which was not that of Christianity, it was with inward regrets, and still striving after the higher ideal. Oft in the midst of a crowd he brought his mind into solitude; or while attending banquets and feasts he put upon himself the bridle and discipline of reason, or else retired from them into solitude and the wilderness, though, alas, too often there to become conscious of the power of indwelling corruption (*De Leg. Allegor.* iii. §§ 21, 53).

In truth what Ewald has said of the writings of Philo may also be applied to his life. It exhibits the best that could be reflected from a soul that had not been touched by Christianity. That such a man should have been not only the fit ex-

¹² *De spec. Leg. ad vi. viique Decalogi cap.* § 1.

¹³ There Sarah represents virtue, whose offspring is, so to speak, true and direct: virtue from an innate good disposition, while Hagar is intermediate instruction, when knowledge comes from teaching.

ponent of the highest development of Hellenism, but also been chosen the representative and spokesman of his people, is only what might be expected. In point of fact, he appears in that capacity in the few incidents of his life of which we are historically certain. From the circumstance that at the time of his embassy to Caius Caligula (A.D. 40) he describes himself as aged (*Legat. ad Caium*, §§ 1, 28), we infer that Philo was born between the years 30 and 20 before Christ. Probably he died not very long after his return from Rome, and during the reign of Claudius (A.D. 41-54). He was thus an older contemporary of St. Paul. When we consider his age, and his relation to Hellenism, and, on the other hand, the outward circumstances of the rising Church, we can scarcely wonder that he had apparently not been brought into contact with the work and writings of St. Paul. Still less do we marvel that he should have been apparently unacquainted with the announcement of the Baptist and with what, to such as he, would have seemed its yet more strange realisation in Jesus of Nazareth. One like Philo must have been brought into close personal contact with the Christ in order to have been influenced by Him. Probably he had never heard of that Teacher of Nazareth, Who had brought the deeper and fuller reality of his own strange dreams and feeling after the truth. No historical value attaches to the report mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 17) that Philo had held familiar intercourse with St. Peter in Rome, any more than to his identification of the *Therapeutae* (on whom, see below) with the ascetics of the early Christian communities planted by St. Mark in Egypt (*Eus. u. s.* 16), nor to the supposed reverence of Philo for those "Apostolic men of his day, sprung probably from the Hebrews," who had continued to observe the old customs. To this legend, more confidently repeated by Jerome, Photius (*Biblioth. Cod. cv.*) adds the report, that Philo had been baptised but afterwards seceded from the church *διὰ τινὰ λύπην καὶ ὀργήν*.

Of Philo's domestic life it is not easy to speak with confidence. It has been asserted that he was married, and that his wife had said, in an assembly of noble women, when asked why she alone of them wore not golden ornaments, that a husband's virtue was sufficient ornament for his wife (*ex Antonio*, ed. Richter, vi. 236, *Ser.* cxxiii.). But the story seems to rest on a misreading of Philon for Phokion (Zeller, *u. s.* p. 340, note). Nor yet can any inference, either as to his single estate or his married unhappiness, be drawn from the very unfavourable account which he gives of women and of the effects of marriage on a man, by which he became changed from a freeman into a slave (in the fragment of the *Apologia pro Jud.* quoted by Mangey and Richter as from Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* viii. 8; in Gaisford's ed. viii. 11, vol. ii. pp. 300, 301). For, there Philo is concerned to vindicate abstinence from marriage as enjoined by the Essenes. And just as we know from his own writings that he mixed in society and even took part in its pleasures, so may he have been married, although in theory he may have regarded the other state as every way preferable. At the same time the absence of any reference to wife or children, or even to domestic life, seems significant. But what we are chiefly

concerned with, is, to defend Philo from the charge of untruthfulness as regards the asceticism which he professed. In further evidence of his views and mode of living, we here appeal to a very striking passage in which he denounces all frivolity, and warns against indulgence in anything that was not absolutely necessary to life (*de Somn.* ii. §§ vii.-x.). After a very unfavourable description of Joseph as representing the possession of the vain things of this world, he proceeds to denounce the prevailing luxury in food, cookery, dress, houses, furniture, drink, in short in every department of life. Instead of this he bids us practise the utmost frugality in all things. And he concludes by calling upon the soul to cut off a right hand^f—to hate what it had loved, and not like Adam to prefer the two (trees) of the creature to the great Unit, the Creator, but to go forth beyond the smoke and tempest, to flee from the whirlpool of life, and as the proverb had it: not to touch it even with the tip of the finger^g—rather to gird itself up for the sacred ministrations which are "the speculations of wisdom."

It was the custom of the extra-Palestinian Jews to send their contributions and gifts to the temple. Otherwise also they were wont to depute representatives to offer the prayers and sacrifices of their communities. It was only natural that a man every way so distinguished among his coreligionists as Philo should have been chosen for this honourable duty by the Alexandrian, if not generally the Egyptian, Jews. With great modesty he only incidentally refers to it in another connection (*de Provid.* ii. § 107, and the corresponding passage in Eusebius, *Praepar. evang.*), although in a manner showing how closely he had observed everything around. At a later period, he was called, much against his will, to take part in the public affairs, communal or general, of his native city. Most regretfully does he speak of having been drawn from his beloved studies and from solitude, and cast into the sea of politics, with all the cares and troubles which this involved. In the midst of these hateful occupations his comfort was to be able often to rise superior to that in which he was engaged, to indulge in his chosen pursuits, or else to escape from men and public affairs into loved retirement (*de Leg. spec.* ad vi. vii. Dec. c. § 1). We know what forced Philo into a current so contrary to that of his former life. He speaks of a *μισόκαλος φθόνος*, an ill will and malice that hated all good. The political circumstances of his time and people furnish only too plain a commentary to this, although, with his usual charity, Philo avoids (as so often) personal mention of those whom he had to stigmatise, and with his wonted modesty keeps himself and his activity as much as might be in the background. But

^f The saying must not be confounded with the words of our Lord (St. Matth. v. 30), although the form is similar. Not only is the object of Philo quite different, but his immediate reference is to Deut. xxv. 12.

^g Here also the reader will mark similarity of form with expressions in the Apostolic epistles, which only render the more striking the absolute contrariety as regards the object of the Apostles' teaching. The whole subject of the relation between Philo and the Apostolic epistles is too large for discussion here, and must be reserved for special treatment on another occasion.

the sky which for well nigh four centuries had been so bright over the Jewish community of Alexandria (*Legat. ad Cai. 44*) was rapidly becoming overcast, and there were gathering signs of a terrible storm that would soon burst. Whether envy of the wealth and immunities of those prosperous Jews inflamed that national hatred which mostly seems to lurk in the hearts of Gentiles against Israel, or the latter partly provoked it by their overbearing deportment, there was ill-feeling and bad blood in the Egyptian and Roman population of Alexandria, as regarded the synagogue and all its members. And when we remember that the populace and even the better classes were almost absolutely swayed by that intense hater and persecutor of the Jews, Apion—a man for whose lying, ignorance, charlatanism, conceit, boastfulness, and unscrupulousity it is difficult to find adequate terms—it will be understood what the result would be. The mischief broke out so early as the latter part of the reign of Tiberius. Philo informs us that the Roman governor—not the Flaccus of whom we shall presently speak^b—desirous of forcing the Jews into apostasy, began by insisting on their breaking the sacred labour-rest of the Sabbath. The reasoning which he employed is sufficiently indicative of his temper and bearing. Arguing that, if calamities such as would destroy their own and their families' lives and property, were to threaten them, they would bestir themselves to active exertion on the Sabbath, he urged that he himself, who ordered them to work, was, in virtue of the power he wielded, all the evils which he had enumerated: whirlwind, war, deluge, thunderbolt, famine, pestilence, and earthquake (*de Somn. ii. § 18*). Little, or rather anything, might be expected from one whom Philo designates as not a man, but as an evil of some extraordinary kind, a calamity brought from far over the sea, or come from some other planet. Happily this unnamed governor was obliged to desist. But far more grievous evil befell the unhappy Jews under the reign of Caligula. His mad desire to be worshipped as a God, which led to such manifestation of feeling and such mischief, offered to the Alexandrians, who in their frivolity would have worshipped any god, the welcome opportunity of carrying out their designs against the hated Jews. The last incentive was given by the sudden and unexpected arrival of Agrippa, whom Caius had elevated to royalty over the tetrarchy of Philip, and who, by command of the emperor, had taken the more expeditious journey by one of the great liners to Alexandria, rather than risk the more dangerous and uncomfortable sail directly to Syria. The appearance among them of a Jewish king, attended by a body-guard, excited to absolute fury the ill- and well-dressed mob of Alexandria, which, as Philo has it, added to the naturally jealous and envious disposition of the Egyptians "an ancient" and "innate" hatred of the Jews (*in Flacc. § 5*). The Roman governor, Avilius Flaccus, had been previously gained against them. His jealous fears were now stimulated to the utmost. Unchecked and even secretly favoured, the Alexandrians enjoyed a hey-day of Antisemitism. From private and personal insults to Agrippa, they proceeded to

speeches in the public schools, and to doggerel lampoons and gibes of the popular kind. Finally a great demonstration was made in the Gymnasium. Thither they dragged a harmless lunatic, arrayed him with a crown of flattened papyrus leaf, in a door-mat for a mantle, and with a papyrus-rod for sceptre, while the youth of Alexandria stood around him as mock bodyguard, and the multitude hailed him Mari, which was the Syriac mode of addressing kings. What followed (*in Flacc. § 6-11*) reads terribly like Antisemitic movements in all ages, to our own enlightened days. The first rush of the mob was to the synagogues to place in them statues of the emperor—for, were not the Jews dangerous despisers of the religion and customs of the empire, and, indeed, hostile aliens in its midst? Next the wretched sufferers were driven together, and shut up in one narrow quarter of the city, while the mob plundered their houses at will. When hunger drove the poor outcasts beyond the boundaries to which they had been confined, they were set upon and put to torture and death amid terrible sufferings, their lifeless bodies being dragged to pieces through the streets. But this was not all. A show of right must be given to these proceedings. The rule of the Jewish community in Alexandria had been committed by Augustus to a council of elders. Thirty-eight of the most aged and venerated among them were now arrested by order of Flaccus, and driven, bound with thongs or in chains, to the theatre, where they were stripped and scourged in a manner only done to the lowest populace, and never to Jews. Some of them died under the lash; the others had a brief life of suffering left them. Other horrors followed: scourging, hanging up, and torturing on the wheel—all as part of public theatrical entertainments, to be followed by the execution of the victims on the fatal cross or otherwise. The excuse for this was that the Jews had concealed arms for attack on the people and authorities. But the most rigid search brought nothing to light, though it gave occasion for every insult and indignity. It may, however, have been (for the only account we possess is the indignant, rather than historically precise, narrative of Philo) that the sufferings of the elders and others had been in punishment of their resistance to the worship of Caius; and that Flaccus, professing to act all along in his Roman magisterial capacity, had made farther show of enforcing peace between the two parties in Alexandria by searching for arms in the houses of the Jews, having previously taken away those of the Gentile population.¹

Even before the arrival of Agrippa in Alexandria, the Jews had prepared a memorial to the emperor, which Flaccus, who still deceived them, had promised to forward with his own recommendation. Needless to say, it was never despatched. Agrippa, indeed, sent it to Rome with a letter of his own, but nothing came of it. But the days of Flaccus' governorship

¹ This is the view of Ewald. But against it is the circumstance, that Philo ascribes the search for Jewish weapons to foreign influence; that he speaks of a desire to incite the army against the Jews as the motive of Flaccus; that he describes the search as wholly unexpected; and, lastly, that he attributes the disarming of the Egyptian population to quite other causes than the tumults against the Jews.

^b Comp. Ewald, u. s. p. 265, note 1.

were numbered. While the Jews were observing their Feast of Tabernacles, and crying to the God Who had brought them through the perils of the wilderness, their persecutor was recalled to Rome, condemned to banishment, and soon afterwards killed. There was now no longer any hindrance to carrying their petitions and complaints before the emperor—unpromising as this must have appeared. A deputation of three was appointed to go to Rome. Philo was chosen their leader and spokesman. Nor could anyone have been found in every respect equally fitted for the task. The Alexandrian counter-deputation was headed by Apion.^k The Jewish deputies travelled in the storms of winter. They were not allowed to see the emperor in Rome, but had to follow him to one of his country-houses. Philo has left an account of the humiliating audience granted to the Jews (*De Legat. ad Cai.* §§ 44 to end of the tractate). They found Caius surrounded by all their bitterest enemies, and indignant not only at the Alexandrian but also at the Palestinian Jews, who refused to receive his statue. No regular hearing was given them, but the emperor hurried from room to room, asking questions about the rights to which the Jews appealed, only to interrupt their answers by continuing his inspection of the villa, expressing anger, or else scoffing, as at their abstinence from swine's flesh. Alternately held in terror for their lives and in horror at the blasphemies to which they had to listen, Caius finally dismissed them with the remark, that these people were not so wicked as unfortunate and foolish in not believing in his divinity. Josephus records that Philo had gone from the imperial presence with these words of comfort to his friends, to be of good courage, since Caius' words indeed showed anger at them, but that in reality they had set God against himself. In the following year Claudius ascended the throne of the Caesars. At tidings of this the Jewish population of Alexandria took up arms to recover their immunities. Claudius interposed on their behalf. Not only was the Alabarch (the brother of Philo) set free from prison, but the emperor issued a decree which restored the liberties and privileges of the Jews. This decree deserves careful perusal. It seems to establish these three points, to which we have previously called attention: that the envy of their Gentile neighbours was provoked by the privileges and immunities which the Jews legally possessed; that attacks upon them were first directed against their religious practices, especially their Sabbath-observance; and that the Jews were too apt to provoke hostility by the contempt which they showed towards others. (*Jos. Ant.* xix. 5, 2.)

Philo must have lived for some years after his return from Rome (probably from ten to fifteen years). He wrote several tractates referring to this embassy, of which one if not more have been lost. Possibly other of his works may date from the same period. It has been conjectured^l

^k We owe our knowledge of this to Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 8, 1). Philo does not name Apion, which Ewald attributes to forbearance on the ground that Apion was alive when Philo wrote—a display of delicacy towards a literary opponent which sounds strange in our days.

^l By Delaunay (*u. s.* pp. 33, 34), who is, however, not always trustworthy in his facts.

that in extreme old age, following his loving bent for solitude and asceticism, he had retired to die among those Therapeutes, to whom Philo introduces us in his tractate *De Vita Contemplativa*. If he wrote this treatise about that time, it would dispose of some of the objections that have been urged against its genuineness, as well as against the existence of the Therapeutes. But this opens up literary questions to which we must refer in connection with an account of:

III. *The Writings of Philo: Criticism of the Text.*

As on other subjects, on which information is not complete, much and very diverse has been written on the tractates of Philo and their order. Only such brief sketch of the subject can here be presented as seems necessary for the information of the reader. The writings of Philo are referred to by Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 8, 1), and lists of them are given by Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 18), to which may be added those of Jerome, Photius, and Suidas. Of the works mentioned by Eusebius, some exist only in a fragmentary form, while others are wholly lost. It must be left undiscussed whether, as Ewald supposes, the larger works of Philo had at an early period been cut up into different tractates, such as we now possess them. External evidence to that effect there is little. The following is a brief account of the principal editions of Philo's works.^m The earliest is that of Turnebus, Paris, 1552 (containing only thirty-nine treatises). To this were afterwards added the treatises published by David Hoeschelius, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1587. Then comes the Geneva edition of 1613, which added the tractate *De Mundo* to the others, and a Latin translation of all. Next we have what is generally known as the *Paris edition*, 1640, which the Frankfort edition of 1691 closely follows (it contains also Hoeschel's edition of the *De Septenario* and *De Providentia Fragmenta*). Lastly, we have what may be regarded as still the best edition, that by Thomas Mangey, 2 vol. London, 1742. The learned editor added to the other works of Philo, from the Vatican codex, in which alone it exists, the tractate *De Posteritate Caini*. To these Cardinal (Angelo) Mai further added (Mediolani, 1818) the two tractates *De Festo Cophini* and *De Parentibus colendis*, and afterwards other fragments. Finally, there were added to all the others certain treatises existing in an Armenian version, found in a MS. at Louberg in 1791 by Dr. Zohrab, and published in a Latin translation at Venice (the MS. having been sent to the Armenian monastery of St. Lazarus at Venice) by J. B. Aucher, vol. i. (1822) *de Providentia, libri ii.* and *de Animalibus*; *Quaest. in Gen. libri iv.*; *Quaest. in Ex. libri ii.*; *Sermo de Sampsone*; *de Iona*; *de Tribus Angelis Abraamo apparentibus*, vol. ii. (1826). To the critical Apparatus of Mangey something has been added in the incomplete edition of A. F. Pfeiffer (5 vols. Erlangen, 1785-92). Finally, we must mention the im-

^m Compare Fürst, *Bibliotheca Jud.* vol. iii. 1863 (pp. 87-93), who gives the literature to that date—although the notices are not always accurate; Delaunay, *Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1867; Schrfer, *Gesch. d. Jud. Volkes*.

portant contribution made to his literature by J. B. Card. Pitra (*Analecta Sacra* T. ii. 1884) containing:—1, fragments from the *Cortex Coislinianus* (of the eleventh century), viz., from *de Mund. Opif.* 3; from *Leg. Alleg.* 6; *Quaest. in Gen.* 2; in *Ex.* 4; *de Gener. Ab.* 1; *de Gig.* 1; *de Ebr.* 1; *de Mut. nom.* 2; *de Relig.* 1; in *Flacc.* 1; *ex cap. metr.* 1. 2. Fragments from Vatican MSS. Among them we note one (v.) to which the learned editor adds in a note the question whether it may not contain a reference to the Therapeutes. 3. An enumeration of the principal Vatican Codices, together with an *excursus*. 4. An account of the succession of the Philonic tractates according to these MSS. 5. Remarks on the ancient Latin versions of Philo, 6, and, most interesting to us, Latin versions of the greater part of *de Vita Contempl.* He also notes that the *Cod. Zohrab* contains an Armenian version of this tractate—and in general that this codex is *dignissimus nota recensione*.

The edition of C. E. Richter (Lips. 1828–30, viii. small vols.) simply reproduces the old text. But it is most serviceable, not only as containing all the works of Philo (from Mangey, Maï, and Aucher) but as being the most handy, and giving in the margin continuous reference to the corresponding pages in the Paris edition and in that of Mangey, as well as to those in the volumes of Maï and of Aucher.¹ It would occupy too much space to enumerate the various translations of Philo. Suffice it that Fürst (*Bibl. Jud.* iii. s. v. *Philon*) gives the titles of not less than thirty-three versions, either of all the works of the Alexandrian, or of one or more of them (thirteen into Latin, four into Hebrew, three into German, three into French, six into Italian, three into English, and one into Spanish). Since then other versions have appeared, such as Delaunay's French rendering of the *in Flaccum* and *ad Caium*, and the translation of all the works of Philo into English (1854–55) by C. D. Yonge (4 vols. But of the Tractates edited by Aucher, only the three first books of the *Quaest. in Gen.* are given). The translation is careful and faithful, but too often not intelligible,² partly from the confusion of sentences, and partly from the absence of any explanation of Philo's philosophical terminology. Still, great credit is due to the learned translator.

It has already been stated that, as regards the critical *Apparatus*, little progress has been made by Pfeiffer beyond the text of Mangey. Yet for many reasons an accurate collation of the MSS. is not only most desirable in the present state of the text, but even absolutely requisite for critical purposes. All the more therefore is it to be regretted that the collation actually made by Tischendorf for a proposed edition of Philo's works by *Chr. Aenoth. Orthob.*

Grossmann, has—with the exception of a few specimens—been lost to the learned world on the death of that writer. Tischendorf had collated for that purpose not only all the MSS. at Paris but also those in the libraries of Italy, with the result of making many emendations on, and additions to the text of Mangey. The loss of the *Apparatus* collected for Grossmann led Tischendorf in 1856 during a journey to Italy to take in hand once more the best existing codices of Philo: the *Vatican* and the *Codex Laurentianus* in Florence. The latter (of which Tischendorf [*Philonea*, 1868] gives a photographed specimen page) is a beautiful MS. dating from the beginning of the 13th century. In the small work just quoted Tischendorf shows by many instances that Maï, who copied from this codex the *De Festo Coph.* (which really forms part of the *De Septenario*) and the *De Parentibus col.*, both of which are really integral parts of the first tractate *De specialibus Legibus*, had been guilty of serious inaccuracies and mistakes. Tischendorf further notes that Hoeschel had, in his edition of the *De Septenario*, made use of the Munich codex 117, and of a transcript of it. This codex dates from the fifteenth or sixteenth century, and is much more clearly written than the *Laurentianus*, but critically inferior in value to it. We have already stated that Mangey was the first to edit from the *Codex Vaticanus* the *De Posteritate Caini*.³ The edition having been made from a copy of the original MS., not only reproduced the obvious errors in the codex, but added others due to the transcriber, partly owing to his carelessness, partly to the difficulties of the MS. Some of these have been corrected by Mangey, others by Tischendorf. The work which he published (*Philonea*, 1865) contains the first and only critical edition of the first treatise *De specialibus Legibus* (on the third, fourth, and fifth commandments), to which he joined what really forms part of that treatise (though always given under separate headings, as): the *De Septenario*, the *De Festo Coph.*, and the *De Parentibus colendis*. It would be out of place here to mark in detail the critical value of his emendations and notes. But we notice specially (1) that the chapters in Tischendorf's text do not correspond to the paragraphs in Richter's edition. The latter frequently divides the text wrongly, and so introduces confusion. This as well as the omissions from the text render it difficult to understand the meaning and argument. The headings of the chapters are taken by Tischendorf from the margin of the *Cod. Laurent.* We notice (2) these headings to the various chapters; (3) that in the heading to what in Richter's edition (vol. v. p. 20) forms § 2 of *De Septenario*, the inscription taken from the *Cod. Laurent.* differs from that of Hoeschelius in leaving out the disturbing addition which we have italicised "Concerning the Festivals, that they are ten in number."⁴ (4) After § 16 in

¹ The two editions italicised are those generally quoted. In the Richter the Paris edition of 1640, which that of Frankfort, 1691, follows, is marked by the initial letter P.; the edition of Mangey by the initial letter M. The tractates edited by Aucher are commonly quoted A I, A II.

² It is an ungrateful task to point out defects in an undertaking so difficult and laborious. But not only is the arrangement of the tractates bewildering, but the student of Philo would be often misled if he were to use the translation without consulting the Greek original.

³ The tractate is not mentioned by Eusebius, nor by Jerome, Photius, nor Suidas. But Tischendorf conjectures that it may have been comprehended under some other tractate, such as the *Allegoriae*, of the sacred laws. He also shows that it was not known to Jerome, since otherwise he would have made use of it in his interpretation of Hebrew names, in which he follows Philo and Origen.

Richter's edition (p. 38; ed. M. ii. p. 291) follow a chapter (xix.) hitherto unedited (consisting of only five lines); two others (xx. and xxi.) equally unedited; another (xxii.) of which very little, and that inaccurately, had been edited (ed. Richter, § 17; ed. M. ii. 292); then three chapters (xxiii. xxiv. xxv.) partially edited before (Richter, §§ 18, 19; M. ii. 292, 293); in chap. xxvi. (ed. Richter § 20) three large pieces are added which do not occur in previous editions; chap. xxvii. is almost wholly new (the fragment, preserved in Richter, § 20); in chap. xxviii. there are again many lacunae in other editions (R. § 21); and the same holds true to even a larger extent in regard to chap. xxx. After some omissions from chap. xxxi. follows as chap. xxxii. what Mai and others have published as *De Festo cophini*, and with chap. xxxiii. the *De Parentibus colendis*, in which we only note that what in Mai and the later editions consists of three paragraphs (9-11) forms here a special chapter (xxxiv.) with the title "On False Swearers."

The preceding very brief critical analysis of the chief results of Tischendorf's labours must suffice without adding a similar account of his text of the *de Posteritate Caini*, or of the three small pieces which he publishes (two from the Vatican codices, 379 and 746, the third from a codex of the 10th century in the library of the patriarch of Alexandria). To the results of Tischendorf's critical labours require now to be added those of Pitra, which, besides their intrinsic value, will be very helpful for the guidance of future critical investigators. For, it will be observed that as yet we possess the critical text of only two of all the works of Philo.^a How much still remains to be done, may be gathered from the circumstance that, according to Tischendorf, there are forty MSS. of Philo (Pitra enumerates 14 Greek and 10 Latin Vatican Codices), and that, besides these a fresh version of the Armenian codex is urgently required. This must be the first task; the next, and scarcely less important one would be to arrange the tractates, now scattered and torn up, into the works to which they belong (as has been indicated with regard to the *de Specialibus Legibus*) and, if possible, to classify them, alike in their logical sequence and perhaps in the order of their real succession. The last task would be to ascertain whether any, and which, of the tractates ascribed to Philo are spurious, and generally to eliminate all interpolations.

IV. Tractates invalidated: the *De Vita Contemplativa* and the *Therapeutes*.

As regards the question of genuineness or interpolation we ought to keep in mind the caution of Ewald (*u. s. p. 339*, note—perhaps not always remembered by that profound critic himself), that there are now-a-days people who would like to ascribe whatever does not suit them to Christian authorship [interpolation]. In the 17th century a Socinian ascribed all the works of Philo to a Christian falsifier of the second century. He was abundantly refuted by our own countryman, Peter Allix (*Judgment of the*

^a It should however be added that the elegant French translation of the *De Vita Contempl.*, by Delaunay *Moines et Sibylles*, Paris, 1874, pp. 89-122, is based on a critical revision of the text.

Ancient Jewish Church against the Unitarians, London, 1699, reprinted by the Clarendon Press, 1821). In our time (1841) the same theory was revived, with the modification of several Christian falsifiers, by a Jewish writer, Kirschbaum, to whom Grossmann replied with more than needful detail (*de Phil. oper. cont. serie*, Lips. 1841-42). The two orations, "in Sampson," and "de Jona," translated from the Armenian by Aucher (ed. Richter, vii. pp. 350-376) have been generally, and rightly, regarded as spurious, although (as Ewald rightly remarks, *u. s. p. 304, 305*, note) they present no clear mark of Christian authorship. The *de mundo*—probably compiled from Philonic writings—and the *de incorruptibilitate mundi* (ed. Richter, vi. pp. 1-37), are also generally rejected. The objections against the genuineness of the *Quod omnis probus liber* (ed. Richter, v. pp. 269-302), and still more those against the *de Legatione ad Caicum* (ed. R. vi. pp. 77-147) have been proved groundless. Zeller (*u. s. p. 340*, note) rejects the first of the two books *de Providentia* (ed. R. viii. pp. 8-44). But the most serious attacks have of late been directed against the *De Vita contemplativa* (ed. R. v. pp. 302-323). These, especially as formulated in the ingenious, learned, and exhaustive treatise of P. C. Lucius (*Die Therapeuten*, Strassburg, 1879), involve not only the genuineness of that tractate, but, what is historically more important, the existence of the Therapeutes of whom it gives an account, and who have hitherto been commonly regarded as a kind of Egyptian counterpart of the Essenes. The question is of such importance, and so novel among ourselves, as to demand some special consideration.

The great preliminary difficulty of the theory of Lucius appears when its outcome is finally set forth. It is maintained (p. 154) that the tractate in question is the fabrication of a Christian at the end of the third, or in the first years of the fourth, century after Christ; and that it was intended as an apology for the ascetics of that time and especially of Egypt. Their practices were to be vindicated by the testimony of Philo—an equally *grata persona* with Jews and heathen philosophers—to the effect, that there had been an ancient Jewish sect, the Therapeutes, whose practice was similar to that of the Christian ascetics. And if the theory could otherwise be established, there would be *à priori* presumption in its favour from the circumstance that Eusebius, who is the first to refer alike to this tractate of Philo and to the Therapeutes, brings them into such marked connection with the ascetics of Egypt and the supposed disciples of St. Mark. But, as Lucius himself admits, the silence of writers previous to Eusebius cannot be regarded as proof of the non-existence of the Therapeutes, while, on the other hand, if they had really existed—or at any rate, if the *De Vita contemplativa* was a Philonic tractate—it would only be natural for such a writer as Eusebius

^r See especially the full discussion by Bernays (*Gesammelte Abh. i. 282-290*). Frankel, whose strictures must however be taken with caution (as in the case of his unwarranted attack on the *Quod omnis probus liber*), has shown some strong reasons against the *de Incorrupt. Mundi*, which he regards as an enlarged redaction of the equally spurious tractate *de Mundo* (Palaest. u. Alexandr. Schriftforsch. in the Programm d. Jud. Theol. Seminars, 1854, pp. 32, 33, note).

to bring them into such connection with the Christian ascetics. Nor is the argument of Lucius advanced by the fabulousness of the notice in Eusebius about a supposed intercourse between St. Peter and Philo, and the imaginary praise of the disciples of St. Mark by the latter. All this only proves that Eusebius really believed that the Therapeutae were "a sect." And, in general, such legends are of too frequent occurrence to derive from them any specific historic inference. On the other hand, there are serious, and to our mind fatal, preliminary objections to the theory of Lucius. For, as he himself admits (especially p. 163), there is no evidence of Christian ascetics at that time living together in communities, still less of such communities consisting promiscuously of males and females* (such as the *Therapeutai* and *Therapeutrides* of Philo); while even the ingenuity of Lucius cannot find a parallel among Christian ascetics for what Philo describes as the "greatest feast" of the Therapeutae, that of the fiftieth day (*De V. Cont.* 8, 9). Accordingly Lucius is obliged to represent this as a fabrication—so far as regards the day—based on the sacredness which Philo ascribes to the number 50, and intended to disguise under a Philonic garb a description of the Christian ascetic Sabbath and Sunday observances.¹ But surely the invention of a fiftieth day feast, for which there is not any *analogon* among Christian ascetics, was not necessary; while the charge of fabrication as regards so important a part of Therapeutic practice would throw doubt upon all parallelism between the Therapeutae and the Christian ascetics. Till these preliminary difficulties are cleared away, no solid argument can be built on the fact that there were at that time male and female Christian ascetics, and that many of their practices closely resembled those which the Philonic tractate attributes to the Therapeutae. For, on the one hand some of the most important Christian rites have no *analogon* in the description of the Therapeutae, while, on the other hand, Asceticism—whether Jewish, Christian, or even pagan—would necessarily always develop in the same direction. For a detailed discussion of this aspect of the question we must refer to the Article "Mönchtum," by Weingarten (in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. x. pp. 761-764). The reasons there urged against the identification of the Therapeutae with the Ascetics of the third century do not seem set aside by the considerations advanced in the subsequent Article "Therapeuten" (*u. s.* xv. pp. 548-550). For it does not appear admissible to argue that we may gain from the *de V. Cont.* fresh knowledge of the practices of the early Ascetics, since such knowledge would be based on the assumption of the very fact which it was required to prove. Weingarten himself denies the Philonic authorship of the *de V. Cont.* and ascribes it (with Renan and others) to Jewish

Hellenistic circles, not long after Philo. But, surely, if the "figment" of the Therapeutae cannot be traced to the Ascetics of the third century, still less is there any trace of a Jewish Hellenist community (apart from the "Therapeutae") which could have served as the historical basis for the spurious tractate. We submit that, as a first necessity of the argument, some adequate motive for the "invention" of the Therapeutae must be historically found. But if neither Christian nor Jewish counterpart can be found for the "Therapeutae," it seems extremely difficult to believe that only a short time after the death of Philo a "sect" should have been "invented" which had never any existence, and a treatise, specially written to describe its imaginary practices, ascribed to Philo, when all readers must have known that he could not have so solemnly vouched for that which was a pure fiction. And we further venture to add, that the main strength of the argument against the *de V. contempl.* turns on the question of the Therapeutae.

We have hitherto treated the *Therapeutae* as a "sect." We hasten to correct that statement by designating them more accurately as a school or party. Even a superficial examination will show such manifest and important differences between them and the Essenes of Palestine² as to make it clear that they could not have been an Egyptian branch of that community. In truth, the Therapeutae were not at all a sect in the twofold sense of either holding doctrines fundamentally diverging from those of the Alexandrian Jewish community, or separating themselves (as the Essenes) from the practices observed by them. They were neither heretics nor yet seceders from the synagogue, but rather an inner, esoteric, circle in it, where the principles which underlay Alexandrian Judaism found their outward expression.³ In this view four points seem of importance.

1. Philo gives the designation of Therapeutae not merely to "a sect," but frequently employs the term in the more ordinary sense of "servants of God." Thus in the *De Sacrific. Ab. et Caini*, § 4 (ed. Richter, i. 235), in *De Vita Moys.* iii. § 14 (ed. R. iv. p. 213), and in *De Praem. et poen.* § 18 (ed. R. v. p. 241). Or else he connects the two terms "suppliant" and "servant" (*ἰκέτης καὶ θεραπευτής*) as in *Quod det. potiori insid.* § 44 (ed. R. i. p. 310); in *De Migr. Abr.* § 22 (ed. R. ii. p. 319); in *De Congr. erud. grat.* § 19 (ed. R. iii. p. 92); or in *De Vict. offer.* § 10 (ed. R. iv. p. 351). Most important in this connection, is the meaning which, as we gather, Philo attached to this *θεραπευτής*, as not any real service of God but a contemplative and ascetic life (see especially *Quod det. potiori insid.* § 16, ed. R. i. pp. 282, 283; and § 44, *u. s.* p. 310).

¹ It is scarcely necessary to say that the *De Vita cont.* does not identify the two. It starts with a laudatory reference to the mode of life adopted by the Essenes, and proceeds to a still more laudatory and full description of those who eagerly follow the contemplative life (*τῶν θεωριῶν ἀσπασαμένων*).

² It seems scarcely requisite to refute the suggestion of an organic connection between the Therapeutae and Neo-Pythagoreanism; still less, that Philo had invented this fictitious community for the purpose of setting forth an imaginary model of ascetic and contemplative life (Zöckler, in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* xi. 638).

* Of Hierakas and the Hierakites we need not here speak, since—even supposing the account of Epiphanius (*Haeres.* 67) to be quite trustworthy—Lucius himself disclaims the manifestly impossible identification of the Hierakites with the Therapeutae, or the inference that the *De V. cont.* was intended as an apology for that party (Lucius, *u. s.* pp. 144, 145). On this point see also the article "Mönchtum," in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* 2nd ed. vol. x., pp. 760, 761.

¹ Lucius, p. 179.

This description of the true Therapeutae quite accords with what is afterwards carried out in detail in the Tractate which gives an account of the so-called sect of the Therapeutae. In fact, even Philo's hesitation as to whence exactly to derive this name—or rather how to account for it (*De Vita cont.* § 1, ed. R. v. pp. 304, 305), seems to point in the direction of our general conclusion. There appears no reason to think of a special "sect," but rather of an esoteric circle of *illuminati*. Again, one of the most instructive passages is that in *Quod omnis prob. lib.* § 12 (ed. R. v. p. 285), in which after having shown that there were "wise men," in his sense of the term, in every nation, Philo points for that wisdom in Palestine to the Essenes, whom he designates the "Therapeutae of God" (*θεραπευταὶ θεοῦ*). These two things then seem clear. In the higher sense there were Therapeutae in every nation—although no mention is made of Therapeutic communities—and this is specially Philonic; while, on the other hand, to Jews the Essene practice would represent that rule of life which, so far as possible, they should follow. And this also accords with the otherwise strange conjunction of the Essenes with the "Therapeutae" in the introduction of the tractate on the Contemplative Life. It accounts for more than this, and explains how those "Contemplatives" should have, some occasionally, most of them constantly, withdrawn to a convenient place near busy Alexandria—a kind of "retreat," which, if it had been the monastery of "a sect" of strict ascetics, would scarcely have been located there. The "Therapeutae" were as little "a sect" as the original "Methodists;" they were Alexandrian Methodists (if the expression be lawful), or like the inhabitants of the Württemberg settlement of Korntal.

2. This leads us to the second point of importance, which can be treated more briefly. Philo speaks of the Therapeutae as existing not only chiefly in Egypt, where the neighbourhood of Alexandria was their chosen retreat, but in Greece, nay everywhere, in all countries (*De Vita Cont.* § 3). We again emphasise that there is no mention of any other community of them, or common centre, than that near Alexandria. It is strange that when Lucius argues that this betrays the Christian forger and his apologetic aim, since such wide extension could not have been predicated of any Jewish "sect," but might be attributed to the Christian ascetics—it should not have occurred to him that such a forger would have scarcely put into the mouth of Philo what the slightest consideration would show he could never have asserted in regard to a Jewish sect. But if he did not mean a sect, but the Therapeutae were in his mind "Contemplatives," such as he found in all nations—while the specially Egyptian and Alexandrian Therapeutae were "Contemplative" Hellenistic Jews, fashioning their rule of life so far as possible after that of the Essenes, then all becomes plain. From this point of view this otherwise strange assertion of the universality of the Therapeutae becomes an argument in favour of the Philonic authorship of the tractate *De Vita contemplativa*. In it Philo describes, after a general reference to universal Therapeutism, the special practices of the Alexandrian Jewish Therapeutae—perhaps with some exag-

geration and idealism, perhaps even in language which may have been afterwards "redacted" or "interpolated."⁷

3. Another point which requires to be kept in view is this, that there are in the writings of Philo not unfrequent indications of his retirement to solitude and separation. In our previous remarks sufficient evidence has been furnished of the fundamental accord between the views of Philo in regard to the body, to pleasures and business, as well as the need—or rather the truth—of asceticism in the contemplative life of true wisdom, and the principles which underlay the rule of life followed by the Therapeutae of the *De Vita contemplativa*—indeed, we might say generally, by the "Therapeutae of God" of Philonic conception. But indeed this is not questioned by Lucius. To this, however, the further evidence here requires to be added that Philo himself resorted to such solitude. To select only a few instances—we quote here, first, his own express statement (*De Legg. Alleg.* ii. § 21, ed. R. i. p. 113) to the effect, that he often left the men who were his kindred and friends, and his country, and went into the wilderness that he might mentally perceive the things which were worthy to be beheld (*ὅσα τὶ τῶν θείων ἀξίων κατανοήσω*). Again, in the *De Abrahamo* (§ 4, ed. R. iv. pp. 8, 9) he similarly describes the good man as going forth from the town to spend his time in contemplation in some solitary place (*ἐν μοναγρίῳ ποιεῖται τὰς διατριβὰς*)—where he is taking for companions the most virtuous of all mankind, "whose bodies indeed time has dissolved, but whose virtues the records which are left keep alive." We would suggest that, when retirement and separation were the ideal of every good man, many like-minded must have resorted to it, and in that case the idea of association would naturally occur. And although no definite argument may be founded upon it, we here recall the remarkable passage in *de mut. nom.* § 4, about that *θλασος*—that rare *γένος*—who had voluntarily deprived themselves of external things, had become weak, pale, emaciated, dissolved into a species of souls, in short, *ἀσώματοι δυνάμεις*: just what we would have imagined the Therapeutae of Philo. Similar are the references in the *De Praemiis et Poenis*, § 3 (ed. R. v. p. 222), and the pathetic allusion to his own past contemplative life, as well as the mention of his occasional escape from public affairs and from men, in the introductory paragraph of the *De Specialibus Legibus*, ad vi. viique Decal. cap. (ed. R. v. pp. 63, 64). Indeed we are frequently arrested by references to a class of persons who involuntarily recall the Therapeutae (as in *de mut. nom.* § 4). Similarly, there are striking verbal correspondences. If in *de Abr.* § 4, the good man is said to retire to the *μονάγριον*, in *de V. cont.* § 2, the *μονάγριον* is the chosen abode of the Therapeutae. If in *de Abr.* § 4, we are told that this love of retirement was not prompted by *μυσταθρησκία*, in *de V. cont.* precisely the same is said of the Therapeutae.

⁷ If we have not referred to the reply of Delaunay (*Moines et Sibylles*, pp. 1-51) in defence of the *De Vita cont.* it is that the objections to which he replies are of the past, and, indeed, never were of any real importance. It is interesting that Frankel (*u. s.* p. 33, note) implicitly accepts the genuineness of our tractate.

4. The arguments hitherto advanced were intended to show that the "Therapeutes" of the *de Vita Cont.* are not represented as "a sect" but were an esoteric circle of "Contemplatives," chiefly among the Hellenists of Egypt, who formed a special "retreat" in the neighbourhood of Alexandria to which Philo was in the habit of retiring. In regard to this it seems even instructive that Philo designates them as a *γένος* (*de V. Cont.* § 2), and not as a *αἵρεσις* (which word is used in § 3). For, we remember that Philo attaches a special meaning to *γένος* in distinction from *λαός*—the latter term applying to the many, the former to the select and elect among them (*de Sacr. Ab. et C.* § 2). And this is the more noteworthy, as occurring in a connection which describes the contemplative state. It is further emphasised in § 4 of the same tractate, where such persons are specially designated as "Therapeutes of God." And the strength of the argument is increased by verbal comparisons. We refer here once more to the passages previously indicated (*de Legg. Allegor.* ii. § 21; *de Abr.* § 4; *de mut. nom.* § 4; *de Praem. et Poen.* § 3; *de Spec. Leg.* ed. R. v. pp. 63, 64). And we call particular attention to the wording in *de Legg. Alleg.* § 21, and to that in *de Abr.* beginning of § 4, as compared with the close of § 2 in *de V. Cont.* There seems here such correspondence as to confirm the Philonic character of our tractate—yet with such differences also as to render it impossible to regard the expressions in *de V. Cont.* as copied from the other tractates. It still remains briefly to advert to three important objections urged against the *de V. Cont.* First, the absence of any reference to the "Therapeutes" in the *Quod omnis prob. lib.* §§ 12, 13, where one would have expected their mention, is supposed to disprove their existence at the time. We answer: not, on the view of the Therapeutes taken in this Article. On the contrary, it seems to us that Philo at the close of § 11, in strict accordance with the *de V. Cont.* first, attests the existence of "Therapeutes" among Greeks and barbarians, and then proceeds, in §§ 12, 13, to describe the other Therapeutes—those in Palestine and Syria, the Essenes, or the "Therapeutes of God." There was no occasion for special reference to the Hellenist Therapeutes—the more so, that, as the beginning of § 12 shews, the argument was more properly addressed to the Gentiles, and the introduction of the Jewish Therapeutes was rather apologetic. A similar answer must be given to the second objection: concerning the narrowness that characterises *de V. Cont.*, and which cannot descry wisdom or virtue except among the "Therapeutes." Naturally so; but then the Therapeutes were not a Jewish sect, but "the wise" of all lands, although specially of the Jews. It is, indeed, true that the *de V. Cont.* speaks very harshly of heathen practices and even philosophic views. Yet, surely, there are admissions on the other side also (§ 3). And we venture to say that there is not anything about heathenism in the *de V. Cont.* which is not asserted much more strongly in *de Decal.* §§ 12, 13, 14. These paragraphs must be read before a conclusive argument can be based on the anti-Greek sentiments in the invalidated tractate. We might quote other and very strong passages

to the same effect, but we content ourselves by pointing to the denunciations in *de Monarch.* i. § 1 (*πλάνον ἀνήνυτον*, and at the close: *ἀσεβεία τῆ μεγίστη*), and especially as regards Egypt in *de Jos.* § 42. Nor would even inconsistencies in his views about heathendom startle us—first, because such inconsistencies frequently occur in his writings, and notably as regards the state of the heathen (comp., for example, the praise in *Quod Omnis Prob. Lib.* § 11 with the denunciation of Persian immorality in *de Spec. Leg. ad vi. vii. d. c.* § 3, and in general the sweeping blame in *de Leg. Spec. u. s.* § 7); secondly, because of the period when *de V. Cont.* was written, since, as Ewald has finely remarked, the tone of Philo becomes much more anti-heathen after the embassy to Caius. Lastly, it is urged against the *de V. Cont.* that Philo, so far from recommending ascetic withdrawal from life, repeatedly insists on the duty of taking part in its affairs. To this it is sufficient answer that Philo only advises such participation in worldly affairs for the present necessity, but at the same time constantly urges that the "contemplative" was the higher and better life, to which he himself had recourse whenever possible, and for which at all times he ardently longed.

In the space at our disposal we have only been able to refer to such arguments as seemed of greatest weight. It is proverbially difficult to prove a negative—that the *de Vita Contemplativa* is not spurious—although the *onus probandi* properly devolves on opponents. But it is submitted, as the outcome of our enquiries, that as yet sufficient ground has not been shown against the *de V. Cont.*, and that the existence and character of the Therapeutes, as we have viewed them, are confirmed by what we derive from other parts of the Philonic writings. But that centuries after this circle of Hellenistic *illuminati* had ceased, and quite gone out of all remembrance, Eusebius, finding their mention in a Philonic tractate, should have regarded them as "a sect," and utilised them in defence of Christian asceticism, is only what might have been expected.

V. Arrangement of the Tractates of Philo.

Comparatively little can be said about the arrangement of the tractates of Philo in the present state of the text. Until this has been rectified the materials for a "reasoned" arrangement can scarcely be said to exist. With characteristic genius Ewald has attempted it (*Gesch. d. V. Isr.* 3te Ausg. vol. vi. pp. 294-304). But although not only the general direction but even many of the details of his arrangement must commend themselves to every thoughtful student, it is all too reasonable (if the expression may be used)—too much *à priori* and artificial, implying such a plan of conception and such steady continuance of execution as few writers of many tractates are conscious of. And so it impresses us rather as the survey of a later philosophic critic than as the absolute sequence of plan and work on the part of Philo, although great help in the understanding of his writings may be gained from it.* Putting aside

* Ewald supposes that Philo had composed three great works. The first of these was entitled Questions on the Laws and their Solutions. Of this only fragments (on

then, for the present, any "reasoned" arrangement, it may be most convenient to select from the various schemes proposed* that which offers greatest facility to the student by grouping the tractates according to certain common outward marks.^b Here then we have—

A. Works on the Pentateuch.

Philo himself arranges these (*De Praem. et poen.* § 1, ed. R. v. p. 219) into three classes: the cosmogonic, the historical or historico-allegorical, and the legislative, comprising in the latter the two sections of general laws and special and particular ordinances, together with kindred subjects. It is an unimportant deviation from this when in Book II. of the *De Vita Moysis* (§ 8, ed. R. iv. 194) he marks the cosmogonical as a subdivision of the historical and genealogical section, thus leaving only two classes.

1. *Cosmogonic Literature.*—(1.) *De Mundi Opificio*, an allegoric and philosophic presentation of the history of the creation. [On this tractate, the work of J. G. Müller, *d. Jud. Philo Buch von d. Welterschöpf.* Berlin, 1841, should be

Gen. and Ex., and a fragment on Lev., as well as other fragments), have been preserved in the four books of *Quaest. in Gen.* and the two in *Ex.* of the Latin transl. from the Armenian by Aucher (ed. R. vols. vi. and vii.), and in Mai, *Script. Vet. n. collect.* t. vii. 1. The work had extended over the whole Pentateuch. [We regard these tractates rather as the material and preparation for his allegorico-exegetical writings.] Then had followed a second work on "The Allegories of the Sacred Law," which, as it grew in his hands, was divided into separate tractates. As regarded his main object Philo had only got as far as Gen. xx. (this is apparent from the contents of *de Somniis*, which, however, is also classed with the second great work of Philo. Eusebius speaks of five books *de Somniis*, of which only two have been preserved.) The work formed a kind of Homilies addressed to the circle of "Initiated" Jews. On account of its length and for other reasons, these tractates were subdivided and abbreviated. Ewald considers that this work comprises all in Richter's ed. from vol. i. p. 60 (ed. M. i. p. 43) to the end of vol. iii. (that of M. i.), as well as the little tractate *de Deo* (ed. R. viii. pp. 409-414; A. ii. pp. 613-619). The third large work of Philo was chiefly intended for heathen readers and bore the title: On the Life of Moses and on his Laws. This work consisted of a "Life of Moses,"—originally intended to comprise four, but compressed into two books; then of treatises on three kinds of *Oracles of God*, viz. (1) *de Mundi Opificio* (ed. R. i. pp. 4-56); (2) on the unwritten laws, as embodied and presented in the lives of the seven patriarchs: Enos, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. Of this only the tractates on Abraham and on Joseph have been preserved (ed. Richter, iv. pp. 4-113); (3) An explanation of the laws, with various supplemental tractates, comprising all in ed. Richter, iv. p. 246—v. p. 217 (ed. M. ii. pp. 180-407). To them must be added as a twofold supplement the *de Praemiis et poenis* and the *de Execrat.* (ed. R. v. pp. 219-257). The other tractates of Philo Ewald regards as detached and occasional. We cannot enter into further details; only remarking that, besides those which in their present form are in some sense fragmentary, at least 21 tractates of Philo seem wholly lost.

* Perhaps the most untenable arrangement is that into theoretical writings [*Haggadana*] and practical [*Halachana*] to which Grossmann adds as a third division: a *genus mixtum*.

^b I have here followed generally the arrangement of Zöckler in Herzog's *Real.-Encycl.* xi. pp. 638, 639.

consulted.^c After a general Introduction in which the criticism of the text, although only from the then standpoint,^d is discussed, Müller gives the text of the tractate which is followed by a very full commentary.]

2. *Historical Treatises* [mostly commentations on Genesis, although with frequent references to other parts of Scripture]. They are also called allegorical or genealogical, and comprise the following: (2, 3, 4), *Sacr. Legum Allegoriae*, three books (I. Gen. ii. 1-16; II. Gen. ii. 17-iii. 7; III. Gen. iii. 8-19), a most important work—apparently incomplete in our present text. It is closely connected with, *De Mundi Opif.* (as appears even from the words on the title: *μετὰ τὴν ἐξήγησιν*); (5) *De Cherubim et de Cain* (Gen. iii. 24; iv. 1); (6) *De Sacrificio Abelis et Caini* (Gen. iv. 2, 3); (7) *Quod deterius potiori insidiari solet* (Gen. iv. 8-15). These form vol. i. in ed. R. and extend in ed. M. to i. p. 225. (8) *De Posteritate Caini sibi visi sapientis* (Gen. iv. 16-26); (9) *De Gigantibus* (Gen. vi. 1-4); (10) *Quod Deus sit immutabilis* (Gen. vi. 4-12); then four tractates on the history of Noah: (11) *De Agricultura Noe* (Gen. ix. 20); (12) *De Plantatione Noe* (Gen. ix. 20, specially stated to be a second part of the treatise); (13) *De Ebrietate [tumulentia]* (specially marked as preceded by another tractate now lost, on Gen. ix. 21-23); (14) *Resipit Noe, seu de Sobrietate* (Gen. ix. 24); then (15) *De Confusione Linguarum* (Gen. xi. 1-9); next five treatises on events in the life of Abraham: (16) *De Migratione Abr.* (Gen. xii. 1-6); (17) [here begins ed. R. iii. ed. M. i. p. 473] *Quis Rerum Div. Heres sit* (Gen. xv.); (18) *De Congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia* (Gen. xvi. 1-6); (19) *De Profugis* (Gen. xvi. 6-14); (20) *De Mutatione Nominum* (Gen. xvii. 1-22); then (21, 22) two tractates on dreams: *Quod a Deo mutantur Somnia*. From Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 18) we learn that there were five books on Dreams. Those preserved seem to be Books II. and III. Our Lib. i. *De Somn.* treats of the dream of Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 12, and following, xxix. 11-13); lib. ii. of those of Joseph and Pharaoh (Gen. xxxvii. xl. xli.). Then comes (23) (with which vol. iv. ed. R. and ed. M. vol. ii. begins): a *Life of Abraham: the conception and treatment sufficiently appearing from the title, Vita Supra-scriptis per doctrinam perfecti, sive de Legibus non scriptis, hoc est de Abrahamo*. This, as appears from the introduction to *De Josepho*, had been followed by similar lives of Isaac and of Jacob—tractates now lost. Then follow (24) *Vita viri*

^c Müller's synopsis arranges the tractate into an Introduction (§ 1, 2); then follow Part I. on Gen. i. or the *Hexaemeron* (§ 3-29), with interpretation of the number 7 according to Gen. ii. 1-3 (§ 30-43), and an epilogue (§ 44, 45) according to Gen. ii. 4-6. Part II. (§ 46-60) treats of the creation of the visible man and of the fall (Gen. ii. 7; iii. 24). Conclusion and retrospect (§ 61).

^d Müller gives preference to the Munich Codex of the 14th century, which he styles A, and would have us decide in most cases for the readings common to the ed. princeps of Turnebus (Paris, 1552, and, with some additions, 1553) and the Codex A (Munich) which he regards as representing the oldest and most authentic text. Where these two differ, he would give the preference to that reading which is supported by other MSS. Lastly, he prefers Turnebus to the MSS. of Mangey.

civilis, sive de Josepho, and (25, 26, 27) three books *De Vita Moysis, hoc est de Theologia et Prophetia*.

3. Writings on the *Mosaic Legislation* (very unreasonably arranged both in the Paris ed. and in those of Mangey and of Richter), viz. (28) *de Decalogo*; (29) *de Circumcisione*—the arrangement is Philo's (comp. the introduction to each of these tractates—but it may have opened the work *de specialibus legibus*, which, according to Eusebius was arranged into four Books). Next we have (30, 31) two books *De Monarchia* (on the First Commandment); (33, 34, 35, 36) four tractates connected with the Third, Fourth, and Fifth Commandments, and bearing the general title *De Specialibus Legibus*, viz. on the Third Commandment, *De Jurejurando et Religione* (commonly quoted as *De Spec. Leg.*); on the Fourth Commandment, *De Septenario*, with the supplemental *De Festo Cophini* (basket of first-fruits); and on the Fifth Commandment, *De Parentibus colendis*; (37) a treatise *De Specialibus Legibus* on the Sixth and Seventh Commandments (Philo inverts that order, and treats also of cognate subjects); (38) another treatise *De Specialibus Legibus* on the Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Commandments. With the latter he most skilfully connects the laws about forbidden meats.* Then (39) *De Iudice*, (40) *De Justitia*, and (41) *De Creatione Principum* follow in the regular order of things. These are (according to Philo's own statement) succeeded by a treatise *De Tribus Virtutibus*, now divided into three tractates: (42) *De Fortitudine*, (43) *De Caritate*, and (44) *De Poenitentia*. Somewhat loosely joined to the Philonic treatises which we possess, but evidently inwardly connected, is the group of three tractates referring to Lev. i.-vii.: (45) *De Praemiis Sacerdotum et Honoribus*, (46) *De Victimis (de Animal. idon. Sacrif.)*, and (47) *De Victimis Offerentibus*. With these should probably be connected: (48) the brief tractate *De Mercede Meretricis* (on Deut. xxiii. 18). It is not easy to find an exact place for the short tractate (49) *De Exsecrationibus* (on Deut. xviii. 33). Possibly it may fit to (53) *De Praemiis et Poenis*. This tractate is (in its introduction) described as following on the *Cosmological*, the *Historical*, and the *Legislative* writings, and is a retrospect in which the rewards and punishments are traced from the time of Enos and Noah.

B. Philosophical Writings.

(51) *Quod omnis probus liber sit* (an apologetic tractate) addressed to Theodotus, and which states that it followed and was the counterpart of another tractate which dealt with the converse proposition to that now discussed.^f Part of this tractate Ewald finds in the treatise (52) *De Nobilitate*. Then follow (53) *De Vita Contemplativa* (although this might be regarded as partly historical); (54, 55, 56, 57) four books *Quaestionum et Solutionum earum quae in Genesi sunt* (exegetic-allegorical and philosophical); (58, 59) two books [sermons] *Quaest. Solu-*

tionumque eorum quae sunt in Exodo; (60, 61) two books. *De Providentia*; (62) *De Ratione quum habent etiam bruta Animalia [de Deo? De Mundo? De Incorrumpibilitate Mundi??]*

C. Political Writings.

At present these comprise: (63) *In Flaccum* and (64) *De Virtutibus et Legatione ad Caicum*. According to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 5) this work had consisted of five books. Of these the first, second, and fifth are lost. If we suppose the present work *Ad Caicum* to have formed Book IV. then the fifth book (which is otherwise also announced as a continuation of the *Ad Caicum*) may possibly have formed together with Book IV., an independent work: "On the Virtues" (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 6). Ewald supposes that in early life Philo had written an apologetic work, entitled *Hypothetika*, or "On the Jews," of which he regards the quotations in Eusebius (*Praepar. Evang.* viii. 5, 11-7, 20) as fragments (comp. ed. R. vi. pp. 176 sqq.).

If, in conclusion, it be asked from which of the tractates of Philo insight may most readily be gained into his system, we would name in the first place: *De Mundi Opificio*, *De Abrahamo* (for allegorical interpretation), *De Josepho* (for practical philosophy), and *De Vita Moysis*. To these should however be added, as scarcely less important, the tractates *De Lejum Allegor.*, *De Somniis*, and *De Decalogo*.

VI. Standpoint of Philo: his Allegorical Method.

What has hitherto been stated regarding Philo and his system cannot be properly understood, nor yet his special views appreciated, without some account of his own mental development and of the method by which he traced, or placed, his own ideas in the sacred Scriptures. The fundamental view of Philo was that true theology was conditioned by a comprehensive philosophical knowledge, by means of which the new Platonico-Pythagorean philosophy was to be combined with the old Jewish faith of Revelation. The method which he employed for this purpose was, as we know, the allegorical.^g We also recall that, while Jewish and Grecian teaching were equally to be considered as true, the latter must be subordinated to the former as containing only partial truth. But as regards this incompatible alliance, the common Greek saying that either Plato philonised, or Philo platonised, really embodies the condemnation of the whole system.

This co-ordination of Greek philosophy with the Old Testament, appears from the very outset. Moses is described as having reached the very summit of philosophy, but yet as having learnt from the [Divine] oracles the most numerous and important principles of nature (*de Mundi Opif.* § 2). It is in the same spirit that Philo severely blames those who, having higher enlightenment, neglected the outward observance of the Mosaic laws, such as of the Sabbath, or of circumcision. This, chiefly, as

* Commonly the part on the Tenth Commandment, together with what is connected with it on forbidden meats, is made a separate tractate: *De Concupiscentia* (ed. R. v. pp. 133-146).

^f This tractate is also mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 18.)

^g Zeller, *u. s.* pp. 340, 341. As we here generally follow Zeller and Siegfried (Philo von Alexandria) special acknowledgments have not been repeated. For the same reason only the principal proof-references will be given, and these as sparingly as possible. For others we must refer readers to the above two works.

it appears to us, on account of its detrimental influence on others, but also because the observance of the outward might tend to the good of that which was within, just as care for the body was needful for the health of the soul (*de Migr. Abr.* § 16). In accordance with this reverence for the letter were the views which Philo entertained about inspiration—although, as in Rabbinic Judaism, Moses was exalted above the other Biblical writers (*Vita M.* iii. § 23). But they had all been impersonal, passive instruments of inspiration, and the same also held true of the Greek version of the Old Testament, in which the translators had been Divinely “prompted” (*Vita M.* ii. § 5-7). Hence the severest punishments had descended on scoffers of even minute statements (*de Mutat. Nom.* § 8). Accordingly Philo rests all his teaching upon the Old Testament, although the special meaning which he finds in certain words and particles of the sacred text may often be due rather to the exigencies of his system than to his idea of inspiration.^b

But by the side of this we have the other, or Grecian, side in Philo. He was so conversant with Greek literature—historical, poetic and philosophical—that it had entered into his mental being, and become part of it¹. If he appeals to the seven sages of Hellas, to the Magi among the Persians, and the Gymnosophists among the Indians (*Quod omnis prob. lib.* § 11), he is specially enthusiastic as regards his own philosophic teachers. Empedocles, Parmenides, and Xenophanes are little short of divine (*de Provid.* ii. § 42); they, with Zeno, Cleanthes, and others, are a holy assembly (*u. s.* § 48); the Pythagoreans are described as most sacred (*ἱερώτατος θλασος*), and philosophy as of equal weight with a divine oracle (*Q. o. p. l.* § 1), while Plato is “the great,” and Hellas, the only true “mother of men.”^k In accordance with Jewish and Rabbinical views, Theology was indeed considered the centre and climax of all, but then philosophy formed part of, and led up to, it. Therefore although Moses was incomparably the superior among philosophers, yet in a sense he was only *primus inter pares*. To the objection that the heathen myths were full of absurdity, profanity, and immorality (*de Provid.* ii. § 34-39), Philo replies that even if their writers were in these respects blameworthy, it would be as absurd to

^b The latter is the view of Zeller.

¹ Grossmann (*Questiones Philoneae*, p. 5, nota 5) enumerates 65 as “Graeci scriptores a Philone laudati.” Comp. also Siegfried, pp. 137-139. Siegfried traces *Neo-Pythagoreanism* in the fundamental dualism of the system of Philo: in his views of God, of the Divine Reason pervading all, and the Divine powers in the *Kosmos*: *Stoicism*; in his views of the Logos a mixture of *Platonic*, *Stoic*, and *Neo-pythagorean* teaching; in his views of matter *Platonism* and *Stoicism*; of creation, specially *Platonism*; in his symbolism of numbers *Pythagoreanism*. In Psychology he traces the influence of *Stoic* elements (in the division of the soul according to eight powers); of *Platonic* elements (in the trichotomy of reason, courage, and desire); of *Aristotelianism* (as regards the nourishing, sentient, and reasonable soul); of *Neo-pythagoreanism* (as regards the body as the source of all evil), and, finally, again of *Platonic* teaching in regarding the essence of the soul as an efflux of the Divine. In Ethics Philo is chiefly under the influence of *Stoicism*.

^k See the extravagant language about Hellas at the close of § 109, *de Provid.* ii.

speak ill of them as of our fair world for the nuisances which it contains. But, in truth, our estimate of these myths was not correct. Each of them was an allegory, and had a deep spiritual meaning (which Philo presently sets forth in detail), which those “theologians:” Empedocles, Parmenides, Xenophanes, had taught in plain language (*u. s.* § 40-42). This, although Philo speaks in terms of strong reprobation of the heathen—even Greek—notions about the gods, just as he does of atheistic and materialistic views (*de Decal.* § 12, 13, and especially § 14). All these he denounces as not only ignorance (*ἄγνοια*), but endless error (*πλάνος ἀνήνους*), and the greatest impiety (*ἀσέβεια ἢ μεγίστη*), which should even be visited with punishment at the hands of the magistrates, since such men loved darkness rather than the brightest light (*de Monarch.* §§ 1, 7). And yet withal Philo seems not only to trace some of the myths (such as those about Herakles) to a background of historical fact, but even in platonic fashion to regard the planets as divine (*θελας γὰρ φύσεν ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης*, Philo apud Eus. *Praep. Ev.* viii. 14, 50).^l

The solution of the various difficulties which must have suggested themselves to a Jew in his acknowledgment and reception of heathen philosophic truths lay, as previously stated, in the view that the heathen philosophers had ultimately drawn from Jewish biblical sources, or at least that they had come to the same conclusions, which, however, had been anticipated by Moses. The latter—in regard to the leading principle of the philosophy of Heraklitus as to the existence of opposites in nature, which was found already in Genesis (*Quis rer. div. s. her.* § 43^m). Zeno had actually derived certain of his ethical views from the history of Jacob and Esau (*Gen.* xxviii.), and in general the laws of Moses had influenced all nations, barbarians as well as Greeks (*de V. Moys.* ii. § 4). But it would certainly have been impossible to prove what was the fundamental idea of his system: the identity of the truths of philosophy with those of Revelation, and the priority and superiority of the latter, if the Scriptures had been interpreted only in their literal sense. It was necessary to regard the latter as an allegory, and to ascertain their higher meaning, at least to the initiated. In truth, it would have been derogatory to Scripture to have understood it only in a literal sense. It was not only that the law, as in *Ex.* xxii. 26, would in its bare letter seem poor and even open to objections (*de Somn.* i. § 17),—but occasionally the letter would give no meaning. Not that it was to be discarded: but it was only the body, while the allegorical meaning was the soul. If in *Numb.* xxiii. 19,

^l His condemnation of speaking ill of the heathen deities is, however, based on the need of general respect for the appellation of God (*de V. Moys.* iii. § 26), while his attribution of the fate of the three despoilers of the temple of Delphi, not to accident (*casu*) but to the judgment of God (*de Provid.* ii. § 28) may be set down to his general views.

^m Socrates sive a Moysae edoctus sive ex rebus ipsius motus (*Quaest.* in *Gen.* ii. § 6); Heraclitus . . . a theologo nostro mutuatus, although additis immensisisque laboriosis argumentis (*u. s.* iii. § 5), in another passage (*u. s.* iv. § 152) even: Heraclitus a Moysae furtim dempta lege.

we read that "God is not a man," and in Deut. i. 31, that He was as a man, the former expressed the absolute truth in regard to His teaching, while the latter referred to what was needful for the instruction of the many" (*Quod Deus immut.* § 11). In another place, commenting on the same two passages, Philo speaks of the full truth which is opened to the wise, and of the accommodation granted to the foolish, in which he includes all anthropomorphisms and all representations of God's anger, or of the instruments which He used against the wicked (*de Somn.* i. § 40). It follows indeed from his views on inspiration that all the narratives of Scripture were to be absolutely received, and all its laws to be literally observed. But this occasionally necessitated rationalistic suggestions on the part of Philo, such as that Moses had seen a fair form in the bush, and that its flames became articulate speech. But there was deeper truth also of which the letter was the allegory. Thus the manifestation and communication of God in fiery flame meant that the oracles of God are to be accurately understood and tested as gold by the fire, and that as fire both gives light and burns up, so those who obeyed God's commands had the light and would live for ever in it, while the disobedient were set on flame and burnt up by their appetites (*De Decal.* § 11). On the other hand, Philo also not infrequently indulges in tasteless and tedious effusions, such as in the stilted speech which he puts into the mouth of Jacob when he hears of the loss of Joseph (*De Jos.* § 5), or in the lecture which Joseph is made to deliver to Potiphar's wife, which, we should imagine, would have extinguished the most ardent passion (*u. s.* § 9), or in the address which Moses gives to the Midianite shepherds, and which, to our mind unaccountably, led them to discover from his looks and words that he was a prophet, and hence to retire before the daughters of Jethro (*De V. Mos.* i. 10). The historical tractates of Philo contain many such prosaic stories, speeches, and moralisings. Along with these Philo also introduces not a few embellishments and additions to the Biblical history, found also in Rabbinic tradition.⁸ Although he was undoubtedly acquainted with Hebrew,⁹ yet he probably derived these not from Rabbinic teaching, but indirectly, from what was floating about among the Jews, and universally received, as dating perhaps no one knew whence, nor from how long ago.

It were impossible here to give a detailed account of the application which Philo made of his method for eliciting the allegorical meaning of Scripture—often ingeniously and attractively, still more frequently in a manner and with results most extravagant.¹⁰ Yet he did not proceed in a quite arbitrary manner, but kept in view

⁸ This also accords with Jewish views. See *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*.

⁹ For a fuller account of Philo's Jewish training and of the correspondence between his interpretations and the Haggadah (of which a summary is given in the *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. l.) we refer to Siegfried, pp. 142-157.

¹⁰ This is denied by Mangey, though on very insufficient grounds.

¹¹ A number of instances are collected by Zeller, *u. s.* pp. 348-350.

some of the Stoic rules of allegory, and probably also many of the Jewish Haggadic canons. Still we cannot persuade ourselves that he always allegorised on definite rules.¹¹ So to speak, his only system was his system. He allegorised when he could—when the text suggested its possibility; and he allegorised when he must, when the text would otherwise have seemed to him incongruous. This necessity of his system accounts for the three rules, in accordance with which (as Siegfried supposes) Philo in certain instances wholly discarded the literal for the allegorical meaning of a passage, viz. when the former seemed to involve what was unworthy of God (in Philo's view); or else when the text presented insurmountable difficulties; or, lastly, when Scripture itself seemed to point to an allegory.¹² On the other hand, Philo also allegorised whenever he could by dint of ingenuity find some deeper meaning for what was written, especially when that deeper meaning could be substituted for what to a Grecian mind might seem trivial and superficial, or difficult in the letter of the text; and also when by such allegory he could foist upon Scripture his own philosophical views; or when it suggested some symbolism that had been used by his Greek or his Jewish teachers. To one or other of these the twenty-three rules can be reduced, by which (according to Siegfried) Philo was wont to trace the allegorical under the literal meaning of a passage. Even the number of these rules would render it difficult to believe that he had always consciously kept them in view. And when he speaks of "canons" (*de Somn.* i. § 15), and of "laws of allegory" (*de Abr.* § 15) this does not necessarily imply (as Siegfried suggests) a reference to certain definite rules, but rather that there were rules and laws in accordance with which allegorical interpretation was necessary.

At the same time it may be well, for the better understanding of Philo's writings, to group his allegorisms according to certain points of view. What here first impresses us is that Philo so often occupies ground similar to that taken in Jewish Rabbinic interpretations. It is so, when he finds indication of a special meaning in every word and sentence which, strictly speaking, might seem superfluous. Thus such a duplication as "Abraham, Abraham," conveyed a meaning of its own. So did an apparently superfluous expression, such as "Dying thou shalt die" (*Gen.* ii. 17), or the reiteration of what had been stated before, as when (*in Gen.* xvi. 3) Sarah is once more styled Abraham's wife, which was intended to show that, despite his union with Hagar, Sarah was still his real wife. But whereas Rabbinic interpreters would have made exegetical use of all this, or else applied it in a moral sense, Philo found in such cases indication, not of an exegetical or moral meaning, but of a quite different kind of teaching of which the letter was an allegory. Thus in the case of Sarah and Hagar the lesson was (as previously explained) about the relation of encyclical knowledge to true wisdom (*De Congr. quaer. erud. gr.* § 14). More arbitrary, but still

¹² This is the view of Siegfried.

¹³ Siegfried has illustrated the application of each of these three canons by a selection of apt and striking examples.

Jewish, is it, when different expressions that occur in connection with the same person are supposed to indicate a special meaning, as when Laban is once called the Syrian, and at other times Rebecca's brother[†]; or when an allegorical meaning is elicited, by an arbitrary change in the punctuation of a sentence, or in the relation to each other of words in the same sentence. Decidedly Jewish is also the attachment of a specific meaning to the choice of one word rather than another among synonyms (such as when in Gen. ii. 8, we have ἐπλασε, which referred to "the earthly man," while the expression ἐποίησε, in Gen. i. 27, referred to the "heavenly" man (*Leg. Alleg.* i. 12, 16). This canon gave large scope for allegorising, and Philo made frequent and very ingenious use of it. Still more ingenious were the allegorical interpretations based on a play of words, such as also occur in Rabbinic writings. Thus Philo explains (in *De Sacrif. Ab. et Caini*, § 34) the direction in Ex. xiii. 13, to exchange the first-born of an ass for a young sheep by a twofold word-play: ἄνος, ass, and πόνος [onus] labour; and again, πρόβατον, sheep, and προβαλνεν, to advance forward—the latter word-play being expressly referred to by Philo, the former clearly implied in the collocation of the words. And the meaning of the allegory was: exchange all labour for improvement. But the meaning of the alternative—that, if the firstling of an ass was not exchanged, it was to be ransomed—was: if you are not able to exchange labour for improvement [if your nature does not advance by your labour], then give up your labour. We are still on Jewish ground when we find an allegorical meaning sought in adverbs and prepositions, or even in parts of a word. Thus, very instructively, Philo infers from the particle "after" in Gen. i. 27 ("God made man after the image," not "the image"), that the "heavenly" man was only a copy of the image of God, or of the Logos—the "heavenly" man serving in turn as model for the "earthly" (the mind in us), which was therefore only a third image of its Maker (*Quis rer. div. her.* § 48). Perhaps this, as indeed some of the previous principles of interpretation, can scarcely be called allegorical.[‡] It is otherwise when, for example, Philo allegorically derives from the particle εἶδ in εὐλογήσω ("I will bless them," Gen. xii. 2) this meaning, that God gives to the wise man the Logos who is worthy of praise, the particle εἶδ always referring to virtue* (*De Migr. Abr.* § 13). Again, wide and varying allegorical application could be made of this other principle, that a word or an expression might be

[†] This is certainly conveyed in *De Prof.* 8, 9.

[‡] I have nevertheless ranked them among the allegorical canons, because I have here followed Siegfried, from whose store of illustrations I have selected those given in the text, after having verified and examined them in detail. But the caution, given in the text, will show that all is not to be set down to "allegorising," and that our remarks about the "system" on which Philo proceeded are justified.

[§] It may be worth while giving, by way of illustration, from the section previous to that just quoted, the following ingenious allegory: If in Deut. xxiii. 1, 2, a eunuch and the son of a harlot are excluded from the congregation, this really referred to the exclusion, on the one hand, of an atheist, on the other of a polytheist.

taken in one or all the meanings of which it was capable, nay, that for this purpose it might even be slightly altered (as in the accents or in the breathing). Yet this was also one of the most common modes of Haggadic interpretations—although (we repeat it) not for allegorical teaching. Thus Philo finds in the simple question, ποῦ εἶ; ("Where art thou?" Gen. iii. 9), no less than four different meanings (*De Ley. Alleg.* iii. 17). First, by altering the accent to ποῦ, it would mean: Thou art somewhere—that which is created is in space and place, but God is not in any place, as Adam seemed to imagine that God was walking in the garden and surrounded by it. Secondly, it would be a call to the soul to consider how, instead of wisdom and good, it had chosen ignorance and vice. Thirdly, viewed as a question, the answer might be in the negative: "Nowhere," indicating that the soul of the wicked had no place of rest to go to, hence he is also said to be ἄτοπος. Or fourthly, the answer might be positive and hortative: "Hear, where I am"—where those are who see not nor hear God, who are destitute of wisdom and virtue, and who tremble. Again, very Rabbinic are the attempts to trace a deeper meaning in the choice of a peculiar expression, or in the use of a number, or of a tense. Illustrations of each of these may prove instructive. As regards the first, Philo[‡] imagines that the use of the expression "one day," instead of "the first day," in Gen. i. 5, had this meaning, that it described, not the visible creation, but the "intelligible" and incorporeal kosmos, whose nature was "monadic" (*De Mundi Op.* § 9). In regard to the strange use of the plural in the account of the creation of man (Gen. i. 26), Philo "conjectures" that God had assistants in it on account of the "mixed nature" of good and evil in man, the good alone being traceable to Him, while the evil must be imputed to His other assistants. Conversely, the singular number in Abraham's address to the three angels (Gen. xviii. 3) showed that it was only a threefold appearance of one substance. But the allegory of the whole narrative is remarkable. It was really the vision of God by the soul. This vision was at one time of one, at another of three. In the middle was the Father of all, called in Holy Scripture ὁ ἅν. On either hand were the two most ancient and most near potencies: at His right hand the "Creative Potency" (ποιητικὴ δύναμις), at His left the "Royal" or Governing "Potency" (βασιλικὴ δύναμις)—the former θεός, the latter κύριος. Now the highest vision was that of the soul quite purified, when, discarding all numbers, even that of "two," which was nearest to the unit, it rose straight up to the Absolute, which was free from all mixture or combination, ὁ ἅν. Next to it was the vision of God through the "Creative Potency" (when man knew God through His works in creation); while the third was that through the "Governing Potency" (His Rule)—when man knew God in His providential government. Thus, after all, it was only the threefold appearance of One—hence the use of the singular number in Gen. xviii. 3 (*De Abr.* §§ 24, 25). To all this we may

[‡] Like the Revised Version—and with little better reason.

add that yet another indication of allegorical meaning was found in the use or the absence of the article. For δ $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ was God Himself, $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ was the Logos, (*de Somn.* i. § 39).

Nor is this all. In Rabbinic interpretation, if an inference had been drawn as to a special meaning in one passage, that meaning might henceforth be applied in all cases. We notice the same rule in Philo. Again, the position of a word relatively to what preceded or followed yielded allegoric teaching. Further, it was, in Philo's view, culpable negligence to overlook the significance of an omission. Thus the omission of the word "son" at the birth of Cain, although the first in the generation of men (*Gen.* iv. 1), while it occurred at that of Seth (*iv.* 25), showed that Cain was a disposition of the soul. Similarly, if Er was called wicked (*Gen.* xxxviii. 7) without any reason being assigned for it, it meant corporeity, while, when Noah was declared righteous without assignment of reason, it pointed to the significance of his name—that the righteous had rest. Nor can we wonder if the converse rule also was applied, and a special meaning seen in strange designations or names. Thus, if "Bethuel," "the daughter of God," was the father of Rebecca, its allegory was that Wisdom ever virgin had indeed a feminine name but a masculine nature, and hence could beget Rebecca—perfect virtue (*de Prof.* § 9).

We get beyond Jewish modes of interpretation when we come to the symbolism of numbers which has at all times engaged thinkers, and of which Philo makes most ingenious use. As regards the symbolism of names, Philo occupied Biblical ground, since the significance of names is frequently indicated in the Old Testament. It need scarcely be said that this was carried much farther in the Haggadah. Philo here sometimes follows the lead of Scripture, sometimes that of Jewish tradition, and at other times that of his philosophic teachers. But the importance of his use of that symbolism lay in the application which he made of it. In the view of Philo "those who bear a name become allegorical representatives of definite characters, and in that capacity affect the whole history." And this, although the same name was at times interpreted and applied by him in a manner quite different, and even opposite.^a Sometimes Philo also gives a twofold Hebrew, or else a Hebrew and a Greek, etymology of a name, which again leads to manifold allegorical interpretations. We have left to the last Philo's symbolism in regard to objects, because it admits of too extensive application to be otherwise than generally described. All four-footed animals, birds, and creeping beasts mentioned in the Bible, were allegories of conditions of the soul, of faculties, dispositions, or passions; the useful plants were allegories of virtues, the noxious of the affections of the unwise—and so on through the mineral kingdom; through heaven, earth, and stars; through fountains and rivers, fields and dwellings; through metals, substances, arms, clothes, ornaments, furniture, the body and its parts, the sexes, and our out-

ward condition.^a Thus all Scripture, and every event, and every person and object mentioned in it, became an allegory. This must suffice, chiefly by way of illustration, with only this added caution that, when we speak of accord with Rabbinic modes of commentation, it is not implied that either Philo or the Rabbis derived their views from each other. Such dependence may indeed have existed, either generally (in floating traditions) or specifically. But it is at least conceivable that the source of both streams had been independent of each other, since allegorical and Haggadic interpretation naturally flow in the same direction, as the experience of all ages and schools has shown.

VII. The System of Philo.

What has just been explained in regard to the method of Philo will be useful in such study of his system as can here be attempted. So far as possible his views shall be presented in his own words.

A. THEOLOGY.—It has perhaps not been sufficiently noticed how earnest and how intensely Jewish Philo is in his Theism. The assertion of the Being of God, as against Atheism and Polytheism (that against Pantheism is perhaps rather a sequence of his system), is repeated in almost every tractate. It is supported by well nigh every argument which has since been brought forward in its favour, and set forth with an enthusiasm of personal conviction that shows how vital this point was to Philo, and often with an eloquence that carries us away. And, indeed, without it Philo would not have had any standing within Judaism. But beyond this, his views about God form the foundation of his practical theology. They also lead up to his conception of that contemplative life which Philo regarded as the highest object—as alike true wisdom, true life, and true holiness.

We have to keep this always in mind, since from the first Philo also introduces another principle, apparently antagonistic to that just referred to, and yet quite as fundamental to his system. For Philo would remove God far away from all contact with everything that exists (placing Him almost in contrast with it), until the Divine Being stands out in unapproachable light, and this alone can be predicated of Him that He is δ $\acute{\omega}\nu$. There are two poles around which the system of Philo moves, alike in its speculative and in its practical aspect: the infinite separateness of God and the evil of matter. And yet, although the one is the outcome of Platonism, while the other touches Stoic elements, the two are really so connected that we might regard the Philonic view of God as the source and *matrix* of his whole system. And this view of God might seem to him not Platonic only. The Old Testament also had taught the infinite elevation of God, and the Judaism of

^a We cannot deny ourselves quoting this beautiful allegory of Philo's (which has in so many ways been appropriated without acknowledgement): $\sigma\kappa\iota\alpha\acute{\nu}$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\upsilon\pi\acute{o}\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\iota\omicron\nu$ $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\alpha\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota$ $\epsilon\pi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$ $\alpha\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\upsilon\pi\eta\upsilon\omicron\nu$ [*somnum futuræ olim resurrectionis umbram et similitudinem*—ex vers. Mangey], *Phil. Fragm.* ed. R. vi. p. 229. In a somewhat different form, we have this in *Ber. R.* 17, where sleep and death, dream and prophecy, the Sabbath and the future life are grouped together.

^a For further particulars and for illustrations, we refer to *Siegfried, u. s.*

Philo's time had declared His Name Jahveh to be ineffable. Besides, the whole tendency of the pre-Philonic development had (as will have been noticed) been in the same direction. We recall here the persistent and consistent efforts to remove all anthropomorphisms from the conception, and from the Biblical representations, of God. That such infinite distance of God was compatible with closest nearness to man, even to the extent of personal condescension to the humblest, and the dwelling in and with such: this constituted the highest teaching of the Old Testament, the sublimated essence of its spirituality, quite plainly indicated indeed in the Pentateuch, but brought out with increasing clearness by the Prophets and in the Psalms. Yet the apprehension of this element required spiritual sympathy, spiritual responsiveness—we had almost said, spiritual kinship. But Hellenism possessed not that kinship. Nay, in a sense, its intellectual apprehension of God and, though the expression seems to involve contradiction, such intellectual spirituality as that of Philo, were really contrary to it. It was necessary to have been "born of God," to open one's heart to its influence, in order to be in sympathy with it (comp. St. Matth. xi. 25). And so in this, as in all other respects, the New Testament has brought perfectness. St. John also (i. 18), as well as St. Paul (1 Tim. vi. 16) taught the unapproachableness of God, but their teaching led up to the Gospel-message by which the seeming contrast was for ever removed. And in the New Testament also, we must take leave to say, there is a vein of Asceticism, as regards the evil of the flesh and of the material; but that evil is not absolute, only relative and conditional, and its Asceticism aims after the subjection and transformation of the material, not its utter rejection.

1. *God*.—It has been said, and with truth, that the views of Philo in regard to the Deity are mainly of a negative character. But this was one of the necessities of his system. To his mind there might, as before indicated, seem such fundamental agreement between those negative descriptions of God in the Old Testament—with its ineffable Jehovah—and his philosophic teachers, as would make the latter only the more dear to him, and prove the kinship of their philosophy with his ancestral faith. But, assuredly, greater heresy could not have been spoken in Philonic ears, nor yet views more contrary to his system expressed, than when St. Paul preached his Gospel of Him^b Who was manifested in the flesh (1 Tim. iii. 16), and St. John of the Son of God manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil (1 John iii. 8). For the fundamental principle of Philo's theology was that as God was neither in time nor space, so no qualities of any kind could be attributed to Him (He was *ἄποιος*). Hence no Name could be given Him (*ἔρρητος*), nor was He within the comprehension of man (*ἀκατάληπτος*). Instructive statements in this direction have been quoted in some of our previous remarks. Many further passages might be adduced. We select only one as interesting in other respects also (*De mutat. Nom.* §§ 2-4). Philo begins by warning us that the *τὸ ὄν*, which is equivalent to the *ὁ ὢν*,

^b The reading *ὄς* for *θεός* does not alter the significance in this respect of "the mystery."

cannot be comprehended by man. Nor is it to be wondered (*εἰ τὸ ὄν ἀνθρώποις ἀκατάληπτον*), since even the mind in us is not knowable. It follows that no proper name can be given to Him who is "the Being in truth" (*τῷ ὄντι πρὸς ἀλήθειαν*). The "I am that I am," meant that His nature was "to be, not to be spoken forth" (*εἶναι πέφυκα, οὐ λέγεσθαι*). But the appellation Lord had been conceded to man: "Lord the God of three natures [in us—by]: instruction, goodness of nature, and practice" (*askesis*), of which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were respectively the symbols. If we read that the Lord appeared to Abraham, it was not He who is the great cause of all that became manifest, but one of His Potencies, "the Royal Potency," which bore the name Lord—not *τὸ ὄν*, but *κύριος*. And the expression "I am thy God," was not used properly, but in a figurative manner, as God was not in relation to anything, and this alike before and after the creation of the universe. Again—matter was that which was defective, even evil, and hence there was absolute contrast between it and God. We have already seen what special meaning we must attach to the expression, that God made man "after" His image. Similarly, we recall how all such affections on the part of God, as anger and the like, were to be regarded as an accommodation to a lower standpoint, as well as what lessons in reference to God were to be learned from the words to Adam: "Where art thou?" Remote from all matter which was finite, composite, not really being, God was the great *Monad*, the unmingled and unmixed One. It would be difficult to determine whether it was this contrast with all that was created, or the principle that God could not be compared to anyone, and that attributes could not be ascribed to Him, that had led Philo to describe God as quite above all the notions which we can connect with either virtue, knowledge, the good, or the beautiful (*De Mundi Opif.* § 2). Probably his philosophy would lead him to that conclusion, while his Jewish belief would arrive through the positive conception of the infinite superiority of God at the negative description of Him to which we have referred. In the view of Philo God was the archetype of the beautiful, the alone perfect and blessed, the world-reason, He Who is everywhere, beholds, and comprehends everything, yet is not comprehended by any. Above all, He is absolutely and eternally working, from Whom all springs and is set in motion, the constantly productive cause of all. Here then we have Stoic elements by the side of Platonism. But the transcendental perfectness of God was to be learned from those effects or manifestations of which He was the transcendental yet ever active cause. In this constant Divine causation^c two properties stood out as fundamental: power and goodness. More especially was it the property of goodness.^d This was also the highest and original impelling principle of Divine manifestation. And since God was *θεός*, Philo gives this name also to the property of goodness. It was the quality of good-

^c It need scarcely be pointed out that there was here a contradiction in the system of Philo between God as absolutely outside the world, and God as innermost in it, the constantly active, creative cause of all—the *δραστήριον αἴτιον* (*de mundi op.* § 2).

^d The Rabbis also speak of this property of goodness.

ness to which alike the creation and the government of the world were to be traced. Yet only of that which is good in it, not of that which is evil. We have previously seen that God created only the souls of the good (*de mut. nom.* § 4). So also in regard to His government. Only the good came from Him—not the evil, nor yet punishments, which His compassion, that outweighed His justice, sought to mitigate.

2. The "Potencies," *δυνάμεις*. The apparent contradiction between the entire separation of God from the world and the fact that He was the ever active cause of all was resolved by the doctrine of the Divine "Potencies," as intermediary beings. Here Philo could fall back, on the one hand, upon Plato's archetypal ideas as the models of all the real, and, on the other hand, upon the Stoic principle of efficient or productive causes—the world-pervading reason of God, the potencies which, proceeding from Him, gave life and form and continuance to all. These two, then, Philo combined. When God would create the world, He recognised that there must be an ideal archetype of every work, and He formed the supersensuous world of ideas. But these ideas were not only models; they were also the productive causes, the potencies, which brought order into the material that existed, and to each thing its properties. The archetypal world then is also those invisible Potencies (*δυνάμεις*), which surround the Deity as His train, and by which He works in the world that which, owing to His separation from it, He could not otherwise have wrought.⁶ The Potencies are the vicereagents of God, His legates, and intermediaries to things finite. Here we come upon another of the difficulties of the system. On the one hand, these "Potencies" were ministering spirits—what the Greeks called "demons," and Moses "angels"—and as such to be invoked. On the other hand, they were "ideas," Potencies of which the higher always included the lower, and they existed only in the Divine thinking (*De Mundi Opif.* § 4). Besides, it was God Himself who in His Potencies was present in things. If, therefore, these "Potencies" are undoubtedly presented by Philo as "hypostases," yet they have not any true personal subsistence. Here his philosophy and theology are hopelessly at issue. In Philo's system the *δυνάμεις* must be in God, on account of his views about the world, and yet they must be different from God, on account of his views about the Deity.

The same unclarity prevails in regard to the origination of these Potencies. They can scarcely be called emanations from God, except by way of "a figurative description of a process, of which Philo himself had not formed a clear conception."

3. The *Logos*.—The number of the "Potencies" may be described as indefinite—since each Divine operation might be attributed to a separate one, or else several subsummed under one Potency. Among them, as previously stated, two: "goodness" and "power," stood out separately and supremely. We have already spoken of these as "the creative" and the "governing" Potencies, and seen that God is

represented as standing between them. But the *Logos*, who is the manifestation of God, must be viewed as alike the combination and the source of these Potencies. We mark here once more the same inconsistency as before in regard to a hypostasis, which yet has not any personal subsistence. In truth the reasoning of Philo is wanting in logical precision. His definitions are only illustrations—perhaps for that very reason attractive to some minds, but unsubstantial and unsatisfactory. They tell us not what a thing is, but what it is like. Even in this respect there is a radical difference between the *Logos* of the fourth Gospel and the *Logos* of Philo. We feel assured that, as might be expected from the circumstances of time and place, there is frequent and marked reference to the system represented by Philo in the writings of St. Paul, but especially in those of St. John. For this must have been the prevailing mental direction among the educated and enlightened—the impressionable, in the Greek-speaking Diaspora. The Apostles must have been brought into constant contact with it. All the more striking therefore is it that St. John also sets forth as primal the doctrine of the *Logos*. But the Apostle deals with it not, like Philo, in illustrations, but—if not in definitions, which were impossible—in definite propositions, which clearly mark, not only the Personality of the *Logos*, but His relation to God, to the world, and to man.

On the other hand, the *Logos* of Philo is full of difficulties, contradictions, and perplexities. It is He in whom the intelligible world had its place (*De Mundi Opif.* § 8). Indeed that intelligible world (*νοητὸς κόσμος*) is no other than "the *Logos* of God already making the world." Again, "It is evident that the archetypal seal which we say is the intelligible world, is itself the archetypal model, the idea of the ideas, the *Logos* of God" (*u. s.* § 6). Further, the *Logos*, who sums up all the Divine Potencies, is also the intermediary between God and the world. In one of the strangest passages Philo, commenting on Ex. xiv. 19, tells us that the Father gave to the Archangel and most ancient *Logos* to stand on the confines of the two and to separate between God and creation. He is at the same time their bond and their separation. He is also both a suppliant with God on behalf of men and the ambassador who brings to them the commands of the Ruler—in which gift He rejoices. He is neither uncreated as God, nor created as man, but in the midst between these two extremes—a security to the Creator that man would not lapse into absolute revolt and disorder, and to the creature that God would not forsake His own work (*Quis rer. Div. her.* § 42). Thus He is, on the one hand, the representative of God to the world, the interpreter (*ἐρμηνεύς*) of His will and the executor of it, while, on the other hand, He is the suppliant for men (the *ἱερέης* and *παράκλητος*), even their High Priest. Here we might seem to have reached not only a personality, but even a Divine personality, although one subordinate, a kind of second God. But we soon discover that what is meant does not represent anything real, but is only once more figurative or illustrative of this, that the connection between God and the world is not, and cannot be, direct, but must be indirect and

⁶ We are here chiefly following the analysis of Zeller.

mediate. Thus, so to speak, the *Logos of Philo* is a medium of disjunction, the *Logos of the New Testament* one of conjunction; in *Philo* it is because God is so far, in the *New Testament* because He is so near; in *Philo* the *Logos* is an unreal, in the *New Testament* a real and essential Personality. Hence, if *Philo* calls Him the first-born *Logos*, and even "the Name of God," it is as the oldest of His "angels," the great archangel of many names—a Son only in the sense in which we all may be such (*de Confus. Ling.* § 28). This appears still more clearly when the *Logos* is called the eldest son in contradistinction to the world as the younger son (ὁ μὲν γὰρ κόσμος ὁδτος νεώτερος υἱὸς θεοῦ, *Quod Deus sit immut.* § 6). We now know what value to attach to it when *Philo*, designating the *Logos* as the shadow of God, tells us that He had used Him as the instrument in making the world. He himself explains it by adding that this shadow, and as it were model, is the archetype of all other things (*De Lég. Alleg.* iii. § 31). In point of fact the *Logos* is identical with the Wisdom of God, viewed as a quality. This is expressly stated (*Leg. Allegor.* i. § 19). The *Logos* is therefore not a Personality, but the relation in which God stands to the world—or rather it is both and yet not either: though certainly not a Person in the *New Testament* sense, or in regard to which we could speak of either co-ordination or subordination to God. Indeed we can scarcely think of the *Logos* irrespective of creation, of which he is alike the archetype, the model, and the pervading spirit. After all then the *Logos*, like the patriarchs, is only an allegory.⁵

B. COSMOLOGY.—Little requires to be here added to our former remarks. In estimating the views of *Philo* on this subject we must keep in mind the dualism which is fundamental to his system. Only what was good in the world was due to God—life and perfectness; all evil—imperfectness and death—must be traced to another source. That source was matter. Very instructive here is a passage in which the doctrines of Stoicism are put in the mouth of Moses. That greatest philosopher, we are told, had learnt that there were two principles: an active and a passive one (δραστήριον αἴτιον and παθητικόν). The former was the infinite Reason—as previously stated—unadulterated and unmixed, superior to virtue, to knowledge, to the good, or the beautiful. The passive principle was matter, inanimate and incapable of any motion of its own (ἄψυχον καὶ ἀκίνητον ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ). But set in motion, fashioned, and endowed with life by the *νοῦς*, it became the *Kosmos* (*De Mundi Opif.* § 2). The source of the *δύναμις* by which the world was made, was—as we remember—the goodness of God. God would impart of the good of His nature to matter [here specially designated "the substance," οὐσία] which had nothing good, but

⁵ In a remarkable passage (*de ebriet.* § 8) *Philo* speaks of the Creator as the Father, Knowledge being the mother, and their offspring the world, designating the latter as "the only" and "beloved" "Son" (τὸν μόνον καὶ ἀγαπητὸν αἰσθητὸν υἱόν).

⁶ We cannot here attempt to institute a comparison between the *Logos* of *Philo* and the *Memra* of the Targumim. For this we must take leave to refer the reader to the analysis in *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*.

was capable of becoming everything. In itself it was without property (ἄποιος), without life, without arrangement, full of disorder and confusion. But it was transformed by the active impartition of the Divine. Yet this, not equally to all things, but to each in the varying measure of its capacity of receptiveness (*de Mundi Op.* §§ 5, 6).

Without pausing to distinguish what in these views is of Platonic, and what of Stoic origin,⁶ we mark that in such a system the idea of Creation had no place. The world was not created but formed¹ (by the instrumentality of the *Logos*) by the separation (the *Logos* as *τοιμεῖς*) and then conjunction (the *Logos* as *δεσμῶς*) of what formerly had been chaotically mixed up. Only the forms of what exists, not the matter, came of God. Yet the world had a beginning; but it would not pass away. Of time—which could not be older than the world—we must not speak in connection with creation, and the Mosaic account indicated the order of rank, not of time. As the world had been formed, so was it sustained by the constant activity of God. It was therefore a kind of continued creation. From creation we derived one evidence of the Being of God [the physico-theological argument]. Our world was in this respect like the gates into a city, like the first round of the ladder up to heaven. For a work so artistically, beautifully, and wisely arranged could not have originated of itself. Yet other evidence came from the mutability of all things, which therefore could not have originated of themselves but by the Immutable One, who alone could sustain them. Before passing from this, we must notice that here also there was contradiction. For the principle of *Philo* *ex nihilo nihil fit* was in contradiction to this other, according to which matter was really the *μη ὄν*.² Yet the physico-theological evidence for God, was, although the readiest, not the highest. That which should chiefly be aimed after was direct apprehension and contemplation of God by the soul. Nor should we here omit at least to mention the evidential connection between the earthly and the heavenly which *Philo* found in that symbolism of numbers, derived from Pythagoreanism, of which he made such frequent and strange application.³ Of *Philo*'s views on physical questions it is not necessary to speak. They were those of the philosophies of his age. Like them *Philo* regarded the stars as living beings, endowed with reason, and wholly virtuous without capability of evil (*De Mundi Opif.* § 24). Accordingly he

¹ See here Zeller, pp. 386–388.

² And yet there is contradiction to this also when we read (*De Somn.* I. § 13, end) that God, Who begat all things, not only brought them to visibleness, but also made that which formerly had not been (ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄπρότερον οὐκ ἦν ἐποίησεν), being not only the Former but also Himself the Creator (οὐ δημιουργὸς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ κτίστης αὐτὸς ὤν). The objections of Zeller to the inference, that *Philo* here taught actual creation, do not seem to me conclusive.

³ But Dähne (i. pp. 171, 172) ingeniously suggests that in the following we should substitute οὐκ ὄν for *μη ὄν*: ὡςπερ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ μη ὄντος οὐδὲν γίνεται, οὐδ' εἰς τὸ μη ὄν φθείρεται (*De Incorrump. Mundi.* § 2). But this must be taken with the reservation as to the genuineness of the tractate.

⁴ For a summary see Zeller, pp. 391, 392.

designates them the "visible Gods" of whom the heavens are "the most holy abode" (*u. s.* § 7).

C. ANTHROPOLOGY.—As all the parts of the universe were full of living creatures, so was the air. It was the abode of incorporeal souls. Among them those that were nearest the earth and lovers of the body descended upon earth and were joined to mortal bodies (*De Somn. i.* § 22). The body like a river draws the soul into a whirlpool from which only few are saved by that spiritual philosophy, that teaches them to obtain the inheritance of the imperishable life in the presence of God (*De Gigant. § 3*). But the other souls, whose dwelling was higher up, were never entangled by love of the earthly, and always served the Father of the world (*De Somn. u. s.*). These souls that hovered in the air the philosophers called demons, but Scripture angels, because they reported (*διαγγέλλουσι*) the behests of the Father to the children and the necessities of the children to the Father (*De Somn. u. s.*; *De Gig. § 24*).^m The evil angels were simply evil souls. By its origin, and irrespective of those sensuous parts which cling to it through its union with the body, the soul was connected with God. It was one of those "Potencies" or emanations which in their original condition were called angels (demons) and formed parts of that of which the Logos was the whole. But here also we must properly understand Philo. In the original formation of man, he tells us, God had used no other model (*παράδειγμα*) than His Logos (*De Mundi Opif. § 48*). But all the succeeding generations of men were always inferior, being farther removed from God, the original former of the first man. So there was constant degeneration (*u. s.* § 49). Adam had been the first citizen of this world. As every city, so the world had a constitution which was the right reason of nature, or more exactly the established order (*θεσμός*), the Law of God. But of this city and polity there must have been citizens before man. These could only have been the reasonable Divine natures (*λογικὰ θεῖα φύσεις*), some of them incorporeal and "intelligible," others not destitute of bodies such as the stars (*u. s.* § 50). With this constitution and with these beings the first man had been in complete harmony. Every man then was in respect of his reason kindred with the Divine Reason, Logos, being an impression, or fragment, of that happy nature. As regarded his body man represented every element and every thing in nature (*u. s.* § 51). In another place Philo describes "reason" (*νοῦς*) as an image of the Divine and invisible Being, a coin stamped and impressed with the seal of God, of which the eternal Logos was the *χαρακτήρ* (*De Plant. Noë § 5*; comp. also the passage in *Quis rer. div. her. § 48*, previously quoted).ⁿ The rational soul then was not formed immediately after God, but after the Logos. This "reason" (*νοῦς*), "the soul of the soul," had come to man from without, from God (*De Mundi Op. § 21*). In the system of Philo "reason" was equivalent

to that "spirit" (*πνεῦμα*), which had been inspired from above, and was of Divine substance (*Quis rer. div. her. § 38*). But we had within us really a twofold nature: "animal and man." Each of these had its cognate faculty: the "zootic" (irrational), by which we lived, and the "reasoning," which made us rational beings. Irrational beings (animals) shared with us the "animal" faculty, but not the purely rational part, which was of God, who was the source of the most ancient Logos. The seat of the animal soul was in the blood. But the rational soul or "spirit" which had emanated from the supreme fountain, was the *τύπος* and *χαρακτήρ* of the Divine *δύναμις*. Moses had called it "the likeness of God," to shew that God was the archetype of the "rational" nature, and man the imitation and the copy. As stated, all this referred not to the animal part of the soul but to "reason," which was the "spirit" breathed into man, and of His own Divine Nature (*ἰδίον θεούτητος*) (*Quod deter. pot. insid. §§ 22-24*).^o While the "spirit" was thus the direct outcome of the Divine, the animal soul was (since its first creation) due to generation, to the *σπέρμα*, which passed from the lowest stage (*ἔξις*, such as the bones) by motion to that of *φύσις* (plant-nature, as the hair and nails), and into animal nature—the moist parts of the *sperma* forming the limbs and other portions of the body, and the airy parts of it the animal soul, with its two chief powers: nutrition and sensation (*De Opif. M. § 22*; *de Leg. all. ii. 7*). The peculiar properties of the spirit were intellect and freedom of the will (*Quod Deus sit immutab. § 10*). And yet for all this spiritual nature, we are told in another place, that the soul was an efflux of that aether of which the heaven and the stars were formed.^p Before time began the souls had been without body in undisturbed contemplation of God (*De Gigant. § 7*). To this Gen. i. 27 referred, which described the creation of "the heavenly man" (*ἄνθρωπος οὐράνιος*). He was the archetype ("after the likeness of God")—not an individual, but a species, and hence neither male nor female (*ἄνθρωπος γενικός*). But when joined to the body the heavenly became the "earthly" (*γήινος*) [*de leg. all. i. 12*; *ii. 4*]. Standing between the mortal and immortal, man was himself a little world—a microcosm—the noblest of all creatures. Yet far beneath purely spiritual essences, and indeed (as we have seen) not created by God alone, but with the assistance of demiurges. Only when the soul was freed from the body would those who had liberated themselves

^o Zeller refers to the difficult question of the relation of this Divine Pneuma to the "Potencies," especially to the Logos. He holds that, as God only acted upon the world through His Potencies which were summed up in the Logos—and never directly—the Pneuma could not have been a second principle by the side of the Logos, but must be regarded as either one of the Potencies in the Logos, or else as only another aspect of the Logos, although not one peculiar to Him. Zeller decides in favour of the latter view, and thinks that Philo understood by Pneuma spiritual substance generally, as extending from God to rational beings through the medium of the Divine Potencies.

^p *Quis rer. div. her. § 57*. Zeller shows that we have here an attempt to combine the Stoic view about the substance of the soul with the Aristotelian about aether.

^m In *De Somn.* all this is connected with Jacob's vision of the ladder; in *De Gigant.* with the marriage of the sons of God with the daughters of men.

ⁿ All these explanations turn on the *κατ' εἰκόνα* of man's creation in Gen. i. 27.

from its sway, return to the enjoyment of the higher life—the *vous* alone, not the lower parts of the soul, having share in it. But for those that were bound by the love of the earthly, a kind of migration of souls was in store (*De Somm.* i. § 22). In connection with the recent controversy about the views entertained at the time of Christ as to punishment and its duration we mark^a that in Philo's view those who had been wholly subject to the violent and incurable disease of earthly wickedness would have to bear their misery, "being to all time shamefully cast out into the place of the wicked" (μέχρι τοῦ παντός αἰῶνος ἀνάστα σκορακισθέντα εἰς ἀσεβῶν χάρον, *De Cherub.* § 1), there to endure unmitigated and everlasting misery. And even the wicked of Jewish descent are consigned to "Tartarus and deep darkness" (τάρταρον καὶ βαθὺ σκότος, *de exocr.* § 6).

The main point in the Psychology of Philo lies in his distinction between reason and sensuousness, between the reasonable and the non-reasonable, the immortal and the mortal part of the soul. With this, however, the Stoic views about "presentation" [by means of sensation (*φαντασία*) and "impulse" (*ὄρμη*)] are connected—the former being sensuousness affecting reason, the latter reason affecting sensuousness. And yet both were attributes of the animal soul! In another passage Philo speaks of three attributes of it: perception, presentation, and impulse (*αἰσθησις, φαντασία, ὄρμη*), giving the Stoic definitions of them (*Quod D. sit immut.* § 9). In yet another place we read (in connection with the symbolism of the number seven—that of the stars) of seven attributes of the soul: the five senses, the vocal organ, and the generative power (*de M. Opif.* § 40). Again, Philo speaks of the "male" and the "female" soul, of which the one devoted itself exclusively to God, the other to things created (*De Leg. Spec.* ed. Rich. v. p. 103, § 32). Lastly, we mark, on the one hand, the Platonic distinction of "reason" (*λόγος*), "courage," and "desire" (*u. s. p.* 135, towards the end)—and, on the other, the Aristotelian of the nourishing, sentient and rational soul.^b If from all this uncleanness we turn to what constantly emerges in the system of Philo, we come back upon the fundamental distinction and separation of sensation and reason. But sensation is that in the soul which is most kindred to the body. It has its deep root in the body, as the vessel of the soul (*τῆς ὅλης ψυχῆς ἀγγεῖον*, *De Congr. erud. gr.* § 5). The body was "Egypt," and this same allegorical designation indicated all the evil which came to us from the body.^c Life in the body was real death, and death real life (*De Leg. Alleg.* i. at the close). The body was the prison-house. To come forth from it and from all sensuousness, was the condition of true life, and would be that of the better life hereafter. And this was the higher meaning of it when Abraham was led forth (*Gen. xv.* 5), and

when Isaac and Moses went forth (*Gen. xxiv.* 62; *Ex. ix.* 29; *De Leg. Alleg.* iii. §§ 13, 14). We have previously referred to the remarkable passage (*De Gigant.* § 3), in which Philo speaks of the descent of the soul into the body as into a river, whose whirlpool carries away the many, while only few swim on the top, and afterwards return to their original habitation. These were they who, giving themselves to wisdom, died to the bodily life. And (*u. s.* §§ 7-9) those "angels" who had allied themselves to the daughters of man were the wicked who pursued various pleasures. Accordingly the spirit of God would "not remain among men for ever, because they are flesh." But all this was chiefly due to our inseparable connection with the flesh (§ 7), which was the great hindrance to the growth of wisdom. True, participation in earthly things was necessary in our present condition. And here applied the warning of *Lev. xviii.* 6. So far from voluntarily approaching the pleasures of the body, we must ever seek entirely to alienate ourselves from them, looking upon such things as riches, glory and bodily strength as being really the greatest evil (*μέγιστον κακόν*).^d

From what has been said, it will be inferred that Philo strongly maintains the universal sinfulness of man. It is deeply interesting, that he always introduces it in connection with the need of sacrifices. If the entrance of the soul into the body was due to love of the sensuous, the connection between soul and body must lead to constant sin. Sin was congenital to every man, however good he might be. It was involved in his being born (*De Vita M.* iii. § 17). Commenting on *Gen. xvii.* 1, Philo shows that it was impossible to get rid of every stain of sin, or wholly to eradicate its evil; on which account we ought not to look for any perfectly good man in this life (*De mutat. nom.* § 6). But all this is not to be taken quite absolutely. While Philo declares that no man from his birth to his end lived without fault (whence, except for His mercy, God might pronounce universal condemnation), yet he also guards himself by qualifying this declaration of universal sinfulness by this addition: "Of himself" (*αὐθενὸς ἀνθρώπων τὸν ἀπὸ γενέσεως μέχρι τελευτῆς βίον ἄπταιστον, ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ δραμόντος*, *Quod D. immut.* § 16). Similarly, although he would attribute absolute sinlessness only to God, yet he adds that it might possibly be also ascribed to a God-like man (*τάχα δὲ καὶ θεῖον ἀνδρὸς*, *de Poenit.* § 1). Whether this is to be regarded as a concession to current Jewish views, or must be traced to his exaltation of the Biblical heroes, it certainly modifies the statements of Philo as to the absolute prevalence of sin. And yet more important limitation does the doctrine of original sin receive. Commenting on *Gen. xv.* 16, Philo discusses the four ages of man, and ascribes to the child during its first seven years—before passion has developed in youth^e—a pure nature

^a For our present purpose it matters not what Philo may have derived from Plato (*Zeller*, p. 397, note 6).

^b *Comp. Zeller*, p. 398.

^c *Zeller* aptly notes that with Philo *σάρξ* is only a realistic expression for "body." The distinction between the Pauline and the Philonic use of this term must be evident. St. Paul distinctly and repeatedly marks that it is not the material *per se* which is evil.

^d All this, and more, is fully set forth in *De Cherub.* §§ 13-19. Beginning with a highly mystical allegorisation of marriage—of that of Sarah, of Leah, of Rebekah (who is perseverance), and of Zipporah (winged and sublime virtue)—Philo makes an enthusiastic appeal for self-denial and the pursuit of wisdom.

^e But this is partly developed with the development of the body, the passions having lain hidden.

which he likens to a smooth tablet that had not yet received any indelible characters, whether of good or of evil (*Quis rer. d. h.* § 59). And the same view is even more strongly expressed when Philo declares that the soul of the infant has neither share of good nor of evil (*ἀμέτοχος οὐσα ἑκατέρου, ἀγαθοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, de Leg. All. ii.* § 15).

D. ETHICS.—It will naturally be expected that in Ethics Philo should mainly follow Stoic teaching. Throughout he emphasises it that only one thing was to be desired and followed: the good, pure virtue (*τὸ μόνον εἶναι τὸ καλὸν ἀγαθόν, de post. C.* § 39, end). We have seen that, according to Philo, all that was earthly was to be regarded as a necessary evil, of which man was to make use as little and as simply as was absolutely requisite for his life, while at the same time he was to aim after the entire uprooting of all earthly desires and affections.² In all these respects one of the most instructive passages is that in *De Leg. Alleg. ii.* §§ 17–19, where Adam serves as allegory of the mind, Eve of sensation, and the serpent of pleasure, and all that has been previously said of the influence of the one on the other, and of the need of renouncing pleasure is evolved from the history of the fall. But this is not all. Like the Stoics, Philo speaks of the four great virtues: prudence, temperance, courage, and justice. These were the four rivers—all branches of that generic virtue, which springs from Eden, the wisdom of God, which is the Logos of God, according to whom generic virtue was created (*De Leg. Alleg. i.* § 19). Similarly we have an allegorical explanation of the four kings against five (*Gen. xiv.* 1–9) being the four affections: pleasure, desire, fear, grief, and again the five senses (*De Abr. xli.*). It would occupy too much space to follow the parallelism with Stoic teaching to its details.³ It is more important to notice where Philo breaks off from Stoicism. To the question, how man was to get free from the power of the sensuous, Philo could not reply by directing him to himself. As a Jew he must have directed him for this to God. It was God who alone could plant or build up virtue in the soul (*De Leg. Alleg. i.* § 15). Nay, Philo goes beyond this into absolute Predestinarianism when he ascribes not only all good in man to Divine grace, but indicates that there had been an election for good even before any actual deed (*De Leg. Alleg. iii.* §§ 28, 27, 24), that God went forward to meet some souls (*u. s.* § 76), and that to some He gave the grace of perseverance (*u. s. i.* § 28). But from all this it followed that the main object of man must be to place himself in right relationship to God—not to follow his own ideas or views, but to aim after the contemplation of God. This, and this alone, was true wisdom. And with this final conclusion Philo returned from Greek philosophy to his Jewish faith.

Everything was to be regarded as subservient and secondary to this contemplation of God.

² For details see Zeller, p. 403. Noteworthy passages also in *De Somn. i.* § 20, and the opening paragraphs of Book II.

³ See here Zeller, whose order and lead we have generally followed.

Hence, although Philo insists with all earnestness on the duty of not leaving to the wicked the management of all political and worldly affairs which would lead to ruin, and on the duty of not withdrawing from all into solitude (*De Prof.* § 4), yet this was only for the present necessity, and as a kind of preparation for the higher life. We remember Philo's bitter complaints at being drawn into the whirlpool of public affairs. Joseph, as the type of a man engaged in state affairs, appears in an unfavourable light by the side of higher characters.⁴ The same superiority belonged to Divine wisdom, as compared with all other knowledge. Philo treats of this in quite a series of paragraphs (*De Congr. quær. erud. gr.* § 4, onwards). Not only are the encyclical sciences—grammar, music, mathematics, rhetoric, and dialectics (§ 4), and even astronomy, to which Philo assigns the second place (§ 10)—merely intermediate, subordinate, suited to the child-period, though they may lead up to the higher, but we remember the various allegorisms on this subject. Even philosophy is denounced as too often sophistry (§ 13). All such pursuits were as concubines compared with the true wife. We recall here what has been previously stated about the allegorical meaning of Hagar and Sarah, and about Philo's own experience in bringing, as it were, all the offspring from such connections to the true mistress of his soul (§ 14). And in another discussion (*De ebriet.* §§ 40–49) Philo seeks to show the groundlessness and the danger of imagining that we can attain any true knowledge by such studies. The human mind was not competent of itself to attain it in that direction; 1st, because of the darkness which here compassed many objects (§ 41); 2ndly, because of the endless variations which occurred in things within our ken (§ 42); 3rdly, because of the varying judgments of men, nay, even of our own minds, on the same subject (§ 43); 4thly, because of our liability to mistake and the partialness of our knowledge (§ 44, 45); 5thly, because of the merely subjective character of our sensations (sight, taste, &c., § 46), of our knowledge (§ 47), and even of what was considered right or wrong (§ 48); lastly, because of the absolute differences among philosophers on metaphysics, ethics, and all else (§ 48).

So then it was to God that mind and soul must turn. There only would we find true wisdom and true perfectness. But how was this to be attained? We have already seen that Philo sets before us the three patriarchs as symbols of the three types of wisdom and virtue: Abraham, of that which has been acquired by instruction; Isaac, of that which comes by natural disposition, and is innate; and Jacob, of that through practice and discipline, *askesis*. Nor can we be in any doubt which of these Philo regarded as the highest. Lowest stood *askesis*. It implied a constant struggle against the hostile element, in which a man ever required to pause, take breath, and recoup his strength. Higher than this was the virtue which came by instruction. Here there was no arrestment, but

⁴ So very often. See among others the comparison with Isaac "the leader of the good and noble company," "the self-taught," whose goodness was not acquired, but of his own nature (*De Somn. ii.* § 2).

continual advance. Yet both were only partial and progressive—mediate also, whereas that virtue which was innate was direct, immediate, and absolute (*De mut. nom.* §§ 10–14). This was the immediate gift of God. True wisdom also, in its highest and only real stage, was the direct and immediate contemplation of God—not in His manifestations, but beyond all that is finite: in Himself. We are here approaching the final difference, as it seems to us, between the system of Philo and the fundamental principles of New Testament theology. In the system of Philo forgiveness, reconciliation, and mediatorship are ultimately not required; they would, indeed, be wholly out of place. Nor yet is faith required for approach to God. Philosophy might tell us to recognise God by His works. But this were only to perceive God in His shadow. Better far to pass beyond all created objects, to know the Great Uncreated Himself, the Logos, and the Kosmos. This had been the difference between Moses and Bezaleel (*De Leg. Alleg.* iii. §§ 32–33). In another place (*u. s.* § 62) Philo, using as illustration the difference between the health that comes to us from God, and that which is the result of medical skill, understands the latter of such good things as come to the soul through the “angels” (the individual “Powers”) and the Logos—who is, as it were, the physician. But there are those who pass beyond the Logos to see God face to face, and are nourished directly by Him, and not by the Logos.^a Nay, more than this—in a passage previously referred to (*De Conf. ling.* § 28) we are encouraged to advance to be adorned like “the firstborn Logos,”^b the oldest of His “Angels,” the great “Archangel” of “many names.” Here then the Logos is no longer required—indeed, is left aside. Here also “the soul is shone upon by God as if at noonday,” “it is wholly and entirely filled with the ‘intelligible’” light, and wholly surrounded by its brilliancy; it has hastened on beyond the perception of God’s highest attributes to that pure and unmixed unity, even to “the sight of the living God” (*De Abr.* §§ 24, 25). Led on by love as the guide of wisdom, the soul proceeds onwards beyond all that is seen, and heard, and known, to the purely “intelligible,” to the original “models” and “ideas” of what, even when perceived by the senses, is so beautiful. Then it is “seized with a sort of sober intoxication,” a kind of corybantian mania, and yields to enthusiasm, by which it is conducted onwards to the highest summit of the “intelligibles” (*τῶν νοητῶν*) till it seems to be reaching the great King Himself. And while it is eagerly longing to behold Him, pure and unmingled rays of Divine light are poured forth like a torrent so as to bewilder by their brilliancy the eyes of the understanding (*De mundi opif.* § 23).

^a Very similar is the exposition of Jacob’s ladder (*Gen.* xxxiii. 12) on which the “angels” descended, while to the perfect man applied *Lev.* xxvi. 12 (*De Somn.* i. § 23). Similarly also in *De Migr. Abr.* § 31, where we have a beautiful picture of the difference between the teachings of philosophy, falsely so-called, as well as the mistakes of pride, and the pure contemplation of God.

^b Bishop Lightfoot (*Comment. on Coloss.* p. 146, col. b) notes the Philonic use of *πρωτόγονος* instead of the Apostolic *πρωτόκοκος*.

This was the ecstatic state in which our consciousness was merged and lost in the Divine. This was the real essence of “the trance,” such as that of Abraham (*Gen.* xv.); nay, of all prophetic inspiration—and all the Biblical heroes were prophets. For the prophet spake nothing of his own. In him the brightness of the Divine light had extinguished all human light (*Quis rer. d. her.* §§ 52, 53). Nor was this prophetic inspiration confined to Biblical persons, nor yet to direct communications from God. Philo himself claims to have been frequently filled with Divine inspiration, in consequence of which he had learned to understand, and could interpret, what otherwise would have been unknown to him. Thus, for instance, had he learned that in the one living and true God there were these two “Potencies” of goodness and government (*De Cher.* § 9). And here lay the connecting point between direct Divine communication and our dreams, on which Philo so largely dwells in his classification of dreams (for example, in the opening paragraph of the second book *de Somniis*). But—and herein, surely, lies another fundamental difference from New Testament teaching—all this was only for the initiated, to whom Philo makes, as we have previously shown, his special appeal as against the common multitude (*De Cher.* § 14).

E. THE MESSIAH AND THE LAST THINGS.*

On these all-important subjects we shall naturally expect only the most shadowy statements on the part of Philo. Indeed, belief in a Messiah may be regarded as foreign to the system of Philo, and only introduced from his Jewish theology. Even so, it affords strong evidence of Jewish Messianic expectancy at that period. At the outset we mark three points on which Philo fundamentally diverged from the faith of the synagogue, and still more from the teaching of the New Testament. First: considering his views as to the body, Philo could not look for any resurrection of the dead. Nor yet did he believe in a final judgment, nor in the destruction of the world. Secondly, the highest ideal of Judaism, in the view of Philo, was Moses, whose return in the body he could not have expected. Thirdly, it were impossible to conceive anything more opposed to his system than the idea, that the Logos should ever become incarnate and appear in the flesh. And yet, for all this, it cannot be seriously called in question that Philo expressed anticipation both of a personal Messiah and of a Messianic reign and kingdom. The two passages to which we here refer are in *De Excerpt.* §§ 8, 9, and in *De Prasm. et Poen.* § 15 to the end, but chiefly § 19. In the first of these passages (at the close of the *De Excerpt.* beginning with the end of § 8), Philo tells us that after the general repentance and reformation of Israel, a great change would come over their fortunes. Even those held in captivity would in one day, as at a given signal, be restored to freedom—their masters being ashamed to keep those in bondage who were so much better than themselves. Then they all would rise

* Comp. here, besides the works of Gfrörer, Dähne, and Schürer, especially J. G. Müller, *d. Mess. Erwart. d. Juden Philo*, and *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i.

up "with one impulse," and come from all the countries and islands whither they had been scattered "to one place pointed out to them" [similarly in *Bemidb. R.* 11]. On their march they would be guided "by an appearance more divine than is compatible with the nature of man" (*ξαναγόμενοι πρὸς τινος θειοτέρας, ἢ κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνης ὄψεως, u. s. § 9*)—invisible to all others, but apparent to those that are saved. Besides, they would have three "Paracletes" to reconcile them to the Father: the goodness of Him on Whom they would call, the merits and intercession of "the Fathers," and their own moral change. [It will be noticed that in all this Philo is substantially in accordance with ordinary Jewish views, nor can this more Divine than human apparition be identified with his Logos.]

Here then we have a previous state of banishment and misery, a miraculous deliverance, and a return to Palestine under the invisible, yet visible, guidance of this human-Divine appearance. On the return of Israel to their land would follow the period of Messianic bliss. The ruined cities would be rebuilt; the desert inhabited; the happiness of former times would be far exceeded, and wealth inconceivable would flow in upon each individual and on the community. All this, to the utter confounding of their enemies, who had reviled them, ignorant that the former sorrows, due to Israel's unfaithfulness, had been intended as a warning to all men. But alike the religious reformation and the happiness of Israel would be never ending. And the passage appropriately concludes with what, to us at least, seems a reference to *Is. vi. 13*.^d

Even more detailed than this is the sketch of the Messianic kingdom in the series of paragraphs in *De Praem. et Poenis*. Once more we have an allusion to what is evidently a favourite Messianic idea of Philo: the miraculous gathering together in one place, chosen by God, of all Israel, scattered to the ends of the world (§ 19, close). The sketch begins by a curious reference to the two classes of enemies which threaten men: wild beasts, and men inflamed by the selfishness of their passions. Philo connects the two kinds of warfare thus caused, and looks upon the removal of the one as dependent on that of the other. He expects that, when the passions of our minds shall be tamed, a similar change will pass over the wild beasts. They will first imitate the domestic animals, and then gradually learn to be the friends and companions of man. This somewhat realistically sketched picture represents "the future time," when what is "good shall shine upon the world" (§ 15). The peace in nature would react on man, who would be ashamed in this to lag behind the beasts. But if exceptionally there should be war on the part of those who boast in their insolence, they would be repelled by a force far more powerful, so that a hundred would flee before five (*Lev. xxvi. 8*). Some again would flee where no man pursued, so that their backs would be an easy target, and the whole army to a man be destroyed. For, adds Philo, freely quoting from the text of *Numb. xxiv. 7*, "A man shall come forth, heading an army and

warring, who shall subdue great and populous nations, God sending the suitable assistance to the pious." This, he explains, would consist of courage of soul and strength of body. Moreover, quoting *Ex. xxiii. 28*—those who were unworthy of a regular defeat would be opposed by swarms of wasps, and so be shamefully destroyed. The victory thus achieved would be permanent. It would lead to irresistible dominion, to the benefit of all who were its subjects, whether willingly [on the part of the Jews], or from fear or shame [the Gentiles]. And temporal consequences also would follow, quite similar to those expected by the Rabbis in Messianic days: absence of disease, wealth, abundance without need of toil, a constant succession of harvests of the richest and best kind, boundless fertility of the soil, numerous offspring, with entire absence of barrenness, and the like. As we compare all this with the Rabbinic descriptions and with those of the *Pseudepigrapha*,^e we feel that, as regards the outward details of Messianic expectancy, Philo occupies the same ground as his Jewish contemporaries.

F. PHILO'S VIEWS ON THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.^f

1. At the risk of repeating what in part has been stated in another connection, we shall first place side by side the passages in which Philo expresses his views on *Prophetic Inspiration*. They are four in number. In the first (*de Monarch.* close of Book I.), he tells how the "prophet inspired" (*προφήτης θεοφόρητος*) to preach and prophesy was "possessed and inspired" (*ἐνθουσιῶν*) so that he did not comprehend what he uttered, but that all his words proceeded as if from another prompting him—the prophets being the "interpreters of God," Who made use of their voices as instruments to set forth what He pleased. Thus the prophet was actually possessed of God—he was passive, unconscious, and inspiration not only affected his mind but commanded his lips and his speech. Quite similar to this is the description in *de Leg. spec.* § 8 (ed. R. v. p. 122), where we are also told that, unknown to the prophet, his reasoning powers had left the citadel of his soul which the Divine spirit had entered, Who was making his voice to sound forth the prophecies he was delivering. In a third passage, after speaking of Abraham as inspired (*ἐνθουσιῶντος καὶ θεοφορήτου*), Philo uses almost the same ex-

^e Comp. *En. xlvi. 1, &c.*; *xlvi. 2*; *lxii. 7*; *Orac. Book of Sibyll. iii. 236, &c.*; *4 Esd. xii. 2*.

^f The list of Scripture-passages bearing on this subject, given by Mangey, is misleading. The question as to the Old Testament Canon according to Philo—or rather, from what parts of the Old Testament Philo has quoted—has been fully and exhaustively treated by Cl. Frees Hornemann (*Observ. ad illustr. doct. de Can. V. T. ex Philone*). The results of his investigations were transferred, in condensed form, by Eichhorn into his *Eint. in d. A. Test.* (vol. i. pp. 122-135). To remove from these lists all errors, and to supply omissions, it has been thought best to submit the matter to a fresh investigation, so as to adduce (with the exception of the Pentateuch) all the passages which Philo quotes from the Old Testament, and to indicate the Tractates in which he quotes them. For the sake of convenience the quotations are arranged in the order of the books in our A. V.

^d Müller holds that the Messianic description in this passage and in *de Praem. et Poen.* was based upon *Dan. vii. 13, 14*.

pressions about the prophet as being inwardly prompted, and struck and moved like an instrument to sound what God spake* (*Quis rer. div. her.* § 52). Lastly, although in more brief manner, substantially the same description of prophets is given in a fourth passage (*de Praem. et Poen.* § 9).

2. *The Canon.*—Although Philo described all the prophets as "God's interpreters" (*ἑρμηνεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ*),—Plato speaks similarly of the poets, and designated their writings in terms which mark this in the strongest manner,^b yet a special distinction attached to Moses. This, in accordance with general Jewish opinion. And yet there is here also an exceedingly curious modification, if not contradiction, on the part of Philo. In *de Vita Moys.* iii. §§ 23, 24, Philo makes a threefold distinction even in the Mosaic books. In the first class he placed the sacred oracles "delivered in the person of God by His interpreter, the Divine prophet." A second class consisted of those "in the form of question and answer," while yet a third class comprised those "delivered by Moses in his character of Divinely prompted lawgiver, possessed by Divine inspiration." The first class of oracles was too exalted to be adequately praised; the second had a sort of human admixture: the prophet asking information and receiving instruction; while in the third Moses spoke as Lawgiver, God having given him a share of prescient power. This classification of inspiration seems to modify in an important manner the general views of Philo on the subject. It is further very remarkable that Philo ascribes the first and highest class of prophetic inspiration (*ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ*) not only to Moses but also to Jeremiah, whose special disciple he declares himself to have become (*de Cherub.* § 14, comp. with *de V. Moys.* iii. § 23).

The quotations by Philo from all the *five books of the Law* are so frequent that it is impossible here to enumerate them. The *book of Joshua* is quoted (*Josh. i. 5*), as inspired in *de confus. ling.* § 32, with which we must compare what is said concerning Joshua in *de carit.* § 2. The *book of Judges* (viii. 9) is quoted in *de conf. ling.* § 26, although without direct statement of its Divine inspiration, yet in a connection and manner which imply it. It is well known that the two books of Samuel and the two books of the Kings were anciently classed together as the *four books of Kings*. That Philo so classed them appears from this, that in *Quod Deus sit immut.*, § 2, 1 Sam. i. 11⁴, is quoted as from the first book of Kings, while (*u. s.* § 29), when citing 1 Kings xvii. 10, he refers to it as from the books of Kings (*ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις*). If therefore in *de ebriet.* § 36, Philo quotes 1 Sam. i. 11, as "holy scripture," while in paraphrastically citing the same verse, or else 1 Sam. i. 28, he speaks of Hannah and Samuel as prophets (*de Somm.* close of Book I.), the inference seems warranted that Philo ascribed inspiration equally to the two books of

Samuel and the two books of Kings. We have already adduced two if not three passages in which Philo quotes 1 Sam. i. 11, possibly i. 28 also, and certainly 1 Kings xvii. 10. We now add the following: 1 Sam. i. 14, 15, are quoted in *de ebriet.* § 36; 1 Sam. ii. 5, is quoted twice: in *Quod Deus sit immut.*, § 3, and in *de mutat. nom.* § 25; 1 Sam. ix. 9, is quoted in *Quod D. immut.* § 29, in *Quis rer. Div. her.* § 15, and in *de Migr. Abr.* § 8; 1 Sam. x. 22, in *de Migr. Abr.* § 36; and 1 Kings xvii. 10 and 18 are quoted in *Quod D. immut.* § 29.

The *book of Ruth* is not referred to by Philo, but it is only fair to suggest that it was included in the book of Judges.

The *books of Chronicles* are quoted by Philo, viz. 1 Chron. vii. 14, in *de congr. erud. gr.* § 8. Possibly Philo may also have had 1 Chron. ii. 17-19, in mind in *de praem. et poen.* § 13. *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* were anciently joined together. That Philo regarded the *book of Ezra* as forming part of another work,^k appears from the manner in which he quotes *Ezra* viii. 2, in *de confus. ling.* § 28. And *Neh. x. 38*, may have been in Philo's mind in *de mut. nom.* § 1.

The *book of Esther* is not quoted by Philo. *Job* xiv. 4, is quoted in *de mutat. nom.* § 6. All the *five books of Psalms* are quoted, and repeatedly with express declaration of their inspiration. Thus *Ps. xxii. 1* (A. V. xxiii. 1) is quoted no less than three times: in *de agricult.* § 12 twice, and once in *de mut. nom.* § 20; *Ps. xxvi. 1* (A. V. xxvii. 1), in *de Somm.* i. 13; *Ps. xxx. 19* (xxii. 19) in *de conf. ling.* § 11; *Ps. xxxvi. 4* (A. V. xxxvii. 4) is quoted twice: in *de plant. Nō* § 9, and in *de Somm.* ii. § 37a; *Ps. xli. 4* (A. V. xlii. 3) in *de migr. Abr.* § 28 [possibly *Ps. xliii. (xliv.)* in *de conf. ling.* § 12]; *Ps. xlv. 5* (A. V. xlv. 4) in *de Somm.* ii. § 37b; *Ps. lxi. 12* (A. V. lxii. 11) in *Q. Deus immut.* § 18; *Ps. lxiv. 10* (A. V. lxx. 9) in *de Somm.* ii. § 37b; *Ps. lxxiv. 9* (A. V. lxxv. 8) in *Q. Deus immut.* § 17; *Ps. lxxvii. 49* (A. V. lxxviii. 4) in *de Gigant.* § 4; *Ps. lxxxix. 6* (A. V. lxxx. 5) in *de Migr. Abr.* § 28; *Ps. lxxxix. 7* (lxxx. 6) in *de conf. ling.* § 13; *Ps. lxxxiii. 11* (A. V. lxxxiv. 10) in *quis rer. Div. her.* § 58; *Ps. xciii. 9* (A. V. xciv. 9) in *de plant. N.* § 7; *Ps. c. 1* (A. V. ci.) in *Q. Deus immut.* § 16; and *Ps. xciii. 25* [17] (*cxiv. 17*) in *de Prof.* § 11.

From the *book of Proverbs*, which Philo ascribes to Solomon (*de congr. er. gr.* § 31), he quotes *Prov. iii. 4*, in *de ebriet.* § 20; *Prov. iii. 11*, in *de congr. er. gr.* § 31; *Prov. iv. 3, &c.*, in *de ebriet.* § 20; and *Prov. viii. 22, 23*, in *de ebriet.* § 8.

From the *book of Ecclesiastes* there is not any quotation, but the reasoning attributed to Abraham on the death of Sarah (in *de Abr.* § 44), reminds us generally of Ecclesiastes, and in one part specially of Eccles. xii. 7. The *Song of Solomon* is not quoted by Philo.

Is. v. 7 is quoted as prophetic inspired utterance in *de Somm.* ii. § 26; *Is. xlviii. 22*, in *de mut. nom.* § 31; and *Is. liv. 1*, in *de exercut. § 7*. From *Jeremiah* we have three (or rather four) quotations, viz. *Jer. ii. 13*, is quoted in *de prof.* § 36; *Jer. iii. 4*, is quoted, with the previously given description of the prophet's highest inspiration, in *de Cher.* § 14; and *Jer. xv. 10*, in

* In the same passage we also find the curious statement, that every good man is a prophet.

^b For the various designations given by Philo to the prophets (including Moses), and to their writings, see Hornemann, *u. s.*

⁴ This, I think, and not v. 28, as is generally supposed.

^k This probably included the books of Chronicles.

de conf. ling. § 12, and again with a variant in § 13. The book of *Lamentations* is not quoted, but it seems to have been included with the prophecies of Jeremiah. The only reference in Philo to the book of *Ezekiel* is of a peculiar kind. In *de monarch.* § 9, he explains the law as to the marriage of the high priest, as laid down in Lev. xxi. 13, 14. But in the following paragraph (§ 10) he adds certain details about ordinary priests not found in the Levitical Law, and which must be derived from Ezek. xlv. 22, although the passage is not expressly quoted in so many words. [And does not this concession to ordinary priests in the Priest-code of Ezekiel prove that it is of later date than the Law in Leviticus?]

Daniel is not quoted by Philo. But we have seen that the picture which Philo presents of the Messiah and of Messianic times is probably based on Dan. vii. 13, 14.

The twelve *Minor Prophets* are commonly treated as one work. Attestation of some of them would therefore imply the reception of all in the Canon. But Philo expressly quotes from two of the minor prophets, and that with distinct attestation of their Divine inspiration, viz.: Hos. xiv. 8, 9 in *de plant. N.* § 33, and again in *de nut. nom.* § 24, and, lastly, Zechar. vi. 12 in *de confus. ling.* § 14.¹

From this analysis it will be seen that the only books of which it may with certainty be affirmed that they are not referred to by Philo are *Esther* and the *Song of Solomon*. The reference to *Ecclesiastes* is very doubtful, much more so than that to *Daniel*.

3. The reader who will take the trouble of comparing the quotations of Philo from the Old Testament, above given, and still more those from the Pentateuch, with the text of the LXX., will be equally struck by the agreement, and by the number and character of the divergences, between them. The latter (to which alone we here refer) are the more remarkable when we remember that Philo regarded the LXX. version as inspired. These divergences between the quotations of Philo and our present text of the LXX. seem to establish that sometimes that text differed from ours; at other times Philo seems to quote from memory; or he quotes paraphrastically; or he emendates the LXX. from the Hebrew; or he quotes freely; or he combines two or more of these peculiarities of quotation. But the general impression left on the mind is the marked accordance in these respects between the mode of quotation by Philo and that of the *New Testament writers*. In another place^m we have shown that this free mode of Targumic quotation was in general use among the Hebrew-speaking Jews at the time of Christ. It is now clearly established by an examination of Philo that the same was the case with the Greek-writing Alexandrian Jews. The peculiar mode of Old Testament quotation by the *New Testament writers* is therefore, so far from being an objection, entirely in accordance with the established practice of that time.

¹ The references in *Quaest. in Gen.* § 100, are probably to Numb. xiv. 9, and Ps. lxxxi. 15 (*Vulg.*). But we possess the Tractate only in Latin translation.

^m *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*

While the quotations previously given will enable the student to institute the comparison and verify the conclusions just referred to, he has also the means of extending it over the Pentateuch. In his *Exercitatio in Versionem LXX. Interpr. ex Philone*, Hornemann has instituted a detailed comparison between the quotations of Philo and the text of the LXX., as previous to the labours of Tischendorf and Lagarde. This task has been resumed, with far better critical means, and extended over all the Old Testament quotations of Philo, by Siegfried in three articles in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* Jahrg. 1873. As the outcome of these investigations Siegfried groups the quotations of Philo under the following heads;

1. Quotations which are paraphrases. These comprise a very large proportion of them.
2. Quotations in which citation from the LXX. is combined with explanatory additions of Philo.
3. Quotations in which a verse is adduced in one passage according to the LXX., in another differing from it.
4. Quotations in which the reading of Philo occurs also in some of our MSS.
5. Quotations in which the LXX. is emendated from the Hebrew.
6. Quotations containing other variants—mostly of small importance.
7. Quotations which seem to indicate a Hebrew text differing from our Massoretic.
8. Variations from the LXX. of a linguistic character, to avoid Hebraisms or harsh constructions.
9. A few quotations in which several verses are strung together. This was also a frequent Rabbinic practice.
10. Some remarkable quotations, in which Philo bases a special interpretation on an expression not found in our present text of the LXX. On this important point comp. also Gfrörer, *Philo*, vol. i. p. 51, and Dähne, *Jud. Alex. Rel. Phil.* ii. pp. 3, 4 (notes). But Siegfried is mistaken in including among these passages 1 Sam. i. 28 (*Q. Deus innuit.* § 2) since the quotation there is not from 1 Sam. i. 28, but from verse 11, where the *δοτόν*, on which the argument turns, does occur in the LXX.
11. Deviations from the LXX. due to corruptions in the text of Philo.
12. Siegfried notices certain corrections in the text of Philo, to bring it into accordance with that of the LXX.

4. *The Apocrypha.*—Philo does not quote from any of the Apocrypha. This is the more remarkable since he so often quotes from heathen authors. There are indeed expressions which have been regarded as analogous, or at least similar, to some in the Apocrypha—chiefly in the *Wisdom of Solomon*, next to it, in *Ecclesi.*, a few in *Tobit*, one in *Judith*, a few in 1 Macc. and in 2 Macc., and one in 3 Macc. and in 1 Esdr.^o But these supposed or real resemblances are not in any sense quotations, at most imitations, easily explained in the circumstances.

VIII. Literature.

The exigencies of space prevent the discussion of some other questions arising from the writings of Philo which, indeed, could not be adequately treated in a general Article. We therefore only indicate the sources of further information on

ⁿ *Comp. Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*

^o The full list is given in Hornemann, *Observ. ad illustr. doctr. de Can.* vol. i. pp. 390.

these subjects. For a detailed exposition of the *Allegorical Exegesis* by which Philo connected his views with the Old Testament, we refer to the well-known work of Siegfried, which is mainly devoted to this point. To the same work we must also refer in regard to the *Jewish training of Philo and the agreement between his interpretations and those of the Rabbinic Midrash*. A very interesting branch of the same subject is the *correspondence between Philo and the Halakhah*, or Jewish traditional law. This has been carefully and learnedly indicated in a tractate (of 139 pages) by Dr. Bernhard Ritter. That scholar makes exhaustive examination of the, often incidental, notices in the writings of Philo on subjects connected with Jewish law: criminal jurisprudence, the law of marriage, of inheritance, constitutional law, and sacerdotal ordinances. By a comparison of these notices with the ordinances of the Mosaic law, and the later determinations of Rabbinism in the Halakhah, Dr. Ritter arrives at the conclusion, that the writings of Philo show a not inconsiderable acquaintance with the Halakhah of Palestine, side by side with great deviations from it. This is the more interesting as alike the one and the other indicates how the law of Moses was viewed, applied, and extended in practice by the Jews of Egypt. And both the agreement and the divergences with the Rabbinic usage of Palestine are the more important since, from the position of Philo, whose brother was Alabarch, his statements may be regarded as representing not only the common practice, but also the decisions of the Sanhedrin of Alexandria. It results that, although certain legal determinations of the Halakhah were known in Egypt long before Philo (as by Demetrios and Pseudo-Aristeas), and had taken root in popular life, yet their number was much smaller, and the general stand-point much more free, independent, and wide, than in Palestine.

A subject of still greater interest is the *relation, textual* (as to forms and modes of expression) and *doctrinal, between Philo and the New Testament writers*. On the doctrinal aspect some observations—although necessarily very brief—have been offered in this article. The relation between the views of Philo on "faith," and the teaching of the Old Testament on the one hand, and, on the other, that of the Gospels and Epistles is very ably discussed in the important monograph by A. Schlatter: *der Glaube im N. T.* (pp. 83-105 and 545-552). The general subject is more or less fully referred to in such works as the commentaries of Lücke on St. John, and others. The special treatise by Loesner is referred to in the subjoined account of the *Literature* of the subject. But with all acknowledgement of the learning and ability hitherto brought to bear on the subject, a fuller examination of this important point is still required. We may add, that another very important subject of enquiry is that into the *relation between Philo and the Alexandrian Fathers* (comp. here Dr. Bigg, "*The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*"). Yet another point of interest would arise from an examination of the *relation—we cannot say connection—between Philo and a certain direction of teaching in the later synagogue*, notably "*The Guide of the Perplexed*" [*Moreh Nebhu'im*] by Maimonides.

The object of that treatise is to show the identity of Aristotelianism with the Old Testament and the Talmud. The method adopted may in some sense be described as the allegorical; indeed, sometimes the same Biblical facts are chosen for allegorising as by Philo. The views of God, of the Kosmos, of inspiration, and of many other topics are almost identical with, or closely related to those of Philo, while occasionally we are involuntarily reminded of the great Alexandrian, even by turns of expression. The subject is of literary interest, the more so, as no direct connection between the two can be traced.^p

The literature on Philo is so large as to render it impossible here to enumerate it in detail. The curious reader is referred to Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* iii. pp. 87-94. The earlier literature of the subject is also given in most of the works which will be cited. In the enumeration about to be made, only such works will be named as have been used or referred to in connection with the present article. Unfortunately we cannot quote any previous English writer who has treated in detail of the system of Philo, with the exception of the account by Professor Jowett in his work on *The Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. i. pp. 448-514. This absence of previous English literature on the subject has rendered it necessary sometimes to introduce a new terminology, such as in rendering *δυνάμεις* by "Potencies,"—since other terms, such as "Powers," "Forces," or "Energies," were open to serious objection. The text used has been that of Richter (8 vols. Lips. 1828, 1829) together with the Frankfort ed. of 1691. The edition of Pfeiffer (Erlangen, 1785) is practically useless, not only from its incompleteness, but as not marking the text in paragraphs, nor yet giving any marginal reference either to the Paris edition or that of Mangey. Too much acknowledgment cannot be made of Tischendorf's *Philonea* (Lips. 1868), nor yet regret expressed for the loss of his other emendations of the text. Besides the books to which brief allusion has been made the following Articles or works on Philo may here find a place: the Articles in the *Encyclopaedius* of Schenkel (by Fritzsche) and of Herzog (in the 1st ed. by J. G. Müller, in the 2nd by Zöckler), and in Hamburger's *Real-Encycl.* (Abth. ii.); Gfrörer, *Philo u. d. Alex. Theos.* 2 vols. 1831; Dähne, *Gesch. Darstell. d. jüd. alexr. Relij. Philos.* 2 vols. 1834; Delaunay, *Philon d'Alexandrie*, 1870; Delaunay, *Moines et Sibylles*, 1874; Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* vol. ii. pt. 1, 1875; Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes* (2nd ed. of pt. ii. of the *Neutest. Zeitgesch.*), 1885; Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* (3rd ed.), vol. vi. 1868;^q Grossmann, *Quaestiones Philonae*, 1829; Lücke, *Comment. ü. d. Evang. d. Joh.* vol. i.; Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, 1875; Siegfried, *d. hebr. Wörterkl. d. Philo*, 1868; Zeller, *d. Philos. d. Griechen* (3rd ed.), vol. iii. pt. ii. 1881; J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo B. v.*

^p The "Dissertation" of S. Weisse (*Philo von Alexandria u. Moses Maimonides*, Halle, 1884), though superficial, deserves to be read as calling attention to the subject.

^q The accounts in the works of P. Beer, Jost, and Grätz, as well as others, have been perused, but require not special reference. Works on the pre-Philonic period would occupy too much space.

d. Weltsch. 1841; Bucher, *d. Lehre vom Logos*, 1856; Heinze, *d. Lehre vom Logos*, 1872; Harnoch, *Philonis Jud. Logoi*, 1879; B. Ritter, *Philo u. d. Halacha*, 1879; J. G. Müller, *d. Mess. Erwart. d. J. Philo*, 1870; P. E. Lucius, *die Therapeuten*, 1879, with which should be read the articles *Mönchthum*, by Weingarten, and *Therapeuten*, by Harnack—both in the 2nd ed. of Herzog's *Real-Encykl.*; lastly, C. F. Loesner, *Observ. in N. T. e Philone*, 1777 and C. F. Hornemann, *Exercit. Crit.* (Gött. 1773), as well as his *Observ.* (Hauniae, 1775), with which comp. the Art. by Siegfried in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* for 1873. To these we venture to add the present writer's account of Philo in the *History of the Jewish Nation*, pp. 417-456, and that in *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i. and App.—both, in some sense, preparatory and supplementary to the present Article. [A. E.]

PHILO (2), deacon. Among the proofs of the genuineness of the Ignatian letters is the fact, that we obtain a thoroughly consistent story on piecing together scattered notices about obscure persons. Thus two deacons are mentioned; Philo from Cilicia and Rheius Agathopus from Syria (*Philadelph. ii.*, *Smyrna. 10, 13*). On carefully examining these notices, we find that these deacons had not started with Ignatius on his journey, but had afterwards followed on his track: that they took the same route as he had done: that at Philadelphia, a place where Ignatius himself had encountered some heretical opposition, there had been some who treated them with contumely; that they had been too late to overtake the saint at Smyrna, but had been kindly entertained by the church there. Finally, they are found in company with the martyr at Troas, and from them doubtless he received the joyful news of the peace which the church of Syria had obtained since his departure. The clearness with which the whole story comes out from oblique inferences is evidence that we have here true history to deal with. (Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, i. 334, ii. 279.)

It was no doubt the mention in the genuine epistles of this Philo from Cilicia that suggested to Pseudo-Ignatius to forge a letter in the name of the martyr to the church of Tarsus, and to specify that city as the place where Philo served as deacon. [G. S.]

PHILO (3), a bishop (see unknown) said by Jerome (*Vit. Hilarionis*, 30) to have been banished by Constantius to Babylon, and visited by the hermit Hilarion. [W. H. F.]

PHILO (4), bishop of Carpsasia in Cyprus (erroneously called by Suidas *Καρπιδιος*), who according to the religious romance which passes under the title of the *Life of St. Epiphanius*, having been a rhetorician entered holy orders, and while still a deacon was ordained to the episcopate by Epiphanius, in obedience to a divine revelation, *ἀπὸ ἀποκαλύψεως* (Polyb. *Vit. S. Epiphani.* c. 49, p. 860). When Epiphanius visited Rome in A.D. 382 he left Philo in charge of Constantia, with authority to administer ordination if necessary (*ibid.*; Epiphanius, *Epist. ad Joann. Hierus.*). He is probably the same with *Φίλων Καλπιδάσιος*, commemorated in the Greek Menaea on Jan. 24. Philo was the author of a commentary on the Book of Canticles (Suidas

sub voc.), dedicated to Eustathius a presbyter, and Eusebius a deacon, attributed in the old Latin translation to Epiphanius, and published under his name by Petr. Fr. Foggini, 1750. It was first published in Greek, with a Latin version by M. A. Giacomelli, archbishop of Chalcedon, Rome, 1772. The largely interpolated Latin version of Stephanus Salutatus had been previously published at Paris by Rob. Stephens in 1537, and had been transferred to the *Bibl. Vet. Patrum*, cf. Le Bigne, 1609, tom. i.; the *Bibl. Magna Patrum*, 1618, tom. iv., and the *Bibl. Max.* 1677, tom. v. The commentary has been printed by Galland, 1769, tom. ix. pp. 713 ff.; and by Migne, tom. xl. pp. 10-154. Cave thinks Philo may probably have been the author of an Ecclesiastical History referred to by Anastasius Sinaita. He is quoted by Cosmas Indicopleustes, lib. x. (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* x. 520; Ceillier, *Aut. Eccl.* viii. 480; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 374; Fabric. *Biblioth. Graec.* iv. 751, x. 479; Allatius, *de Philonibus*, *Mai Biblioth. Patr.* tom. vi.) [E. V.]

PHILO (5), bishop, who singly consecrated Siderius, bishop of Palaebisca, and is blamed by Synesius (*Epist.* 67) for it as an act of irregularity (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 627-8; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 220). [J. G.]

PHILO (6), bishop and head of a monastery, addressed by St. Nilus the Ascetic (*Epp.* ii. no. 160) on the training of novices in the religious life (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 218). [J. G.]

PHILOCALUS, a subdeacon of Hippo, holding the first place in his order, of good family, born on the estate of Orontius, for whom St. Augustine sent a letter by Philocalus to recommend him to his favour. (*Ep.* 222, 223.) [H. W. P.]

PHILOGONIUS, bishop of Antioch, 22nd in succession, followed Vitalis, c. A.D. 319. He affords the example of a layman, the husband of a wife and the father of at least one daughter, being raised at once, like Ambrose at Milan, to the episcopate of his city. He had been by profession an advocate (*δικόλογος ἐκ μέσση ἀγόρας ἀρπασθείς*), and had gained universal esteem by his powerful advocacy of the poor and oppressed in the law courts, "making the wronged stronger than the wronger." The few facts known of his history are gathered from a homily delivered at Antioch by Chrysostom on his *Natalitia*, the day of his death to this world and his birth to the heavenly world, Dec. 20th (Chrysos. *Orat.* 71, tom. v. p. 507, ed. Savile). Chrysostom comments upon the great difficulties, *δυσκοιλία*, Philogonius had to encounter at the commencement of his episcopate, from the persecution which had so recently ceased, and says that his highest eulogy is the pure and flourishing condition in which he left the church. The earliest ecclesiastical building in Antioch, "the mother of all the churches in the city," traditionally ascribed to apostolic times, the rebuilding of which had been begun by Vitalis, was finished by him (Theod. *H. E.* i. 3). He was denounced by Arius as one of his most determined adversaries (Theod. i. 5). He was succeeded by Paulinus, the Arianizing bishop of Tyre, c. A.D. 323. He is commemorated by the Latin church on Dec.

20, and on the same day in the Greek Menol. He is called Philonicus by Eutychius (p. 431), who assigns him five years of office (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. vi. p. 194; Neale, *Patr. of Ant.* p. 84). [E. V.]

PHILOPONUS. [JOANNES (564).]

PHILOROMUS, Feb. 4, a high treasury official in Egypt and martyr in the Diocletian persecution, A.D. 306 (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 9). His acts are given Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 548; cf. Le Blant, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 55. [G. T. S.]

PHILOSTORGIUS, a Cappadocian, born about A.D. 368, and author of a church history extending over the period between the year 300 and the year 425. The greater part of his work has perished, but some fragments of it have been preserved by Photius. They were published under the care of Godefridius, at Geneva, in 1642, and again under that of Valesius, with a Latin translation and notes, at Paris in 1673. An English translation by Walford appeared at London in 1855. It is much to be regretted that so little of the history of Philostorgius has come down to us, for, injudicious and prejudiced as it may have been, it would at least have possessed the merit of being a contemporary record, and could not fail to have thrown light upon the feelings, if not always the facts, of his time. Photius regarded both the author and his book with worse than contempt. The style of the book he allows to be sometimes elegant, though more frequently marked by stiffness, coldness, and obscurity. The contents he treats as unworthy of reliance, often beginning his extracts by denouncing the author as an "enemy of God," an "impious wretch," an "impudent liar." Even Gibbon, naturally inclined as he was to accept the statements of a heretic in preference to those of an orthodox theologian, and who does not fail to notice, when speaking of Ulphilas the apostle of the Goths, that "the heresy of Philostorgius appears to have given him superior means of information" (*History*, chap. xxxvii.), is compelled to allow that "the credibility of Philostorgius is lessened, in the eyes of the orthodox, by his Arianism; and, in those of rational critics, by his passion, his prejudice, and his ignorance." (*History*, chap. xxi.) At other times Gibbon thinks that he appears to have obtained "some curious and authentic intelligence" (chap. xxv.), and yet that he was marked in making use of it by "cautious malice" (chap. xxiii.). These opinions, in the main so unfavourable, are shared by Tillemont (*Histoire*, vol. iv. p. 281), and, though with some just expressions as to what might have been the value of his history had it been preserved to us, by Jortin (*Eccles. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 122) and Schröckh (vol. i. p. 148). All the existing evidence indeed leads to the belief, that the history of Philostorgius was less a fair statement of what he had seen and known than a panegyric upon the heretics of his time. These circumstances, combined with the fact that so little of his history survives, render it unnecessary to dwell upon him at greater length. It may be worth while only to notice, that his history seems to have been written upon a plan illustrative of one of the curious conceits of his age. It

consisted of twelve books, each book beginning with a letter of his name, so that the initial letters of all the books, taken together, formed an acrostic. (Comp. Fabricius, vol. vi. p. 115.) [W. M.]

PHILOSTRATUS. Of the various writers of this name one alone is important in relation to Christian history; the author of the celebrated life of Apollonius of Tyana. The following are the facts which may be said to be known, either absolutely or with a near approach to certainty, respecting this writer. He was born at Lemnos (*Vita Apollonii*, vi. 27), not later than the year A.D. 182; he studied at Athens under Proclus the rhetorician (*Vitae Sophistarum*, ii. 21), and at the same time occasionally heard the lectures of Hippodromus, the more magnanimous rival of Proclus (*V. S.* ii. 27). After this he attended the lectures of Antipater, at a time when that rhetorician was also instructing the two sons of the emperor Severus, Caracalla, and Geta (*V. S.* ii. 24). At what date or in what place this happened, we are not told; but it may be presumed to have been between the year A.D. 193 (the date of the accession of Severus), and A.D. 198 when Caracalla and Geta accompanied their father in his expedition against the Parthians. After this (and possibly before also), Philostratus was a great traveller (see especially the last sentence in his life of Apollonius); but, to judge by the epithet, "Philostratus the Athenian," attached to him by Hierocles and Eusebius, the greater part of his time must have been spent at Athens; and, as he tells us (*V. Ap.* 1, 3), that he belonged to the court of the empress Julia, wife of Severus, it is clear that he spent some years at any rate at Rome. The account given by Suidas agrees with this. It was at the instance of the empress Julia that he composed the life of Apollonius, though the language he uses respecting her in the passage last cited implies that she was no longer alive when the work was completed (he uses the past tense in speaking of her; and, moreover, the work would certainly have been dedicated to her had she been alive). Hence the completion of this work must be set down as posterior to A.D. 217, the year of Julia's death; but it had no doubt occupied Philostratus several years before that time. It may be observed that Philostratus accompanied Caracalla, then emperor, to Gaul, probably in the year 213 A.D. (*V. S.* ii. 32). The only other place, which is definitely mentioned as having been visited by Philostratus, is Antioch in Syria, where he had a conversation with Gordian, afterwards consul (see the dedication, to Gordian, of his lives of the Sophists). The 'Lives of the Sophists,' composed, it would seem, about A.D. 237 (see the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography), is the most valuable, though not the most celebrated, of all the works of his author. It gives a lively picture of men who were indeed not of exalted worth, and who floated on the surface of society without trying to penetrate to its depths, but whose character was not without amiable and benevolent traits. It must be said also, that it enables us to understand how it was that so little effort was made by the heathen world for the removal of the evils that

afflicted it; since intellectual men found so easy a resource for their faculties, and so sure a scope for their ambition, in the composition of rhetorical exercises.

Hardly anything is known of the personal life of Philostratus after the reign of Caracalla; he is said by Suidas to have lived into the reign of Philip (A.D. 244-249). Of the remaining works of Philostratus, the *Heroicus*, *Imagines*, and *Epistolae*, an account will be found in the *DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY*. For a full account of his most celebrated work, see the article in this dictionary on APOLLONIUS OF TYANA.

As a writer, Philostratus is quick to seize points of interest, delicately fanciful, and not without a praiseworthy industry; as a man, he is rather too much of the butterfly-courtier species.

The best edition of Philostratus is that by C. L. Kayser, Zurich, 1844. [J. R. M.]

PHILOTHEUS. [HIPPARCHUS.]

PHILOXENUS (1), bishop of Doliche in Euphratensis; sister's son, and suffragan, to PHILOXENUS (4), and a follower in his Monophysite tenets. He was one of six Severian bishops who, by command of Justinian, met six orthodox bishops in a conference at Constantinople in 533 (INNOCENTIUS (17)); the others being John of Tella, Nonnus of Ceresina, Peter of Theodosiopolis [Ras'ain], Sergius of Cyrus, and THOMAS of GERMANICA (see *infra*). Hence it is probable that he had been previously ejected from his see, as three at least (John, Peter, and Thomas) of the others had been. But while the names of these three, with that of Sergius, are appended to the "Defence of the Orthodox bishops before Justinian" (extant in a Nitrian MS. (Wright, p. 937)), which no doubt belongs to the occasion of this conference, that of Philoxenus is wanting. We infer therefore that this was the time when he made the recantation of which we are informed by Innocent in his contemporary narrative. Gregory Barhebraeus makes his defection "to the sect of the Dyophysites" occur after his uncle's death, but before the consecration of Jacob Baradaeus (circ. 541); when he "subscribed the Synod and lived at Cyprus." (*Chron. Eccl.* i. 45.) There is no evidence that he was ever reinstated in his see. His signature (with those of his uncle and others) to the *Prosphesis* of Severus to the *Orthodox monks of the East* (Wright, p. 970), and the *Letter* addressed to him by Severus, "*On the Episcopal Office*," belong of course to the earlier period of his life. [J. Gw.]

PHILOXENUS (2), presbyter, legate of pope Julius in 341 [ELPIDIUS (23)], and, with Archidamus, legate of Julius to the synod of Sardica in 343 (Athanasius, *Ap. c. Ar.* § 50). [C. H.]

PHILOXENUS (3), agent of pope Leo I., who wrote by him (*Ep.* 162 al. 132) to the emperor Leo, A.D. 458 (Tillem. xv. 812). [C. H.]

PHILOXENUS (4) (XENAIAS), a conspicuous leader of the Monophysite section of the church at the beginning of the sixth century. He shares with Severus of Antioch, the true

scientific head of the previously headless party of the Acephali, the reputation of having originated the Jacobite form of Monophysitism, which long held the supremacy in Egypt and which is still adopted by the Copts. We have the misfortune of deriving our knowledge of Philoxenus almost exclusively from his theological opponents, against whom he was engaged in a determined and not very scrupulous warfare. According to them Philoxenus was little better than a religious adventurer of low birth and discreditable antecedents, who, endowed with considerable intellectual gifts, by mean arts and the most unblushing audacity worked his way to a place of dignity in the church, where he abused his power for the most unremitting persecution of his theological opponents. Much of what is stated to his discredit admits of reasonable doubt. Some stories we may absolutely reject as the exaggerations of polemical bitterness. We do know Philoxenus as an acute dialectician, a subtle theologian, and a zealous and uncompromising champion of the unity of the nature of Christ against what he regarded as the heresy of the two natures, and as one to whose desire to have a faithful rendering of the New Testament the church is indebted for what is known as the "Philoxenian Syriac Version." The original form of his name is uncertain. Xenaias

represents the Syriac $\langle \text{ܟܢܝܐ} \rangle$ which (see Payne-Smith's *Thesaurus*) is an adaptation of the Greek $\xi \nu \alpha \iota \sigma$, and therefore seems to present the latter half of the name Philoxenus in a Syriac guise. According to the received tale, however, Xenaias was his earlier name, which was Graecised into Philoxenus on his becoming bishop of Hierapolis. He was born at Tahal in Persia. He may have been of low even of servile origin, but that he was an unbaptized slave who had run away from his owner, as stated by Theodorus Lector (p. 569) and Theophanes (*Chronogr.* p. 115), and repeated by all subsequent writers, may safely be rejected as an orthodox calumny. The slander is refuted, according to Asseman, by his own words to Zeno in his letter *De Incarnatione Dei Verbi*, and in his tract *De Trinitate et Incarnatione*, which assert the fact of his baptism. Before he left his native country, he and his brother Adaeus were zealous opponents of the two natures in Christ, and of all Nestorianising tenets (Asseman, *Bibl. Orient.* i. 352; ii. pp. 10 ff.) The opprobrious epithet of "Manichee," which was applied to him (Theoph. p. 128; Labbe, vii. 368) as to the emperor Anastasius and other favourers of Monophysitism, has nothing to support it in what we know of Philoxenus' teaching. We soon find Philoxenus in Syria, where, having accepted the Henoticon and the twelve chapters of Cyril, he showed himself the active opponent of all Nestorianisers and the zealous propagator of Monophysite views in the country villages round about Antioch. As a heterodox teacher Calandio, the patriarch of Antioch, expelled him from his diocese. He was recalled by Peter the Fuller, by whom he was ordained bishop of Hierapolis (Mabug) in place of the more orthodox Cyrus, c. 485. The story runs that some Persian bishops visiting Hierapolis after his ordination recognised him as a runaway slave, and reporting that fact as well as that he had

never received baptism, Peter made light of it, saying that his ordination would stand instead of the Christian sacrament of initiation (Theod. Lect. u. s.; quoted in the Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea, Labbe, vii. 868). This tale may be safely discarded. During Peter's turbulent rule Philoxenus proved himself an active supporter of that violent and unscrupulous man in his measures for the suppression of the Nestorianising section of the church and the establishment of Eutychian or Monophysite doctrines in his patriarchate and generally in the East (PETER THE FULLER). The accession in 498 of the vacillating Flavian to the throne of Antioch, and his change of front when from having been an opponent of the decrees of Chalcedon he declared himself their advocate, was the signal for Philoxenus' adopting a more active line of conduct (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 31). The untiring animosity with which Philoxenus pursued Flavian, endeavouring to force him to accept the Henoticon, on his refusal denouncing him as a concealed Nestorian, demanding of him that he should not only repudiate Nestorius himself, but all who were regarded as sympathising with him, Diodorus, Theodorus, Theodoret, and many others, his denouncing him once and again to the emperor Anastasius, and the long series of measures by which he at last accomplished his deprivation and expulsion, are fully detailed in another place (FLAVIANUS OF ANTIOCH ii. No. 16, Vol. II. p. 533). In pursuance of his object Philoxenus made more than one visit to Constantinople. The first time was in obedience to the summons of Anastasius, A.D. 507. His arrival caused a great disturbance both among the clergy and laity and the monastic bodies. Macedonius the patriarch refused to communicate with or even to speak to so confessed a heretic. To consult the peace of the city, the emperor was compelled to remove him secretly (Theophan. p. 128; Victor Tunnun. sub ann. 499). Unable in any other way to secure the deposition of Flavian and the sharer of his faith and his fortunes, Elias of Jerusalem, Philoxenus obtained from Anastasius an order for the convening of a synod ostensibly for the more exact definition of the points of faith at issue, but really for the removal of the two obnoxious prelates. This synod met at Sidon early in 512. About eighty bishops assembled under the joint presidency of Philoxenus and Soterichus of the Cappadocian Caesarea. The synod is announced by Marcellinus in his Chronicle as "an infamous and ridiculous gathering of perfidious bishops banded against the orthodox." Parties ran so high, and the public peace was so much endangered, that the synod was broken up by the emperor's command without pronouncing any sentence on the two bishops (Labbe, iv. 1413; Theophan. p. 131; *Vit. S. Sab.* ap. Cotelier, *Mon. Eccl. Graec.* iii. 297, ff.). The subsequent proceedings, when rival bodies of monks poured down from the mountain ranges into the streets of Antioch, those of Syria Prima, being it is said bribed, or at least roused, by Philoxenus, each eager to do battle for the representatives of their form of faith, and respectively joined by different parties among the citizens, converted the city into a scene of uproar and bloodshed (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 32), have been described elsewhere (*D. C. B.*, u. s.). It is only necessary to state

that Philoxenus was left practically master of the field. Flavian was speedily expelled and banished, and the Monophysite Severus, the friend and associate of Philoxenus, was put in his place towards the close of the same year, 512 (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 33). The triumph of Philoxenus however was but short. In 518 Anastasius was succeeded by the more orthodox Justin, who immediately on his accession declaring himself an adherent of Chalcedon, restored to their sees the expelled orthodox bishops and deposed and banished the heterodox. Philoxenus is said to have been banished to Philippopolis in Thrace (Asseman, *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 19; Theophan. p. 141; *Chron. Edess.* 87), and thence to have been removed to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where (Barhebr. ii. 56) he died of suffocation by smoke (*ibid.*). He is honoured by the Jacobites, and commemorated in their liturgy as a doctor and confessor.

As has been already stated we owe to Philoxenus the Syriac translation of the New Testament, known by his name as the "Philoxenian Version," subsequently revised by Thomas of Harkel, in which form alone we possess it. This was executed in 508 at his desire by his chorepiscopus Polycarp (Moses Agnellus, *ap. Asseman. Bibl. Orient.* ii. 83; *ib.* i. 408). The version is characterized by extreme literalness; "the Syriac idiom is constantly bent to suit the Greek, and everything is in some manner expressed in the Greek phrase and order." (Westcott, *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 1635 b.)

Philoxenus and Severus were the authors of the dominant form of Monophysite doctrines which, while maintaining the unity of the natures of Christ, endeavoured to preserve a distinction between the divine and the human. This doctrine is laid down in eight propositions at variance with the tenets of the early Christians, whom he stigmatised as Phantasiasts. Christ was the Son of Man, i.e. son of the yet unfallen man, and the Logos took the body and soul of man as they were before Adam's fall. The very personality of God the Word descended from heaven and became man in the womb of the Virgin, personally without conversion. Thus He became a man who could be seen, felt, handled, and yet as God He continued to possess the spiritual, invisible, impalpable character essential to Deity. Neither the deity nor the humanity was absorbed one by the other, nor converted one into the other. Nor again by a combination of the two natures was a third evolved as by chemical transformation. He taught one nature constituted out of two, not simple but twofold, *μία φύσις σύνθετος, or μία φύσις διττή*. The one Person of the Incarnate Word was not a duality but a unity. The same Son who was one before the Incarnation, was equally one when united to the body. In all that was said, done, suffered by Christ, there was only one and the same God the Word, who became man, and took on Himself the condition of want and suffering, not naturally but voluntarily, for the accomplishment of man's redemption. It thence followed that God the Word suffered and died, and not merely a body distinct from or obedient to Him, or in which He dwelt, but with which He was not one. His view as to the personal work of Christ is briefly summed up in the Theopaschite formula, "unus

e Trinitate descendit de caelo, incarnatus est, crucifixus, mortuus, resurrexit, ascendit in caelum." He held that "potuit non mori," not that "non potuit mori." It naturally followed that he affirmed a single will in Christ. In the Eucharist he held that the living body of the living God was received, not anything belonging to a corruptible man like ourselves. Philoxenus was decidedly opposed to all pictorial representations of Christ, as well as of all spiritual beings. No true honour, he said, was done to Christ by making pictures of Him, since His only acceptable worship was that in spirit and in truth. To depict the Holy Spirit as a dove was puerile, for it is said economically that He was seen in the likeness, not in the body of a dove. It was contrary to reason to represent angels, purely spiritual beings, by human bodies. We are told that Philoxenus acted up to his declared opinions and blotted out pictures of angels where he found them, and removed out of sight those of Christ (Joann. Diaconus, *de Eccl. Hist.* ap. Labbe, vii. 369).

Philoxenus was a very copious author. He is described by Assemani as one of the best and most elegant writers in the Syrian tongue (*Bibl. Orient.* i. 475; ii. 20). Assemani gives the following catalogue of his works:—(1) *Commentaries on H. Sc.* Those on Matthew, Luke, and John exist in part in the MSS. of the British Museum. (2) The Philoxenian Version of the Gospels. (3) The *Anaphora* (Renaudot, ii. 310; Wright, *Catalogue*, 261, 12; 262, 5). (4) Prayer Book. (5) Order of Baptism. (6) *De Trinitate et Incarnatione Tractatus tres*, addressed to certain Syrian monks. (7) *De uno ex Trinitate Incarnato et Passo*, divided into ten discourses (Wright, 675; Assem. ii. 27-30). (8) *Epistola ad Abrahamam et Orestem Presbyteros de Stephano Bar-Sudaili* (a monk of Edessa who had adopted Origenistic views, doing away with baptism, teaching a kind of Antinomianism, and a pantheistic identification of all things with God and their absorption into God). (9) *Professio Fidei*, in ten sections, expressly declaring the one nature and the one will of Christ (Wright, 856, b. d.). (10) *Epistola ad Zenonem Imperatorem de Incarnatione Dei Verbi*, rejecting and anathematizing the tenets both of Nestorius and Eutyches. (11) *Epistolae ad Monachos Gangalenses duae* (Soz. *H. E.* iii. 14). (12) *Epistola ad Monachos Amidenses* (Wright, 861, 78). (13) *Epistolae ad Monachos Teledenses duae* (Wright, 751, 3 g.). (14) *Epistola ad Monachos Senunenses*, written during his exile at Philpopolis. (15) *Disputatio cum Nestoriano quodam in Ephes.* i. 17. (16) *Tractatus in Nestorianum et Eutychen.* (17) *De Fide.* (18) *In Habibam Epistola.* (19) *Epistola ad Arzunitas.* (20) *Ad Monachum Novitianum.* (21) *Ad Patricianum Edessae.* (22) *De Custitate.* (23) *De Interdicto et Excommunicatione.* To these may be added thirteen homilies on Christian life and character (Wright, 764); twelve chapters against the holders of the Two Wills (*ibid.* 730, 749); ten chapters against those who divided Christ (*ibid.* 730). (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 31, 32; Theod. Lect. fragm. p. 569; Theophan. *Chronogr.* pp. 115, 128, 129, 131, 141; Labbe, iv. 1153; vii. 88, 368; Victor Tunnunen. *sub ann.* 499; Cyril. Scyth. *Vit. S. Sabae*; Niceph. *H. E.* xvi. 27; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 268, 352, 408,

479; ii. 10-46, 68; Bar-Hebraeus ed. Abbeoos, i. 184; ii. 56; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* xvi. 677-681, 701-706; Neander, *Ecclés. Hist.* iv. 255, Clark's transl.; Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 94; Schröckh, *Kirch. Gesch.* xviii. 526-538; Petav. *de Theol. Doqm.* lib. i. c. 18; Walch, *Ketz. Historie*, vi. p. 955 ff.; vii. 10 ff.; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Div. ii. vol. i. pp. 133-135, Clark's transl.) [E. V.]

PHILUMENE (1), Marcionite prophetess [APELLES, Vol. I. p. 127].

PHILUMENE (2), a widow befriended by St. Gregory Nazianzen in 382. [OLYMPIUS (7)]. [C. H.]

PHILUMENUS (1), Carthaginian subdeacon, who with the subdeacon Fortunatus and Favorinus the acolyte in the Decian persecution lapsed (or retired) and returned to his duty before the persecution was over. (Cyp. *Ep.* 34.) Cyprian reserves the case for the council of A.D. 251, prohibiting them meanwhile from the monthly clerical dividend. (*Ep.* 34.) [E. W. B.]

PHILUMENUS (2), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, mentioned by Epiphanius as one of the three bishops who followed Acellus in rapid succession. On the death of Acacius in 366, Cyril of Jerusalem, in apparent violation of the canons of Nicaea, appointed Philumenus, who was deposed, and another Cyril appointed, in his turn removed by his namesake who appointed his sister's son Gelasius. (Epiphanius. *Haer.* lxxiii. No. 37, p. 885; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 561; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* vi. 579. CYRILLUS, Vol. I. p. 762 a; GELASIVS, Vol. II. p. 621. a.) [E. V.]

PHLEGON, Greek writer in the second century, native of Tralles in Lydia. (For what is known concerning him and his writings, see *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog.* iii. 337.) Though there is no appearance of his having been a Christian, we yet learn from Origen (*Cont. Cels.* ii. cc. 14, 33) that in his work *Ἰουλιανῶν καὶ Χρονικῶν συναγωγή* (which we have now only in fragments, as put together by Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.* iii. 602 sq. Paris, 1849), he mentioned Christ's knowledge of the future (though falling into some confusion regarding Christ and St. Peter) the fulfilment of His prophecies, and an eclipse in the reign of Tiberius Caesar when Christ was crucified (Müller, *Frag.* iii. 606, 607, with bibliographical account of the passages; Meursius, *Hist. Mir. Auct. Graec.* iii. 169-170, Lugd. 1622; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* ii. 184, 218). [J. G.]

PHOCAS (1), of Sinope, a celebrated martyr, of whom very little is actually known, and whose real date is uncertain. Combefis places his martyrdom in the last years of Trajan, but Tillemont regards a later persecution, either that of Decius or that of Diocletian, more probable. Our sole knowledge of Phocas is derived from an oration in his honour by Asterius of Amasea. He states that Phocas was an honest and industrious gardener at Sinope, a convert to Christianity, and exceedingly hospitable to strangers. Having been denounced as a Christian, he was sentenced to death, and a party of soldiers was despatched to Sinope to carry the sentence into execution. In ignorance

of their errand Phocas hospitably entertained them, and on discovering their mission forbore to escape, as he might easily have done, and on their asking him if he could tell them where they could find Phocas, made himself known to them, and was at once decapitated. His trunk was buried in a grave he had dug for himself, over which a church was subsequently built. His relics were so fruitful in miracles that he obtained the name of Thaumaturgus. His body was transferred to Constantinople with great magnificence, in the time of Chrysostom, who delivered a homily on the occasion, from which, however, we learn nothing concerning the martyr (*Chrys. Hom. 71, tom. i. p. 775*). A monastery was subsequently built on the spot, in which his relics were deposited, the abbots of which are often mentioned in early times (*Du Cange, Constant. Christ. lib. iv. p. 133*). Gregory Nazianzen mentions Phocas as a celebrated disciple of Christ (*Carm. 52, tom. ii. p. 122*). That he was bishop of Sinope is a late invention. Some of his relics were said to be translated to the Apostles' Church at Vienne. He was the favourite saint of the Greek sailors, who were in the habit of making him a sharer at their meals, the portion set apart for him daily being purchased by some one, and the money put aside and distributed to the poor on their arrival at port. He is commemorated by the modern Greeks on two days, Jul. 22 and Sept. 22. The former day may be that of his translation. (*Tillemont, Mém. Eccl. v. 581*.)

Another martyr of the same name is mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*de Glor. Mart. c. 99, p. 222*), who is said to have been martyred in Syria. His relics were sovereign against the bites of serpents. He is unknown to the Greeks. He is confused by the Bollandists with Phocas of Sinope. (*Bolland. ii. 366*.) [E. V.]

PHOCAS (2), brother of PETRUS (86).

PHOCAS (3), emperor from November 602 to October 610. For a full account of his disastrous and sanguinary reign see *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*. For his relations with Gregory the Great, see Vol. II. p. 787. For the concession by Phocas of the primacy to Rome, and his grant of the Pantheon for a church, see BONIFACIUS III. and IV. In the last month of his reign, the Jews attacked the Christians at Antioch, and barbarously murdered the patriarch ANASTASIUS (2). The only column in the Forum that remains standing is that erected in A.D. 608, in honour of Phocas, by the exarch SMARAGDUS. (*Corpus Inscript. vi. 1. 251*.) [F. D.]

PHOCAS (4), of Edessa, as his title Bar-Sergius indicates, was the son of a certain Sergius, by profession a physician. He wrote an introduction to the Syriac translation of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, and illustrated them with explanatory comments, the whole being accomplished, he tells us, in the space of a year without receiving help from any one. He is referred by Assemani to the sixth or seventh century; but Professor Wright remarks, that his mention of Athanasius II. and of Jacob of Edessa proves that he did not live before the eighth century (*Asseman. Bibl. Or. i. 468; Cod. Syr. iii. fol. 300; Wright, Catalogue, 494, 495, dcxx.*) [E. V.]

PHOCYLIDES. [SIBYLLINE ORACLES]

PHOEBADIUS. [FOEGADIUS.]

PHOENIX, a young man of noble birth, probably a native of Antioch, left at an early age by the death of his father master of large possessions, who retired to the mountains to lead a monastic life. Growing weary of this when the novelty was worn off, he listened too readily to the evil counsels of some relatives, and returned to his native city, where he exhibited great splendour of retinue. Under the influence of some solitaries who followed him up, careless of the contumely with which they were at first treated by him, he repented of his backsliding and returned to a religious life. (*Chrysost. ad Theod. Laps. i. 17*.) [E. V.]

PHOTINUS (1), a Galatian by birth, educated by Marcellus of Ancyra, and afterwards deacon and presbyter of his church, perhaps too, through his diplomacy, during the time when Marcellus, expelled from his own see, A.D. 336, was wandering about from one western city to another, between Rome and Constantinople for so many years [art. MARCELLUS], transferred to the see of Sirmium. Less diplomatic than his master, though it would appear more engaging in the pulpit, he made no secret of the erroneous doctrines he had imbibed from him, and succeeded in obtaining a hearing for them. The Eusebians, tracing them to their fountain-head, placed master and pupil in the same category, and said one was just as great a heretic as the other. But the master had once been orthodox, and had stood by St. Athanasius in opposing the Arians at Nicaea—a fact to which he was ever afterwards appealing, with no small benefit to himself. The pupil had no such past to recall, but had been familiarised with error before he could think for himself. Yet so long as his master was upheld by St. Athanasius and by Rome, he was left in peace by the orthodox. Hefeles well knows that he was never condemned at Rome, though he would gladly let others believe that he was. Anyhow the Eusebians at Antioch, in their lengthiest formula, three years after the Encoenia, were the first to attack him, classing him with his preceptor, to add point to their indignation against Julius of Rome for continuing to uphold Marcellus. He was next attacked at Milan, then the imperial capital, by the same party soon after at Sardica (*DICT. CHRIST. ANT., Councils of Milan, and then Councils of Sirmium*), and two years later another and a larger synod decreed his deposition. Moderns are not agreed where this synod met; some maintaining it was at Rome, others at Milan, while St. Hilary, beyond any reasonable doubt, fixes it at Sirmium (*Fragm. ii. n. 21, comp. Larroque, Diss. 1., de Phot. p. 76, et seq.*), being the first of the councils held at that place, A.D. 349, though Larroque places it a year later. The Benedictine editor of St. Hilary declares against Rome, and avows his preference for Milan (*ib. n. 19, note b*). But St. Athanasius, on whose words he relies, being as he shows in his note, not in Italy then, but at Alexandria, simply confounds Milan, where there was a council just as he was preparing to leave those parts, with Sirmium, of which he knows nothing previous to its creed of

A.D. 351. And as for Valens and Ursacius, their very letter to Julius implies their *libellus* had been presented at Milan some time, which might well be two years—before; but they deferred taking further action, as the prospects of St. Athanasius, if not clouding over once more were not advancing just then. Even the Benedictine editor of St. Athanasius admits there were learned men in his day who maintained it was at this council of Milan, A.D. 347, that they were first heard (*Apol. c. Arian*, § 58, note). However, Constantius being absent when sentence was first passed on Photinus in his own city, the popularity which he had gained there stood him in good stead, in spite of his avowed opinions, which Socrates tells us he would never disclaim. He remained in possession accordingly till A.D. 351, when a second council having assembled there by order of the emperor, then present in person, Photinus was taken in hand by Basilius, the successor of his master at Ancyra, and having been signally refuted by him in a formal dispute, committed to writing on the spot, according to St. Epiphanius, by eight notaries who were present, was put out of his see forthwith. Hefele thinks he may have regained it under Julian for a short time; but was again turned out under Valentinian, to return no more, and Hefele places his death A.D. 366 (*Councils*, ii. 199). St. Epiphanius professes to have written his account of the errors maintained by Photinus from the shorthand notes of the disputation between Basil and him, taken down at the time, and which he summarises in a very few words (*Haer.* 71, § 2), but it is quite clear he could have known nothing of Photinus personally. For he places his heresy before that of Marcellus in order of time, makes him a native of Sirmium, and never drops a hint of his connexion with Marcellus. St. Hilary tells us, on the contrary, that St. Athanasius began to distrust Marcellus, as soon as ever his complicity with the opinions avowed by Photinus became patent (*Frag.* ii. 21). Of the twenty-seven anathemas (in the *Dict. of Christ. Ant.* this number, which had been written in figures, is misprinted twenty-five) appended to the creed of the council in which he was finally deposed, Nos. 4–22 are considered by Gieseler, and No. 27 in addition by Hefele, to have been directed against him; but these were framed by his enemies. Socrates, besides telling us that he could never be persuaded to retract his opinions, states that he composed a work against all heresies, measuring them all entirely by what he held himself (*E. H.* ii. 30). It is a pity Socrates should not have supplied us, therefore, with his opinions in his own words. Instead of which he tells us vaguely that Photinus, following the footsteps of his master, affirmed the Son of God to be mere man. According to the Eusebians he said that Christ Himself, and the Son of God, the Mediator, and the Image, had not existed before all ages, but only from the time when He became the Son of God and Christ; namely, when he took our flesh from the Virgin about 400 years since. Philastrius and Lucifer both credit him with the errors of Pau of Samosata; Sulpicius Severus, with the errors of Sabellius. St. Epiphanius and St. Augustine take the same view of him, and, lastly, St. Jerome calls him an Ebionite. All these different views of him

may be seen in Larroque (*Diss.* p. 104–9). Theodoret speaks of the sects founded both by his master and by him as then extinct (*Haer. Fab.* iii. 1). A collection of authorities, on the chronological difficulties in connexion with his history may be seen in a note to Hefele's *Councils* (Oxenham's *Tr.* ii. 188–9). [E. S. Ff.]

PHOTINUS (2), a Cappadocian deacon, who when visiting the monastery of Paphnutius in Scetis, c. 401, while Cassian was there too, delivered a learned discourse against the anthropomorphic doctrine, which Serapion, one of the monks, was maintaining, and supported the letter just then issued by Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria. Serapion was convinced. (Cassian, *Collat.* x. cap. 3 in *Pat. Lat.* xlix. 823; Tillem. xi. 463.) [C H]

PHOTINUS (3), Macedonian bishop, recognised by pope Innocent I., c. 414; but with much hesitation, as he had been condemned by preceding popes. [INNOCENT (12).] (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xx. 535, c. 7; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vii. 515.) [J. G.]

PHOTINUS (4), a Manichean teacher who held a disputation in A.D. 527 with Paul the Persian under the president Theodore. The disputation has been published by Card. Mai in *Biblioth. Nov. Pat.* iv. 79, cf. Migne, *Pat. Graec.* t. lxxxvii. It is divided into three sections, each one of which represents the debate of one day. (1) Concerning the creation of souls. (2) Concerning the two principles upheld by the Manicheans. (3) Concerning the holy scriptures. Under the third head the Manichean asks, in connection with the Sabbath, When did the Old Dispensation cease? To which the Christian replies, at the baptism of Christ. [G. T. S.]

PHOTIUS (1), a sophist at Constantinople, an intimate friend of St. Gregory Nazianzen, who in 382 or 383 addressed him in his *Ep.* 168 al. 91 (cf. Tillem. ix. 544). [C. H.]

PHOTIUS (2), priest at Constantinople, and friend of Nestorius, was employed by the latter in the year 429, to reply to St. Cyril of Alexandria's letter to the Egyptian monks, warning them against Nestorius's teaching (Mansi, iv. 1003; Cyril, *Epp.* 8); in the preceding year he had concurred with Anastasius, another Nestorian priest [ANASTASIUS, bishop of Tenedos], in sending two priests, Anthony and James, to Philadelphia in Lydia for the promotion of Nestorianism, as complained of by Charisius at the Ephesian council in 431 (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xlvi. 727, Praef. ii. Opp. Marii Mercatoris) [CHARISIUS (1)]. When Nestorius was banished by imperial decree A.D. 432, Photius was included in the sentence and sent to Petra, but it is not known what became of him. His letter to the monks against St. Cyril is lost. [J. G.]

PHOTIUS (3), bishop of Tyre, and metropolitan, was elected on the deposition of Irenaeus, Sept. 9, 448. He is unfavourably known for cowardly tergiversation, in the case of Ibas of Edessa. Under the powerful influence of Uranius of Himeria, he and his fellow judges first acquitted Ibas of the charges against him made at the investigation commenced at Tyre and

transferred to Berytus, and the next year at the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus, zealously joined in his condemnation (Martin, *Le Brigandage d'Éphèse*, pp. 118-120, 181) (IBAS). At the same synod he brought forward an act of accusation against Acylinus, bishop of Byblos, whom he charged with Nestorianism and refusing to appear before himself and Domnus, the real ground of offence being manifestly that he had been appointed by Irenaeus, and was a personal friend of his. Without hearing any further testimony, on Photius's statement alone, Acylinus was at once deposed. Photius at the same time undertook to clear Phoenicia of all clergy tainted with Nestorianism (Martin, *u. s. p.* 183; *Actes du Brigandage*, pp. 86-89). With easy versatility Photius took his place among the orthodox prelates at Chalcedon, regularly voted on the right side, and signed the decisions of the council (Labbe, iv. 79, 328, 373, &c.). Here also he gave his vote for the restoration of Theodoret to his bishopric (*ibid.* 623), presented a résumé of the proceedings at Berytus favourable to Ibas (*ibid.* 635), and signed the 28th canon conferring on Constantinople the same primacy, *πρεσβεία*, as that enjoyed by Rome (*ibid.* p. 803). At the same time, after presenting a petition to Marcian (Labbe, iv. 541), he obtained a settlement of the controversy between himself and Eustathius of Berytus as to metropolitcal jurisdiction, in favour of the ancient rights of the see of Tyre, together with a reversal of Eustathius's act of deposition of the bishops ordained by Photius, within the district claimed by the former (EUSTATHIUS OF BERYTUS (22), Vol. II. p. 389) (Labbe, iv. 542-546; *Canon. Chalc.* 29). The date of Photius's death is uncertain. He was no longer bishop of Tyre in 457, when Dorotheus replied to the encyclical of the Emperor Leo (Labbe, iv. 921) (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 443; Ceillier, *Aut. Ecclés.* xiv. 271, &c.; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* vol. xv. (index); Fabric. *Bibl. Graec.* x. 678; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 808). [E. V.]

PHRONESIS, a mythological personage in the system of Basilides, as represented by Irenaeus (I. xxiv. 3). See BASILIDES, Vol. I. p. 278.

[G. S.]

PHTHARTOLATRAE (φθαρτολάτραι), or Corrupticolae, the adherents of Severus the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 519. They were so called because they held that "the body of Christ was corruptible." [SEVERUS.] [MONOPHYSITISM.] (Hefele, *Councils*, t. iii. p. 459, Clark's trans.)

[G. T. S.]

PHYSCO (Φύσκων, Φούσκων), one of four brothers, the rest being Salamanes, Malchio, Crispio, highly trained ascetics, disciples of Hilarion, residing in seclusion at Bethlehem, and all except Malchio living in the reign of Valens. (Soz. vi. 32; viii. 15; Tillem. vii. 573.)

[C. H.]

PIALA, ST., said to have been the sister of St. Fingar or Gwinear (Vol. II. 517, Haddan and Stubbs, i. 36), and to have come with him from Ireland to Cornwall, where they were martyred about 450. The legend by the so-called Anselm is spurious (Whitaker, *Cathedral of Cornwall*, i. 290), but the names of the saints survive in

the names of parishes near the Hayle estuary, Gwinear and Phillack (Whitaker, ii. 15, 21, 202). The latter, however, has been identified by some with St. Felicitas, and the name of the latter saint does occur in a Breton litany of the 10th century (Haddan and Stubbs, ii. 82), but Celtic names were naturally identified later on with the better known names of the Roman calendar. The day of the African martyr, St. Felicitas, was 7th March, and William of Worcester 107, quotes from a calendar at Bodmin, "Sanctus Wenedocus, et Felicitatis Virginis, 7 die Marcii."

[C. W. B.]

PIAMMON, called Ammon by Palladius, a presbyter and monk of Diolcos in Egypt in the 4th century, who had visions of recording angels standing at the altar, and indicating to him which of the brethren had sinned and which were repentant. (Ruf. *Hist. Mon.* 32; Pall. *Hist. Laus.* 72; Soz. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 29.) Piammon was visited by Cassian and Germanus about the year A.D. 390, and Cassian's eighteenth conference (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xlix. 1089) was held with him. The subject of it is *De tribus antiquis GENERIBUS monachorum, et quarto nuper exorto*. The three ancient kinds were (cap. 4) the coenobites, the anchorites, and the sarabaitae, the first two of whom he cordially commends, while of the third he speaks slightly. [SARABAITAE, in *D. C. A.*] The fourth and most recent kind, which he describes, without naming them (cap. 8), he severely censures, calling them anchorites or coenobites in profession, but in practice lukewarm, self-indulgent, and unobedient.

[W. H. F. and C. H.]

PIAMON, virgin in Egypt, mentioned by Palladius (*Laus. Hist.* c. 37).

[J. G.]

PIATON, ST. (PIAT), Oct. 1, presbyter and martyr in Gaul, whither he came with SS. Denys, Quentin, and others. See also a hymn of Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, where his body was said to rest (*Pat. Lat.* cxli. 340).

[R. J. K.]

PIERIUS (1) (HIERIUS), commemorated on Nov. 4. An eminent presbyter of Alexandria, famous for his voluntary poverty, his philosophical knowledge, and his public explications of Holy Scripture. He ruled the catechetical school of Alexandria under the bishop Theonas, A.D. 265, and afterwards lived at Rome. He wrote several treatises that were extant in St. Jerome's time. Some of them were known as late as the time of Photius. Among them was a homily upon Hosea, which he recited on Easter eve, wherein he notes that the people continued in church on Easter eve till after midnight. Photius mentions another work on St. Luke's Gospel as part of a volume by him, divided into twelve books. From his eloquence he was called the younger Origen. Photius declares that he was orthodox about the Father and the Son, though using the words substance and nature to signify person. But his manner of speaking about the Holy Ghost was unorthodox, because he said that his glory was less than that of the Father and the Son. In the time of Epiphanius there was a church at Alexandria dedicated in his honour. Some have therefore thought that he suffered martyrdom in the Diocletian persecution. (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*; *Mart. Adon.*, Usuard;)

Euseb. vii. 32; Hieron. *Vir. Illust.* c. 76; Id. ep. 70 al. 84, § 4, p. 429; Id. *Præfat. in Osee*; Photius, *Cod.* 119; Niceph. *Call. H. E.* vi. 35; Du Pin, *H. E.* cent. iii.; Ceillier, ii. 462; Till. *Mém.* iv. 582.) [G. T. S.]

PILATUS, ACTS OF [GOSPELS, APOCRYPHAL], Vol. II. p. 708.

PIMENIUS, bishop of Amalfi. Gregory the Great, in a letter (lib. vi. ind. xiv. 23 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 813) to his subdeacon Anthemius, blames him for non-residence. [F. D.]

PINIUS (1), addressed, but without a title, by the emperor Valentinian II. in a letter dated Feb. 23 in 385, on the election of Siricius to the see of Rome. The letter is printed from a Vatican manuscript by Baronius (*Ann.* 385, v.), who assumes that Pinianus was prefect of Rome and the husband of Melania the younger. Tillemont shows the difficulty of both these assumptions. On June 4, 386, Salustius is addressed as prefect. Pinianus is first known to have been prefect by a law addressed to him in July, 386, and on Sept. 8, 387, he was addressed in another as prefect. (*Cod. Theod.* vi. 378, ed. Gothofr.; Clinton, *F. R.* i. 513, 516) Tillemont thinks that in 385 he may have been deputy, or acting prefect only. (Tillem. x. 358, 744, 788, 823.) [C. H.]

PINIUS (2), the husband of Melania the younger. His parentage is unknown, but he was probably not of inferior rank to his wife. (Natus ex consulibus; SURIUS, Jan. 31. See also Paulinus, *Poem* xx. 217.) He was but seventeen years old, she but thirteen, when they were married. Palladius speaks of him as son of Severus, who was a prefect (*Vit. Patr.* 119). They had no children; and when the elder Melania arrived in Italy in 397, some four years after their marriage, they agreed to a vow of continence but refused to separate. They entertained Palladius of Helenopolis when he came to Rome on Chrysostom's affairs. (*Hist. Laus.* 121.) They left Rome in 408, when the siege by Alaric was impending, and passed through Sicily where Rufinus joined them, and thence to Africa. Melania the elder having left them, and having died at Bethlehem, and Publicola also having died, they inherited her vast estates. They were intent on doing good, and are said to have liberated 8000 slaves. (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 119.) Pinianus is described by Palladius as living, when he wrote, in Campania and Sicily alternately, having in his train slaves, virgins, and 15 eunuchs. He had also 30 monks with him: he exercised himself much in reading the Scriptures, in gardening, and in hospitality, his wife Melania and his mother-in-law Albina being with him. After the sack of Rome they passed over into Africa, and settled at Tagaste with the bishop Alypius, and desired to make the acquaintance of Augustine. He immediately wrote to welcome them (*Ep.* 124); but, since he was unable to come to them, they went with Alypius to Hippo. There the strange scene, so instructive as to the church life of the period, occurred, which is recounted by Augustine (*Ep.* 126). The clergy and people of Hippo, knowing their wealth, determined that they should, by the ordination of Pinianus, become attached to

their church and city. A tumult was raised in the church, and, though Augustine refused to ordain a man against his will, he was unable, or was not firm enough, to resist the violence of the people, who extracted from Pinianus a promise that he would not leave Hippo, and would not be ordained in any other church. The next day, however, considering that he was in danger of further violence, he, with Melania and her mother Albina, who had been with them thenceforth, returned to Tagaste. Thence some rather acrimonious correspondence ensued between them, especially Albina, and Augustine. (*Ep.* 125-8.) Alypius considered that a promise extorted by violence was not valid, Augustine demanded that it should be fulfilled; and the controversy lasted until, by the rapacity of the rebel Count Heraclian, Pinianus was robbed of his property, and the people of Hippo no longer cared to enforce the promise. Being now free, though poor, Pinianus, with his wife and mother-in-law, went to Egypt and saw the monasteries of the Thebaid. They then passed on into Palestine and settled at Bethlehem. Whether impressed by the monasticism of the Thebaid, or yielding to the despair which marks the epoch of the sack of Rome, they now were willing to do what their ascetic grandmother had been unable to force upon them during her lifetime, and to live apart. On the appearance of the Pelagian controversy, their letters to Augustine induced him to write his book on grace and original sin. This was in 417. They are said by SURIUS to have visited Cyril at Alexandria in the same year. We only hear of Pinianus after this time in a letter of Jerome in 419, in which his salutations, and those of Albina and Melania are addressed to Augustine and Alypius. (Jerome, *Ep.* cxliii. 2, ed. Vall. [MELANIA (2.)] In the last paragraph of which article, after the words "in the year 437," insert "to visit her uncle Volusius;" Aug. *de Grat. Christi*, ii. and xxxii.; Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* 121, SURIUS, p. 380, Dec. 31.) [W. H. F.]

PINTA, Arian bishop, addressed in a letter *pro fide Catholica*, which is ascribed to Fulgentius of Ruspe (*Pat. Lat.* lxxv. 707 sq.); but though it is upon the Arian heresy, and argues and quotes Scripture texts against it, it gives no clue to the identification of Pinta, and probably is not the work of Fulgentius [FULGENTIUS (3)] (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 494-5; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 69.) [J. G.]

PINYTUS, bishop of Cnossus, in Crete (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 21, 23). See DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH, Vol. I. p. 850. [G. S.]

PIONIUS (1), martyr, suffered at Smyrna, in the Decian persecution, March 12, A.D. 250. It is stated in the article POLYCARP (see p. 428) that it was probably this Pionius who revived the *cultus* of Polycarp in Smyrna, by recovering an ancient MS. martyrdom of that saint, and fixing the day of commemoration in accordance with it. The Acts of Pionius relate that it was on the day so fixed (Saturday, Feb. 23), while he was engaged in this commemoration,* he was arrested in company with Asclepiades and Sabina,

* The words "facta oratione sollemni cum sanctum panem et aquam degustavissent," seem to indicate a communion on elements previously reserved.

the latter of whom had been a slave, and had been rescued by the Christians from cruel treatment inflicted on her by her mistress on account of her faith. Pionius had been warned in a dream of the coming arrest, and had put chains beforehand on the necks of himself and his companions in order that their captors might see that it was not in their power to inflict on them anything for which they were not prepared. Wearing these voluntary chains, they were taken to the forum, which was thronged with dense crowds of people, amongst them a great number of Jewish women, availing themselves of the leisure which their Sabbath afforded them. The Acts then contain a report of a long speech made by Pionius to the assembled multitude, of which we only extract one point for mention, namely, that in warning of judgment to come he tells how he himself in his travels had seen at the Dead Sea a spectacle of the effects of the avenging wrath of God.

Many of his hearers, moved with admiration and pity, entreated him not to throw away a life on many grounds so worthy of preservation, but obey the emperor and sacrifice. At last cried one, Are you so obstinate that you cannot be persuaded? Nay, returned Pionius, would that I could persuade you to become Christians. Heaven forbid, was the reply, that you should persuade us to cause ourselves to be burned alive. It is much worse to burn after death, returned the martyr. At this altercation they saw Sabina laughing, and turned on her with threats of a punishment, to a modest woman more terrible than death. That shall be as God wills, she calmly replied.

When at length they arrived at the prison, they found in confinement there already another Catholic presbyter, named Lemnus, and a Montanist woman named Macedonia. The divisions of the Christian community were at this time well known to their persecutors, for we find in the examinations of the martyrs that those who owned themselves Christians were always further interrogated to what church or sect they belonged. The Acts give a long report of exhortations delivered by Pionius to his fellow-prisoners, and then relate how a message was brought to the prison that the Christian bishop Eudaemon had already sacrificed, and that the prisoners must be brought to join him at the temple, in order to follow his example. Pionius protested that they had been committed to prison to wait the return of the proconsul to Smyrna, and that they ought not to be removed before his arrival. And in spite of blows and kicks, he made such obstinate physical resistance to being brought to the temple that the six attendants employed to carry him thither were obliged to get additional help before they could effect their purpose. The constancy of Pionius remaining unsubdued, he was brought before the proconsul on his return to Smyrna, repeated his refusal to sacrifice, persisted in it notwithstanding tortures used to shake his resolution, and ultimately was condemned "to the avenging flames, in order that he might strike terror into men and give satisfaction to the offended gods." Pionius walked with a firm and rapid step to the place of execution, undressed himself without waiting to be ordered, and, looking at his naked body, blessed God that

he had been able to preserve it in chastity till then. Then he let himself be nailed to the stakes, rejected the offer made him that the nails should be taken out if he would even yet sacrifice, and when the flames were lit, closing his eyes, prayed silently, his friends hearing no more than the "Amen," and "Lord receive my spirit." With Pionius suffered a Marcionite presbyter, Metrodorus, the stakes of both being turned to the east, Pionius on the right, Metrodorus on the left. We are told nothing of the fate of Asclepiades and Sabina. The Acts which we have here summarised are important on account of their undoubted antiquity. We only know them by a Latin translation, of which two types are extant; one published by Surius and reprinted by the Bollandists (Feb. 1), the other by Ruinart (*Acta Sincera*, p. 137). Of these the former seems more faithfully to represent the original, the latter not only being abridged in places, but exhibiting two designed alterations viz. the suppression of the apostasy of the bishop Eudaemon, as also of the fact that the martyr Metrodorus was a Marcionite. But the common original was certainly read by Eusebius, who (*H. E.* iv. 15) gives a description of the acts of Pionius which agrees with those extant in too many particulars to allow us to suppose that different acts are intended. Eusebius, however, represents Pionius as suffering at the same time with Polycarp, while, as already stated, the extant Acts place him a century later, a date attested by the *Paschal Chronicle*, which makes Pionius suffer in the Decian persecution, and confirmed by internal evidence. We must therefore explain the statement of Eusebius as an error of haste, arising from the fact that he found the martyrdom of Pionius in the same volume which contained that of Polycarp, and possibly also that the chronological note found in our present MSS. was absent from the copy which he used. On the life of Polycarp ascribed to Pionius, see POLYCARP. [G. S.]

PIONIUS (2), a young man reproved by Nilus for luxuriousness (lib. iii. ep. 31). [C. H.]

PIOR (*Πίωρ*), a priest and solitary of the Cells in Nitria. He embraced the desert life in early youth, and on leaving his father's home (c. 305), he vowed to God that he would never again see any of his relations. Fifty years afterwards his aged widowed sister having heard that he was living, sent to implore a visit from him, and he on being bidden by his superiors, so far complied that he went to her house, stood at the door, and when she came out, spoke to her with his eyes shut, and then returned home (*Soz.* vi. 29). He would never take food except while walking, saying that he regarded feeding as quite a minor matter, nor would he expose himself to the temptation of indulging appetite (*Soc.* iv. 23). Other anecdotes are related of him. (*Pallad. Laus. Hist.* cc. 11, 87, 88; *Rosweyd, Vit. P.* iii. 31, 136, v. libell. ix. 9; *Cassiod. Trip. Hist.* viii. 1; *Cotel.* i. 643; *Tillem.* viii. 447, 569, x. 63.) [C. H.]

PIPPINUS (1) I., the founder of the Carolingian dynasty, called in later times Pippin of Landen, from the Belgian castle of that name where he is said to have been buried and possibly

resided (see Richter, *Annalen*, pp. 154-5, n., and the authorities there cited). Little is known of his origin beyond the fact, that his father was a Frank named Carloman, who had been made duke or count by a king of Austrasia; but there is reason to believe that the cradle of the race was situated in the country lying between the Maas and Mosel, Rhine, Roer, and Amblève (see *Annal. Mett.* 687, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 316; Bonnell, *Anfänge des Karol. Hauses*, pp. 71-85). Pippin first appears in history in the year 613, as one of the Austrasian nobles who supported the Neustrian Clotaire II. against the young Sigebert II., out of hatred for Brunehilde (Fredegarius, *Chronicon*, xl.). Fauriel believes that with Arnulfus, bishop of Metz, the other ancestor of the Carolingians, he put himself at the head of the conspiracy which overthrew the queen. (*Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 410 seqq.; but see Bonnell, p. 94.) He is not heard of again till 622, when Clotaire installed his son Dagobert I. as king over the eastern part of Austrasia. Pippin became his mayor of the palace, and in conjunction with Arnulfus brought those regions to a height of prosperity which is said to have made them the envy of their neighbours (Fredegar. xvii., lviii.; *Vita Arnulfi*, Bouquet, *Recueil*, iii. 508; *Gesta*, xli.; and see Pertz, *Geschichte der Merov. Hausmeier*, 36, 136). In 626 the death of his father left Dagobert sole king of the Franks. He soon moved the seat of government to Paris, and Pippin, though apparently retained with many other Austrasian chiefs in nominal attendance, was supplanted in his favour by the Neustrian nobles who flocked to the court. The king himself is said to have become thoroughly corrupted, and from being zealous in the cause of justice and well-doing, gave himself up to lust and rapine. (Fredegar. lx.) His death, in 638, set Pippin free to return to Austrasia, where the infant Sigebert III. was reigning. His old ally, Arnulfus, had retired into a monastery, but the friendship of Cunibert, archbishop of Cologne, procured him the countenance of the church, which his family found so useful. Now begins the period of the rois fainéants, and it is possible that Pippin might have anticipated the high destiny that awaited his descendants, had not death in the following year cut short his career (Fauriel, iii. 457, s.). Fredegarius bears striking testimony to the grief this event caused to the Austrasians, "ex eo quod ab ipsis pro justitiae cultu et bonitate ejusdem dilectus fuisset" (*Chronicon* lxxxv.; see, too, Aimoin iv. 20, and cf. Bonnell 106 f.) Pippin was a zealous friend to Christianity, which perhaps owed its footing in Belgium to the favour he showed it (cf. Warnkönig et Gérard, *Hist. des Carol.* I. 103). St. Eligius of Noyon, and St. Amandus of Elnone, Maestricht and Ghent, found protection and encouragement under his administration. Tradition, indeed, ascribes to him the foundation of the first monastery in those regions, Calvusmons, or Calfsberg, but this is doubtful (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. xii. 854 seqq.) The church showed its gratitude by numbering him among the Beati, his day being Feb. 21, and many of his relatives among the saints (Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 250-261). It is said that he was buried at Landen, but his remains were removed at a later time to Nivelles. (For his cult, which was

local, see Boll. *ibid.* p. 259, and Warnkönig et Gérard, i. 102.) He left a son, Grimoald, afterwards mayor of the palace in Austrasia, and two daughters, Begga, who married Ansegisilus, or Ansegisus, son of Arnulfus, and became the mother of Pippin II., and St. Gertrude.

Guizot published a translation of his life, or panegyric, which though not earlier than the 9th century, may be founded on prior records. (*Mémoires*, ii. 379). [S. A. B.]

PIPPINUS (2) II., mayor of the palace in France (A.D. 688-714), often called Pippin of Heristal, but with little ground (cf. Richter, *Annalen*, 154-5, n.), was the grandson of Pippin I., and Arnulfus, bishop of Metz, his father being Ansegisilus, or Ansegisus, the son of the latter and his mother Begga, the former's daughter. He first appears prominently in history about the year 678. Four years earlier Dagobert II. had been sought out in his Irish monastery-prison, and raised to the throne in Austrasia by Wulfoald, the mayor of the palace. His stupidity and evil nature probably assisted the rise of Pippin, who, with his ally, Martin, was able to figure as the champion of the old German freedom in face of the royal tyranny, and the protector of the clergy, against the lawless exactions and robberies of the king (see Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 474 ff., cf. also the speech attributed to Pippin in his subsequent victorious campaign, *Annal. Mettenses*, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 318); and by 677 the two were strong enough to convene a council of bishops of their own party, who condemned Dagobert on pretence of the violation of the monastic vows which had been imposed upon him in exile (Fauriel, *ibid.*). In the following year he was assassinated, and Pippin and Martin were left recognised, though untitled, chiefs of the Austrasian Franks (*ibid.*). But a more formidable obstacle than any yet encountered now confronted them. Ebroin, escaped from his imprisonment in Luxeuil, had carried everything before him in Neustria, and was now threatening Austrasia. The murder of Dagobert was probably his work (cf. *Vita Wilfridi*, Bouquet, iii. 601 seqq.), and he was now by force of arms setting up a puppet successor in Theodoric III., with himself for mayor of the palace. By 680 Pippin and Martin, at the head of an army composed partly of Austrasians and partly of refugees from the tyranny of Ebroin in Neustria and Burgundy, believed themselves strong enough to attack. The result, however, was disastrous, their army being defeated and dispersed near Laon. Pippin escaped by flight, but Martin was treacherously murdered a little later. (*Gesta*, 46). It seemed now as though the whole of France was to lie under the tyranny of Ebroin, when in 681 he was murdered. His successor, Warratto, reconciled himself with Pippin, who was apparently induced to acknowledge Theodoric's rule in Austrasia (see Richter, *Annalen* 175), and even assisted Warratto against a rebellious son named Gislemar (683). See *Gesta*, 47; Fred. 98. In 686 Warratto died, leaving his son-in-law, Bertharius, a weak and foolish man, and Pippin, who had now recovered from his defeat, face to face as candidates for the mayoralty. The overthrow of Bertharius at the battle of Tertry, or Testri, near St. Quentin, and his subsequent murder, made Pippin undisputed

mayor of the palace for the whole of the Frankish kingdom, with Theodoric as his nominal sovereign (688). See *Gesta*, 48; *Fred. Cont.* 99. This office he held till his death, and he seems to have thoroughly established its hereditary character, during his own lifetime appointing his son Grimoald to Neustria (A.D. 695), and when Grimoald died (A.D. 714), substituting his grandson Theudoald, an infant guardian for an infant king. In 691 Theodoric III. died, and was succeeded by his infant son Clovis III., who in turn died, and was followed by another roi fainéant, Childebart III., in 695. He reigned till 711, and left a son, Dagobert III. (711-715).

Pippin's policy was vigorous both within and without the kingdom. According to the Annals of Metz, he chastised the iniquities which during many years had grown up by the cupidity and injustice of the nobles, and caused the whole land to flourish in the service of Christ and the enjoyment of profound peace (ad ann. 691, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 320). Few details survive, but we know that abroad he carried on successful wars with the Frisians of West Friesland (*Annal. Mettens.* A.D. 692, 697, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 320, 321; *Fredegar. Contin.* cii.), and with the Alamanni in several campaigns. (*Annal. Mett.* A.D. 709, 710, 712, Pertz, *ibid.* 321-2.) Though eclipsed by his greater descendants, it was he who laid the foundations of his family's greatness. Once master of Austrasia and Neustria, he devoted himself to the policy of bringing within the circle of Frankish dominion the neighbouring nations, which under their own dukes enjoyed a virtual, if not nominal, independence—a policy which was crowned with such glorious results under his three successors (cf. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 7, 8). Like all his family too, he saw how powerful an ally the church might become, and fostered those foreign missionaries whose labours among the German nations seconded his arms. The English Willebrord he warmly encouraged in his mission to the Frisians (Beda, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 10), and his term of power witnessed the conversion of Bavaria by St. Rupert, who founded the bishopric of Salzburg, the mission of St. Kilian in East Frankland, crowned in 696 by his martyrdom near Würzburg (CILIAN), and the efforts among the Bructeri of St. Suibertus of England, who died in 713. For the charters and *privilegia* bestowed on religious foundations in his time, see Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvi.-lxxxviii. Pippin died in 714, leaving three grandsons, two of them sons of Drogo, and Theudoald, the above-mentioned son of Grimoald, and a son by a mistress Alpaida, the famous Charles Martel. Two sons, Drogo, duke of Champagne, and Grimoald, whom he had made mayor of the palace in Neustria in 695, died in his lifetime, the latter by violence.

[S. A. B.]

PIPPINUS (3) III. (called Pepin le Bref, or le Petit, titles unknown to his contemporaries, and said to be founded on a story related by a monk of St. Gall more than a century later, see Monach. Sangall. *Gesta Kar.* ii. 15, Pertz, *Scriptor.* ii. 758), mayor of the palace for Neustria and Burgundy from 741 to 747, for the whole of France from 747 to 751, and king of the Franks from 751 to 768, would stand forth as one

of the greatest men of the middle ages, were he not overshadowed by the still greater figures of his father and son (Martin, *Hist.* liv. xii.). Before his death on the 21st of Oct. 741, Charles Martel divided the realm, over which he held sway, nominally as mayor of the palace, but really with absolute power, into two portions. To Carloman, his eldest son, he allotted Austrasia, Alamannia, and Thuringia; and to Pippin Neustria, Burgundy, and Provence. For Grippo, or Grippo, another son by a Bavarian captive Sonihilde, he carved out at the mother's persuasion a small territory from the middle of these two portions, to the indignation, as is said, of the Franks, who inhabited it (*Annal. Mett.* 741, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 327), and to the disgust of Carloman and Pippin, whose first action was to levy war upon their half brother. Quickly captured he was thrown into prison by Carloman, where he remained till Pippin, six years later, touched by his sorrows, set him free. Thenceforth he was in a chronic state of rebellion till he came to a violent end in 751 [GRIPPO].

Foreign Relations and Wars.—The relaxing by death of the strong grasp of Charles Martel was the signal for disturbances and outbreaks on all hands. At this time the relations of the surrounding countries to what may be called the Frankish territories proper of Austrasia, Neustria, and Burgundy were very diverse. Within the limits of ancient Gaul, Provence, on the south-east, was agitated with its recent rebellion, and reconquest by Charles, while in the tract lying along the Gulf of Lyons, then known as Septimania, the Arabs, though weakened by fierce dissensions among themselves, were still dominant over the Gothic population, and kept a firm grasp upon the old Roman stronghold of Narbonne. Westwards again, Aquitaine, which reached now from the Pyrenees with their wild Basque population (Wascones) to the Loire, under princes of its own (not Merovingian, as is generally said, see Rabanis, *Les Mérovingiens d'Aquitaine*) held a position of nominal dependence upon the Franks, but enjoyed substantial autonomy. Lastly, in the north-west were the Bretons, who, for more than a hundred years, had been self-governed and independent of their neighbours. Turning to the German nations on the east, we find that the strength of the Frieslanders had been broken by Charles in the two successful campaigns of 733 and 734, and they were for the time at peace. The Thuringians were now practically a part of Austrasia. The Suabians, or, as they had now come to be called, the Alamanni, were dependent on the Franks; but dukes of their own administered their internal affairs. Bavaria, like Aquitaine, under its own dukes, was nominally subject to Charles' suzerainty; but the bonds were weak. And lastly the Saxons, often conquered but never subdued, were a standing menace to Frankish supremacy and Christianity.

The accession of the two young princes was the opportunity of their turbulent neighbours. The dukes of Bavaria on the east and Aquitaine on the west refused the oath of fealty to Carloman and Pippin respectively, and declared themselves independent. Provence rose in rebellion again, the Alamanni also revolted, and the Saxons once more flew to arms. It would be unprofitable, even did space permit, to follow in

detail the almost annual campaigns which the two brothers first, and, after Carloman's retirement in 747, Pippin alone, were called upon to make in one or more of the districts above enumerated. In brief it may be said that it was not till the latter half of his reign that Pippin was free to turn his attention to the conquest and consolidation of France itself. The earlier years were chiefly occupied in repressing an attempt of the German nations to reconquer their old independence. This movement was headed by Odilo, the capable and high-spirited Duke of Bavaria, a most formidable opponent. His politic and far-reaching design of a great anti-Frankish confederacy extending to Aquitaine on the west, and his Slave neighbours on the east (cf. *Annal. Mett.* 743, Pertz, i. 328) may be traced even through the unfriendly narratives of the French chroniclers. Into the Carolingian family itself he introduced dissension by marrying Chiltrudis, the sister of Carloman and Pippin, against their will. (*Fredegar. Cont.* cxi.) But the greatest triumph of his diplomacy was the gaining for his plans the countenance of the pope, the official ally, as it were, of the Franks. Possibly Zacharias mistrusted the destinies of the two young princes, and believed he saw in Odilo the future chief of Western Europe and his champion against Lombard oppression. However, the tact and firmness of Pippin, who succeeded in discrediting the Papal Legate in the face of the Frankish army (see *Annal. Mett.* 743, Pertz, i. 328), and the ready tergiversation of the pope directly events showed him his mistake averted this danger. The failure of Odilo's designs may probably be ascribed to the inferiority of the undisciplined levies of his loosely welded coalition, in face of the comparatively civilized Franks, as much as to the superior policy of Pippin and his brother. In the year 748 he died, and the infancy of his son Tassilo and the final defeat and subjection of the allied Alamanni the same year averted all immediate danger on that side. (For the details of the Alamanni campaigns, see Stälin, *Wirtenbergische Geschichte*, pp. 182-4.) By 752 Pippin, now king and sole ruler, was able to turn his attention to France. In this year, assisted by the treachery of their Gothic subjects, he drove the Arabs from all Septimania, except the fortress of Narbonne, the fall of which, after a seven years' siege, in 759, closed the chapter of Mohammedan domination north of the Pyrenees. The following year (753) he was free to invade Brittany, and for the time conquered it, occupying Vannes and imposing a tribute. (*Annal. Mett.* 753, Pertz, i. 131.) After that his work was interrupted by his two Italian campaigns of 754 and 755 against the Lombards, to be mentioned hereafter. But it was the conquest of Aquitaine that formed the great task of Pippin's reign. From 760 onwards till his death, every year but one witnessed the invasion and wasting of this unhappy country. It was not a war of pitched battles, neither the Gallo-Roman Aquitanians, nor even the hardier Basques, being a match in the field for the Franks, whose armies were now strong in cavalry, and even furnished with implements of siege (cf. *Fredegar. Cont.* cxxvi.). Sieges and plundering expeditions on one side, and guerrilla reprisals on the other, were its chief features, till at length the wretched inhabitants, wearied and ruined, bought peace

for their shattered towns and desolated lands at the price of the betrayal and murder of their indomitable duke Waifarius and submission to Frankish rule (A.D. 768). For this war, see Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* tom. iii.

Relations with the Church.—But the chief interest of Pippin's reign lies in his relations with the Church and Papacy. Charles Martel's term of power, though it had saved Christianity from the heathendom of Germany and Mohammedanism of Spain, was fraught with disaster to the church of France. The condition into which she had sunk at the time of his death may best be described in the memorable words of Boniface's letter to Zacharias, written in 742: "Franci enim, ut seniores dicunt, plus quam per tempus octaginta annorum synodum non fecerunt nec archiepiscopum habuerunt, nec ecclesiae canonica jura alicubi fundabant vel renovabant. Modo autem maxima ex parte per civitates episcopales sedes traditae sunt laicis, cupidis ad possidendum, vel adulteratis clericis, scortatoribus et publicanis, seculariter ad profrendum. . . . Si invenero inter illos, diaconos quos nominant, qui a pueritia sua semper in stupris semper et adulteris et in omnibus semper spurcitiis vitam ducentes. . . ; et modo in diaconatu, concubinas quatuor vel quinque vel plures noctu in lecto habentes, euangelium tamen legere et diaconos se nominare nec erubescunt nec metuunt" (*Epist.* 42, Jaffé, *Bibl. Rer. Germ.* iii. 112-3). This terrible state of things was in part the result of the general corruption of Gallo-Roman society, which speedily infected the Franks, and had for many years been infecting the church in its midst, as is evident even in the pages of Gregory of Tours. But it was perhaps still more the result of the acts and neglects of Charles Martel. Without going the length of Michelet, who believed him a heathen (*Hist.* chap. ii.), we may say that he regarded the church merely as an instrument for the furtherance of his political designs. Thus he encouraged Boniface and his band of missionaries among the German nations, because their efforts tended, by creating a Christian and pro-Frankish party, to pave the way for his armies. On the other hand, the church of France he looked upon as a treasury for the payment and reward of his soldiers. Not only did he give to them the lands and revenues of churches and monasteries, but he banished the bishops and abbats who opposed him, and either left their seats vacant, appropriating the revenues, or in many cases instituted friends and followers of his own, turbulent and licentious laymen, who held them as mere posts of profit (see *Hugo Flav. Chron.* lib. i., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cliv. 143-6; Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 12; Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 12 ff.). It was apparent that no reform of this state of things could be hoped for from within. It came in effect partly from Rome, partly, and in the first instance, from the side of Germany. As has been pointed out (e. g., by Michelet, *ibid.*), the Celtic and French churches held a different position in regard to the bishops of Rome from the younger institutions of England and Germany. While the former claimed to be sisters and almost equals of Rome, the latter were the creation of Rome's emissaries, and content with the position of daughters and subjects. The foremost champion of Rome's

supremacy was the great English missionary Boniface, who, for many years, had been labouring among the German nations on the eastern border, and one of whose chief hindrances had been the presence of unworthy members of the French and Celtic clergy. [BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS; ALDEBERTUS; CLEMENS (4); GEWILIEB; MILO.] The effect of the accession of the two young princes, Carloman and Pippin, was to extend Boniface's influence, and with it the power and influence of the popes, westward over France. Carloman, who inherited Austrasia and the German suzerainty, was at heart a monk himself, and became a pliant and eager instrument in his hands. How far Pippin shared his brother's beliefs, or how far he was swayed by policy and self-interest, is more doubtful. But of his disposition to aid in the reformation of the French church there can be no question. The first year of the two brothers' power is marked by the foundation of the three bishoprics of Würzburg, Buraburg, and Eichstädt (Bonifacius, *Epist.* 42, Jaffé, iii. 112), and the following by the first combined assembly of bishops and nobles in Austrasia, with reference to which Carloman had declared that "se de ecclesiastica religione quae, jam longo tempore, i. e., non minus quam per sexaginta vel septuaginta annos calcata et dissipata fuit aliquid corrigere et emendare velle (Bonifacius, *Epist.* 42; Jaffé, iii. 112). This council made evident at once the changes which had come over the temper of the rulers, for, with the provisions for church discipline, was passed one pledging Carloman and his nobles to the unconditional restitution of the property taken from the church. (See Jaffé, *ibid.* 47, p. 127, *fraudatas pecunias ecclesiarum ecclesiis restituimus et reddidimus.*) The following year was probably the date of the synod of Estinnes, near Laubes, another Austrasian Council (Richter, *Annalen*, p. 205). There it had to be admitted that, owing to wars and threats of war, the complete restitution intended was impossible, and a certain amount of church property must be retained for the army, but careful provision was made to lighten as far as possible the burden of the tax, to make the lay occupation temporary only, and prevent it from in any case effecting the utter destitution of the religious foundations (see the *Capitularies* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 1504, and for the whole question of the *precaria*, or as they soon came to be called, *beneficia*, carved out of church property, see Waitz, iii. 14 ff., 34 ff.; Warnkönig et Gérard, *Hist. des Carolingiens*, i. 209 ss.; Fauriel, iii. 224-5). The year 744 witnessed the founding of the famous monastery of Fulda, for long the central shrine of German Christianity, and the summoning by Pippin of the Council of Soissons, which did for ecclesiastical reform in western France what Carloman had already done in the East, and the next is distinguished by the first general council of France held under the presidency of St. Boniface, and, a new thing in French history, at the command of the pope (cf. Richter, *Annalen*, p. 210).

In 747 Carloman retired from the world into an Italian monastery, leaving Pippin sole governor of the Frank dominions. But though absolute ruler in fact, Pippin was still in name a mere mayor of the palace. He had found

himself compelled, two years after his father's death, either in deference to Neustrian superstition, or owing to Neustrian intrigues, to seat another phantom king, Childeric III., upon the vacant Merovingian throne. This descendant of a line whose excesses had reduced it to impotence was a mere puppet. Once a year he was brought forth from the deep seclusion of his palace-prison to be shown to the people, and beyond that his existence served for little but to furnish a date for the years and a title for state documents (See *Ann. Lauris. Min.* 750 [753]; Einhardi *Vita K. Magn.* i.; Erchanberti *Breviarium*, 753, Pertz, *Scriptor.* i. 116, ii. 443-4, 328). A two years' cessation from foreign warfare (A.D. 749-750) gave Pippin opportunity to plan successfully a stroke which Grimoald more than a century before had lost his life in attempting. In the year 751, with the consent of the Franks in their annual assembly, the bishop of Würzburg and the abbat of St. Denys, representatives of Austrasia and Neustria respectively, were sent to pope Zacharias at Rome to ask "de regibus in Francia qui illis temporibus non habentes regalem potestatem, si bene fuisset, a non. Et Zacharias papa mandavit Pippino, ut melius esset illum regem vocari qui potestatem haberet, quam illum qui sine regali potestate manebat; ut non conturbaretur ordo, per auctoritatem apostolicam jussit Pippinum regem fieri" (*Annal. Lauriss.* 749, Pertz, i. 136). Accordingly Childeric was tonsured and relegated to a monastery, while Pippin was raised to the throne at an assembly of the Franks at Soissons, and with his queen, Bertrada, anointed, according to the later accounts by St. Boniface. This is the bald statement of the chroniclers, but it may be regarded as certain that it does not contain the whole matter. The pope undoubtedly was to receive consideration for this ready assent, which might so easily have been withheld, and it is not difficult to conjecture the main features of the transaction. The Lombards, who more than a century before had settled in Italy, had now for many years been pressing on the provinces north of Rome, and threatening the city itself. The Eastern Empire, to which the sovereignty of Italy nominally belonged, could afford no succour, occupied as it was with fierce Iconoclastic controversies and the aggression of Islam. In all the world there was now only one people which had the power and was likely to have the will to help, viz. the ancient champions of orthodoxy in the West, now ruled by the descendant and kinsman of so many saints and prelates. Already in 741, when Luitprand, the Lombard king, was at the gates, Gregory III. had made affecting appeals to Charles Martel, and had even offered to renounce allegiance to the Empire, and confer the title of patrician and consul of Rome upon the Frank mayor. But the deaths of Charles and Gregory within a few weeks of each other brought the negotiations to an abrupt close. [CHARLES MARTEL; GREGORIUS III.] But the chronic danger was still there, while the failure of the Bavarian confederacy had made it even more evident that the only hope of relief lay in the Franks. Without then going the length of Fauriel, who sees an actual bargain struck between the pope and the mayor of the palace (*Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* iii. 227, seqq.), we may well believe that the mutual

advantages to be derived from harmonious action were present to the minds of both.

The whole subject has been seized upon by subsequent writers, and twisted to political ends. At a very early date it seems to have been felt that an apology was needed for the dethronement of Childeric. Accordingly some asserted that he was raving mad (e.g. Ademar, &c., cited in Waitz, iii. 68-9 n.), others have sought its justification in a fictitious genealogy, tacking the Carolingian family to the Merovingian race on the female side (Pertz, ii. 308, 305). Others again have striven to prove, in the face of all the chronicles, that the pope never authorized the transfer of the crown (e.g. Guillon, *Pepin le Bref et le Pape Zacharie*, Paris, 1817), while others turned his advice into a command (Waitz, p. 70 n.), and some, for instance Gregory VII., have gladly seen in the transaction the exercise of a power inherent in the papal office to make and unmake kings. The part played in the transaction by Boniface, now archbishop of Mainz, has also been variously represented, Rettberg and others even holding that he was opposed to and endeavoured to prevent it (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 380 ff.; BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS).

But the return made by the pope went further than the mere sanction of the transfer. Pippin was anointed king. This anointing of the king, ceremony unknown to the Franks, gave to the new monarchy that august and sacred character in men's eyes which the fable of a divine descent had conferred upon the older kings of German race (Waitz, iii. 61), and constituting him, as it were, an actual member of the clergy, was the source of the later theories on the subject of the sacredness and inviolability of his person and the indelible character of royalty (Martin, *Hist.* liv. xi.).

The question of the exact date of Pippin's elevation has been much discussed, but it probably took place in Oct. or Nov. of the year 751 (Richter, *Annalen*, p. 216). The following authorities may usefully be consulted on the whole subject of the change of dynasty, Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 46 ff.; Hahn, *Jahrbücher*, 121 ff.; 223 ff.; Warnkönig et Gérard, *Hist. des Carolingiens*, i. 251 ff.; Mascou, xvi. 34.

It was not however till 753 that the pope claimed from Pippin the fulfilment of his part. In that year Astolfus, Luitprand's son and successor, invaded the Roman provinces, and bore hard upon the city itself. Stephen II., who had succeeded Zacharias, impatient of dragging negotiations, took the desperate resolution of crossing the Alps in person, to implore the Frankish succour. Clothed in sackcloth and with ashes on his head, he threw himself at the feet of Pippin and his nobles, and would not be raised till his petition was granted (*Chronicon Moissiac.* Pertz, i. 293). His prayers were successful in spite of the opposition of Carloman, who was sent from his Italian monastery by Lombard influence to oppose the design (Einhardi *Annal.* 753, Pertz, i. 139; Anastasius, *Stephanus II.* 245, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1094). The pope spent the winter of 753-4 at St. Denys, and the following July solemnly anointed Pippin, his queen and two sons, and created the father and sons patri-cians of Rome. He also blessed the Franks, and

forbade them, on pain of excommunication, ever to elect a king issue of the loins of another than Pippin (*Clausula in fine Greg. Tur. de Glor. Conf.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 911). In the autumn of this same year 754 Pippin passed into Italy with an army. The Lombards were defeated, and Astolfus compelled to sign a treaty respecting the rights of the Roman church, but the Franks had hardly crossed the Alps on their return when he broke his engagements and flew to arms again. Thereupon Pippin, this time summoned by the famous letter purporting to be written by St. Peter himself (*Epist.* v., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 1004), entered Italy a second time, carried everything before him, and effectually broke the Lombard power. One of the terms imposed was the cession to Pippin of the towns and lands of the Exarchate and Romagna. These towns and lands, despite the representations and gifts of ambassadors from the Eastern emperor, to whom they nominally belonged, Pippin gave to the pope, declaring with an oath that he had entered on the contest for the favour of no man, but for the love of St. Peter and the pardon of his sins (Anastasius, *Stephanus II.* 251, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1098). The formal act of donation has not survived, but is alluded to in documents of the time (Warnkönig et Gérard, *Hist. des Carol.* i. 262; Gibbon, cap. xlix.). Fulradus, Pippin's envoy, laid the keys of 22 cities at the shrine of the apostle. (For their names see Anastasius, *ibid.* ii. 254, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1099; and Martin, *Hist.* liv. xii.) These constituted the famous temporal dominions of the papacy. Few events in history have excited more vehement controversy than this gift (see Warnkönig et Gérard, p. 262 seqq.; for the Lombard campaign see Abel, *Untergang des Langobardenreiches*, 25 ff.).

The change of dynasty and subsequent Italian campaigns naturally drew more closely the bonds connecting Pippin with the pope and clergy, and the former event was closely followed by the ratification and partial execution of the decrees as to restitution of church property (see Waitz, iii. 64 note and authorities cited), while the close of the war was marked by the immediate holding of a great council at the palace of Vernon-sur-Seine, where the re-establishment of discipline and reorganization of dioceses in France was seriously taken in hand (Pertz, *Leg.* i. 24). The work was continued by the councils of the following years, at one of which, Compiègne in 757, two papal legates were present (Pertz, *ibid.* p. 27). Henceforth it may be said that the great national assemblies of the Franks, the Fields of March, or Fields of May, as they now came to be (*Annal. Petav.* Pertz, *Script.* i. 11), were little else than councils presided over by the kings, at which bishops and nobles devised social and religious ordinances for clergy and laity alike, and at which the former rapidly obtained predominance, owing to their superior learning and organization. (See the *Capitularies* of Pippin in Pertz, *Leg.* i. 20-32, ii. 13; Bouquet, *Recueil*, v.; Mansi, tom. xii. and Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 1501 seqq.; cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 79, 121; Fauriel, *ibid.* p. 226, Warnkönig et Gérard, i. 266 sqq.)

The religious foundations shared in the prosperity of the time, so far as was compatible with the necessity which lay upon Pippin to provide

for his warriors in part from their lands, and Pippin was able, owing to his close connection with the papacy, to make them partial amends by the importation of famous relics from Italy which were a source of profit and renown to the French recipients (cf. *Annal. Petav.* 765, Pertz, i. 11). He himself set the example of reverence, and the spectacle might be seen of a king of France side by side with priests shouldering the coffin of a saint (*Translatio S. Austremonii*, Bouquet, v. 433; see too *Translatio S. Germani Pratensis*, *ibid.* p. 428), or again presiding over an assembly, that of Salmuntiacum, or Samoucy, in 767, where Greeks disputed with Romans on the subjects of the Trinity and the worship of images (Einhardi *Annales*, an. 767, Pertz, i. 145; Ado, *Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxiii. 125). The surviving charters and grants in favour of churches and religious bodies may be found in Pertz, *Germ. Diplom.* i. 103-110 (during the mayordom); Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xvi. ; and Bouquet, *Recueil*, iii.-v. See too Sickel, *Acta Reg. et Imper. Kar.* ii. 1-11.

A few months after the death of his determined foe, Waifarius, Pippin fell ill, and soon recognising his illness to be mortal, he summoned his nobles and bishops to Saint-Denis where he lay, and divided his kingdom. His brother Carloman had died in 754, in a sort of honourable imprisonment at Vienne, and the claims of his young sons were ignored by Pippin, and they themselves tonsured and immured in a monastery. (See *Gesta Ab. Fontanell.* xv. Pertz, *Scriptor.* ii. 290.) Pippin had two sons, Charles the Great, called Charlemagne, and Carloman. Between these two, with the dualistic tendency which marks the Carolingians, (see Einhardi *Vita K. Magn.* cap. 3), but which events, fortunately for the dynasty, always over-ruled, he divided his kingdom, with the assent of the temporal and spiritual dignities assembled. On September 24, 768, he died, and was buried by his sons in the monastery as he had directed.

[S. A. B.]

PIPPINUS (4), king of Italy, son of Charles the Great by Hildegardis, was born, probably in the year 776 (see Baron. *Annal.* Pagi 776, ii. ; 783, iv). He was first called Carlomannus, but at the desire of pope Adrian who baptized and received him from the font at Rome in 781, his name was changed to Pippinus. He must be distinguished from another son of Charles called Pippin, and surnamed Gibbosus, or the Hunchback, who rebelled against his father in 792 and was secluded in a monastery till his death in 811. The pope when he baptized him also anointed Pippin king of Italy, which portion of his realm Charles had destined for him after his own death, in the meantime installing him there as under-king. In 806 the gift was confirmed by solemn disposition, approved by the pope, and there were further included in his dominion Bavaria and a part of Alamannia (Pertz, *Leg.* i. 140-3). When only 11 years of age he was placed at the head of an army and assigned a part in the operations which finally crushed the rebellious Tassilo (787). But beyond two campaigns against the Avars or Huns (A.D. 791 and 796), one against the Wenedi or Slavi (A.D. 797), and an expedition against piratical Moors who were devastating Corsica (806), his wars, which were frequent,

were confined to his own realm of Italy, where he vigorously prosecuted the family policy of bringing Western Europe under the Frankish empire. There were still two powers in Italy which refused submission to French domination. In the south the duchy of Beneventum, originally a dependency of the Lombards, continued its resistance after the parent stock had submitted, and in the north the islanders of Venetia, assisted in lukewarm fashion by Constantinople, stubbornly defended their independence against the Frankish claims. Into the Beneventan country Pippin made four campaigns between the years 791 and 806, devastating it with fire and sword, while in the latter years of his reign, the Venetians came near to losing their independence by his prowess. (As to the discrepancy between the French and Italian sources in the expedition of 810, see Baronius, *Annal.* 810, Pagi, iv.)

In 810 Pippin died in the lifetime of his father, leaving a son, Bernardus, who afterwards rebelled against Louis the Pious, and five daughters. The little that is known of his disposition is favourable. He is said to have provided for the instruction in Christianity of the conquered Huns and Slaves by Arno, bishop of Salzburg (Baron. *Annal.* 796, Pagi, xviii.), and to have administered Italy under the guidance of Adelhardus, the abbot of Corbie (Paschasius Radbertus, *Vita S. Adelardi*, cap. v.; Gerardus, *Vita S. Adelardi*, cap. iii., *Boll. Acta SS.* Jan. i. 99, 113). Some Lombard laws were promulgated in his name (Pertz, *Leg.* i. 42-4, iv. 514-22). The chief authorities for his life are the *Annales* in Pertz, *Germania*, *Script.* I., especially those of Einhard and the *Laurissenses*, the *Vita Kar. Magn.* in tom. II., and the Italian records in Muratori.

[S. A. B.]

PIRANUS, ST. This name is identical with that of St. Kieran or Ciaran of Ireland, for *p* in Britain is the equivalent of the Irish *k*, as we see in the two forms of the word meaning *head*, *pen* and *ceann*. The lives of these Irish saints were compiled in the 12th century by the Benedictine and other monks established by the English in Ireland, "majori diligentia quam judicio," and the dates of the early saints are hopelessly confused. This St. Kieran is said to have built the monastery of Saighir, which gave the name of Seirkieran to the parish where it lay, in the barony of Ballybritt, King's County (vol. i. p. 544), where his famous bell was kept, and he is also said to have been the first bishop of Ossory. He is said to have migrated to Cornwall, and to have been buried near the Severn sea, fifteen miles from Petrockstowe (Padstow), and twenty-five from Mousehole, about 540, but no such visit to Cornwall is recorded in the Irish lives (Haddan and Stubbs, i. 157, 164). Those lives, however, seldom notice any such migrations, though the Celtic saints were very migratory. Three parishes in Cornwall are dedicated to St. Piran, Peranzabulo (Lampiran in Domesday), where a curious early oratory has been laid bare by the sand drifting away from it, and which corresponds in situation to the description given above, Perranuthno near St. Michael's Mount, and Perranarworthal, near Falmouth harbour, besides chapels in other parishes, such as Tintagel. Probably St. Kerian in Exeter has pre-

served the Irish form of the name. (*Acta Sanctorum*, 5th March, i. 389-399, 901; Capgrave 267, from John of Timmouth, "B. Piranus, qui a quibusdam Kerannus vocatur, in Cornubia, ubi quiescit, Piranus appellatur"; Leland even says that his mother Wingella was buried in Cornwall.) St. Piran's day, March 5, is still a fair-day at Perranzabulo and Perranuthno, and at the parish of St. Keverne in the Lizard district, which also possibly retains the Irish name. (Whitaker's *Cathedral of Cornwall*, ii. 5, 9, 210; Rees, *Welsh Saints*, 271, "Saeran"; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Itin. Camb.* i. c. 6, mentions a chapel at Cardiff.) [KIERAN.] [C. W. B.]

PIRMINIUS, ST., abbat and bishop, or chorepiscopus, famous as a founder and reformer of monasteries, and as a missionary preacher in central Europe during the middle of the 8th century. His birthplace is unknown, and but little information can be gathered as to his life. He is stated to have left his own country, and to have preached first in Gaul and then in Germany, where he recalled to the faith many who had lapsed into heathenism. He appears to have remained for three years as abbat of Augia (Hermannus Contractus, sub anno 724 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. cxliiii, 143), and to have been consecrated bishop, about A.D. 724, in Meltis (Melci, Meldi or Metti, unknown). He died, in 758, at Hornbach, in one of the many religious houses he had founded. His feast is Nov. 3 (Herzog, *Real-Enc.* xi. 680).

Mabillon (*Analecta*, tom. 4. 575; see also Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxix. 1029 sqq.) gives from an ancient MS. a short treatise entitled *Libellus Pirminii de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus*. *Scarapsus* is explained by Fabricius (*Bibl. Lat. Med. et Inf.*, lib. xv. s.v.) as = *collectus*. Heurtley (*Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 71) suggests that it is a misreading for *scriptus*. The treatise begins with the creation, and traces the working of the divine plan to the foundation of the church. It throws much light upon contemporary church life; and, in particular, it furnishes an important link in the history of the Apostles' Creed, containing the earliest known version which corresponds entirely with our present formula. The creed is twice given in the *Scarapsus*, once with each article assigned to its supposed apostolic author, and once as it was used at baptisms. (D'Achery and Mabillon, *Acta Sanct. ordinis S. Benedicti*, tom. iii. 2. p. 136; Pagii *Critica in Baronii annales*, sub anno 759. § ix. sqq.; Herzog, *Real-Enc.* xi. 680-2; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 630.) [H. C. S.]

PIRÔOU, martyr, with Athom his brother, in the Diocletian persecution. His acts are given in Hyvernat's *Les Actes des Martyrs de l'Égypte*. Rome, 1886, pp. 135 and 173. They were sons of a pious Christian priest, named John. Their acts give a lively picture of the Diocletian persecution in the villages of Egypt. [G. T. S.]

PISOURA, an Egyptian bishop, who suffered, with three other bishops, in the Diocletian persecution, under the governor Culcianus. His acts have been published by Hyvernat, in his *Les Actes des Martyrs de l'Égypte tirés des MSS. Coptes de la Biblioth. Vaticane*, pp. 114-134, Rome, 1886. His acts contain several passages found also with some interesting variations in the Coptic *Martyrdom of St. Ignatius*, Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, t. ii. 865. [G. T. S.]

PISTIS SOPHIA. A Gnostic book, known under this name, is one of the few remains of the old Gnostic literature which have come down to us. It has been preserved in a Coptic MS. of the British Museum, which Dr. Askew brought to London. The manuscript, a quarto of 346 pages, is written in the Thebaic dialect. Woide was the first to call attention to it (in Cramer's *Beiträge zur Beförderung theologischer Kenntnisse*, iii. (1778), p. 82 sqq.). From this MS. Bishop Münter published the Pseudo-Salomonic Odes (*Odae Gnosticæ Salomoni tributæ thebaice et latine*, Hafniae, 1812). Many years after this, Ed. Dulaurier gave a detailed account of the book, with two specimens of the text in a French translation (*Journal Asiatique*, 1847, Juin, pp. 534-548). A complete edition of the Coptic text with a Latin translation was soon after prepared by M. G. Schwartz, and edited by Petermann (*Pistis Sophia Opus Gnosticum Valentino adjudicatum e Codice Manuscripto Coptico Londinensi: descripsit et latine vertit M. G. Schwartz, edidit F. H. Petermann*, Berolini, 1851: the Latin version alone, Berolini, 1853).

The name Pistis Sophia, Πίστις Σοφία not Πιστή Σοφία, as Dulaurier and Renan propose to correct it) is nowhere given as the title of the whole work. It has no general title, and begins without any inscription, but is divided into four sections or books, of which the second, third, and fourth, bear separate titles. The second is inscribed *secundus τόμος πίστεως σοφίας* (p. 126, ed. Schwartz), the third and fourth *Μέρος τεύχων σωτήριος* (pp. 252 and 357). The two first of these sections or books treat, for the most part, of the Pistis Sophia (pp. 43-181). The fourth book, which is, alas, defective, has probably got by accident into the place where we now read it in the manuscript. It presents a simpler and older form of Gnostic doctrine, and was the work perhaps of a different author. It describes Jesus as, immediately after His resurrection, making Himself known as the Redeemer to His disciples, and instructing them in the mysteries. The three first books relate, on the other hand, how Jesus gives the disciples a course of instruction for eleven years subsequent to His resurrection, and then ascends to heaven, whence, after completing His redeeming work, He returns to them once more and gives them the last and highest teachings concerning the supersensuous world, the middle kingdom, the under-world, and about the fates of the Pistis Sophia, and of individual human souls.

In the fourth book, Jesus is described as standing, after His resurrection, at an altar on the shore of the ocean, surrounded by disciples, men and women, clothed in white linen raiment. At His command, retire to His left hand, towards the west, the Aeons, the σφαίρα, the Archontes, with their δυνάμεις, and the whole world. Jesus and His disciples then take their place *in medio τόπω ἀερνώ*, on the way of the midst (*via medii*) underneath the σφαίρα. He proceeds to instruct them concerning the significance and operation of the Archontes of the way of the midst, their binding by Jeû, and the tortures to which sinful souls are exposed from the five evil Archontes in the regions of the air, and also concerning the deliverance of the souls out of their power by the planetary spirits. At the prayer of the disciples that He would save them from those

torments, Jesus takes them to a mountain in Galilee, while the Archontes return to their former place. Jesus bids them bring fire and branches of trees, and then, amid mystic prayers, offers the Eucharist (the *μυστήριον ἀληθείας βαπτίσματος*) for their atonement. Here follows in the text a lacuna of several pages. But it is evident that meanwhile Jesus has betaken himself with His disciples into the lower world, and there depicts to them the various fates of souls after death, their torments in Orcus, their *παλιγγενεσία*, and also the conditions under which souls which have found the mysteries and done their penance, will be raised into the *θησαυρὸς luminis*.

The first three books make frequent reference to what is related in the fourth, and complete its descriptions. For eleven years after His resurrection Jesus has instructed His disciples concerning the lower mysteries only up to the 24th mystery. Then, on the 15th of Tobe (Tybi), the day of the full moon, a sudden glorious light invests Him, by which He is withdrawn from the view of His disciples and carried up into heaven. The next day He returns to them again, in order now finally to initiate them into all mysteries, from the highest to the lowest, and so impart to them the perfect Gnosis. This initiation, namely, could not be vouchsafed till the whole work of Jesus had been accomplished, the shining vesture left behind in the 24th mystery been restored to Him, and His return accomplished to the heavenly locality from whence he had come forth. This introduction is followed by a detailed description of the mysteries, in four clearly distinguishable sections, which do not coincide with the four books as denoted by their titles or inscriptions.

The first section (pp. 4-43) describes the ascent of Christ through the different regions of the spirit-world, from the earth through the way of the midst, and through the various provinces of the *Κερασμός*, up to the 13th Aeon, in order to accomplish the *διακονία* entrusted to Him by the first mystery, and subject all the Archontes to His dominion.

The second section (pp. 43-181) depicts the fates of the *Πίστις Σοφία*, that is, the penitent and believing Sophia whom Jesus meets, during His ascent, and beneath the 13th Aeon. Seized with longing for the *Thesaurus lucis*, which lies beyond the 13th Aeon, Pistis Sophia has separated herself from her consort (*σύζυγος*), in the 13th Aeon, and thereby incurred the hatred of *Ἀδθάδης*, one of the Archontes of the 13th Aeon, and of the twelve Archontes under him. Deceived by a false light, generated by Anthades, Sophia is enticed and drawn into the deeps of chaos, where she is deprived of her own robe of light by a number of *προβολαί*. In seven penitential prayers (*μετάνοιαι*) she makes her humble and believing supplication to the upper light, and prays for deliverance.

After the seventh penitential prayer, Jesus comes, of His own good will, to her help, and leads her out of the midst of her oppressors. But inasmuch as the command to deliver her from chaos has not yet issued from the first mystery, she is again tormented by her tormentors. After her ninth penitential prayer, Jesus raises her by means of a power of light sent to her, which surrounds her head with a crown

of beams, up into a higher region of chaos, where she is purified from the material (hylie) elements which still adhere to her. After the twelfth prayer she is requickened by a fresh power of light, sent to her from the first mystery. But, yet again, once more she is overcome in conflict with her enemies, and is hurled down into the depths of chaos. After this, she is brought out of chaos by the angels Gabriel and Michael, is again invested with the powers of light, of which she has been deprived, and brought by Christ to a place underneath the 13th Aeon, whence she sends up thankful hymns to the upper regions. In this place she remains till the ascension of Jesus. Then, finally, after she has withstood the last assaults of her enemies, Jesus leads her to her former dwelling-place in the 13th Aeon, and brings her back to her *σύζυγος*, while she, in new triumphant hymns proclaims the mercy which has been vouchsafed her.

The third section (pp. 181-246) contains a lengthened description of the orders and degrees of spirits in the upper world, from the lowest to the highest *χάρημα*; each degree appearing in its turn as mere darkness in comparison with that above it.

The fourth section (pp. 247-356) finally gives detailed instruction to the disciples concerning the necessity and conditions of *μετάνοια* for individual human souls, concerning the sin-destroying power of the various mysteries, and the different fates to which penitent and impenitent souls will be respectively subjected.

The form of relation is that of dialogue. The disciples, male and female, put questions to Jesus, which He answers one by one, or exhibit the degree which each has attained in Gnosis by allegorical interpretations of scriptural texts and narration. Mary Magdalene is the readiest of all with questions and interpretations. She and John "the Virgin" (*Παρθένος*) are noted (231) as the chief disciples of Christ, that is, as those furnished with the greatest measure of Gnosis. But while Mary Magdalen is distinguished by her special thirst for knowledge, she is also admonished in the fourth book (p. 383) to let other disciples speak as well as herself. So, also, Peter, Andrew, James, Philip, Thomas, Matthew (in the fourth book also Bartholomew and Simon the Canaanite), come forward, and of the women, Salome and the mother of Jesus (*κατὰ κόσμον*). Philip, Thomas, and Matthew commit to writing the instructions which the disciples receive from Jesus (pp. 32, 69 sqq.).

We are indebted to K. R. Köstlin for the first thorough investigation of this work, and a detailed account of the whole system in *Baur und Zeller's Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1854 (pp. 1-104; 137-196). In what follows we have made use of Köstlin's account, in which there is but little to supply or correct; in treating of the doctrines of the fourth book, however, we shall have to separate them more definitely from those of the three first books.

The description of the kingdom of light in the fourth book reminds one of the simpler representations of the older Gnosis. At its head stands the *Pater paternitatis omnis* (called also *Pater θησαυροῦ luminis*; *ἀπέραντον ἕλεος*, *Sanctus Sanctorum omnium*); under him is the mystery of the Seven Voices (*μυστήριον ἑπτέων*

φωτῶν), i. e. probably a Heptad of the highest Aeons, from whom proceed in their turn forty-nine δυνάμεις, with their ψῆφοι. The dwelling-place of the Pater paternitatis is the τόπος luminis luminum (θησαυρός luminis, τόπος ἀληθείας). In this place appear also to exist the fifteen great δυνάμεις of the Pater θησαυροῦ. These are also called Remissores peccatorum (or μυστήρια), because they are the mediators of the powers of redemption.

Much more completely organised is the kingdom of light, according to the description of the first three books. At its head stands the Ineffabilis, called also the Internus interni and Deus ἀληθείας, the fulness of whose Being is unfolded in His immanent μέλη Ineffabilis (or verba Ineffabilis) on the one hand, and on the other, in the μυστήρια, which have issued from Him. At the head of these Mysteries, as highest principle of revelation and organ of creation, stands the μυστήριον Ineffabilis or mysterium primum, called also Verbum unicum Ineffabilis, from whence all other emanations proceed. This is, at the same time, the supreme intelligence which, issuing from the Ineffabilis, is like the Ineffabilis Himself, both introspectus and prospiciens that is endowed with absolute knowledge, both of its own essence and of all other existence. This first mystery is further the supreme principle of all forgiveness of sin. From it again proceeds the primum (unicum) mysterium primi mysterii, and from these two proceed further three, five, and twelve other mysteries. The upper world, the kingdom of light, finds its completion in the twenty-fourth or last mystery, which again itself produces twelve subordinate mysteries and emanations; beneath this is the magnum lumen χαραγμῆς luminis, which again divides itself into five χαραγμαί luminis, the primum praecceptum (statutum), which is divided into seven mysteries, the magnum lumen luminum, the five great Helpers (παραστάται, προηγούμενοι), which serve to conduct the energies of light into the lower regions, and finally the τόπος κληρονομίῶν luminis, the destined habitation of redeemed souls. The whole Light-Region is divided into three χωρήματα μυστηρίων, which follow one upon the other. The uppermost χώρημα is that of the Ineffabilis, the second that of the primum mysterium, the third (the χώρημα partis externae, called also secundum χώρημα primi mysterii) comprises all the other mysteries down to the twenty-fourth. All three χωρήματα are again inhabited by an infinite multitude of spirits, τόποι (or τάξεις), ἀπάτορες, τριπνεύματοι. These τριπνεύματοι again are of three grades, υπερτριπνεύματοι, προτριπνεύματοι, and τριπνεύματοι, with their χωρήματα, τάξεις, and μυστήρια. Again, each of these τριπνεύματοι has his προαχώρητοι, and further five trees of light and twenty-four mysteries. Besides these are named 124,000 ὀνομασθέντες, ἀμύνηντοι [ἀμύνηντοι?], ἀσημάντοι, ἀνενόητοι, ἀσάλευτοι, ἀκίνητοι, with τάξεις corresponding.

With regard to the region which comes next beneath the realm of light, we learn but little from the fourth book. It is divided into three provinces, the right, the left, and that of the middle between them. What we are told of the rulers of these three dominions agrees so closely with the statements of the three earlier books that we may here conveniently combine

both descriptions. There is, however, one essential difference between the latter and the former of these descriptions. According to that, the θησαυρός luminis is no longer identical, as in this, with the upper realm of light, but is placed below the three χωρήματα of the upper world, and stands at the head of the κερασμός or region of mixed light. The θησαυρός luminis, or terra lucis (τόπος προβολῶν) is then, according to this representation, the place from whence the light, which has its source in the upper world, is brought down into the lower world, and whereby it is again transmitted upwards from the one world to the other. In this θησαυρός luminis are found twelve gathering-points of lights (τάξεις τάξεων), the seven φωναί or ἀμύνην (which, according to the fourth book, are the seven highest spirits of the world of light after the Pater paternitatis), and five trees of light. Beside the seven φωναί and the five trees of light are found, moreover, in this region three ἀμύνην, the gemini σωτήρες, and nine φύλακες, who are charged with the office of guarding the light. From the above-named gathering-points of light proceed further twelve σωτήρες, each of whom again is set over twelve τάξεις. The mixture of ὕλη with the θησαυρός, or treasury of light, or the already existing combination of purer and impurer elements therein, has produced the material out of which the lower regions of the κερασμός were formed.

Beneath the light-treasury begins now also, according to the first three books, the division between the regions of right and left. The right, with its rulers, takes the first place next the treasury; but, whereas the fourth book names here, in addition to the two great lights, Jeû and Zoro-kothora Melchizedek, only one other, the Good One, the great Sabaoth, the three first books enumerate six great rulers of this region, Jeû the ἐπίσκοπος luminis, called also primum homo and πρεσβευτής primi statuti, the φύλαξ καταπετάσματος, then the two προηγούμενοι, and, as fifth and sixth, Melchizedek and the great Sabaoth, Father of the soul of Jesus. The office of these rulers is that of forming and developing all lower spheres of existence by bringing down the light out of its treasury, and then conducting it back thither again, and so accomplishing the salvation of such souls as are capable of reception into the higher world.

Next, after the region of the right, comes that of the middle (the τόπος μέσων), the spirits of which are specially entrusted with the guardianship of human souls. Among them the fourth book names (besides the Zarazai or Μασκελλα, which probably belongs here,) the great Iao the Good, and the little Sabaoth the Good, to which the first book adds the little Iao. In this place of the midst the light-maiden (παρθένος lucis) has her seat, and is the judge of souls, who either discloses for them the gates of the light-realm, or sends them back into earthly existence.

Under her are placed (according to the text of the later description) seven other light-maidens with their fifteen helpers (παραστάται). In the τόπος Παρθένου sun and moon also have their seats (the δίσκος solis and the δίσκος lunae), and thence transmit their light, obscured indeed by many veils (καταπετάσματα), into the lower realms of creation. The δίσκος

solis is described in the fourth book as a great dragon carrying his tail in his mouth, and drawn by four great powers in the form of four white horses. The *βάσις* of the moon has the form of a ship drawn by two white cattle and steered from the stern by a boy; a male and a female dragon forming the rudder.

Beneath the place of the mid-region is that of the left, the place of righteousness, the lowest portion of the *κερασμός*, towards which the penitent souls are tending. It is here that the conflict between the light and the material principle takes its beginning. Here dwell likewise, according to the fourth book, the *ἀράτος deus* and his *μagna δύναμις* the Barbelo, from whence is derived the blood or corporeity of Jesus, and also the three *δύ τριδύναμοι*, of which the two uppermost are called *Ψανταχουνοχαινχοουσοχ* and *Χαινχοουσοχ* (*Βαινχοουσοχ*); all these spirits belong to the 13th Aeon reckoned from below. Underneath this Aeon are the twelve Aeons, of which six are ruled by Sabaoth Adamas, and six by Jabraoth. These produce, by the exercise of the *μυστήριον συνουσίας*, ever fresh ministering spirits, in order to extend the circuit of their power. These efforts are, however, opposed by Jeû, the Father of the Father of Jesus. Jabraoth, with his *ἄρχοντες*, undergoes conversion, and becomes a believer in the mysteries of light, in reward for which he is brought to a higher place, into an *ἀέρα πυρριν*, and before the sunlight, *ad μέσον* and *intra τόπους ἀράτου Dei*. Sabaoth Adamas, on the other hand, because he will not abstain from the *μυστήριον συνουσίας*, is confined along with his Archontes in the *σφαίρα*, or the *εἰμαρμένη σφαίρας*, the visible star-heaven in which the twelve spirits of the zodiac have their seat. Over the *σφαίρα* Jeû sets five great Archontes, formed out of the light-powers of the right. These are the five planetary spirits—Kronos, Ares, Hermes, Aphrodite, Zeus. Under it he sets 360 other Aeons. The present fixed order of the star-courses is, therefore, originally a punishment inflicted on the Archontes for the misuse of their liberty. Three hundred and sixty Archontes then of the Adamas, having refused to believe in the mystery of light, are assigned a dwelling-place in a still lower region, that of the air (*τόπος ἀερνός*), beneath the *σφαίρα*, or on the way of the mid-region, *in via medi*. Over these are likewise set five Archontes—*Παραπλήξ*, *Ἀριοῦθ* (Aethiopia), *Ἐκάτη*, *Παρεδρὼν Τυφῶν*, and *Ἰαχθανάβας*. Their occupation is to snatch away souls, to entice them to sin, and after death to torment them.

Here, again, the description in the three first books is somewhat different, and carried out into further details. In these also the 13th Aeon stands uppermost in the place of the left region, or that of righteousness. This Aeon is an image of the upper world, and like it contains innumerable spirits. The uppermost one is the *μagna ἀράτος*, or *μagna προπάτωρ*, with his great *δύναμις* the Barbelo; then follow the three *τριδύναμοι*, the third of which indicates by his very name *Ἀυθόδης*, the intrusion at this stage of finite narrowmindedness, the desire to exist for itself alone, which is characteristic of finite existence. From the great *προπάτωρ* and the two upper *τριδύναμοι* proceed twenty-four other *προβλαί ἀράτοι*, which appear to be thought of as syzygies, or Pairs of Aeons. The

last and lowest of these is the female Aeon (only occasionally mentioned in the fourth book), *Πίστις Σοφία*, whose audacious longing after the *θησαυρὸς lucis* has brought about her separation from her masculine *Σύζυγος*, and her Fall out of the World of Light. Below the thirteenth stand the twelve other Aeons (which again are inhabited by innumerable spirits), with their ambitious rule-loving Archontes, among whom is specially named the *Adamas magnus tyrannus*, known to us from the fourth book, and again below them the Archontes of the *εἰμαρμένη* (the second *σφαίρα*) and the *σφαίρα* (the *prima σφαίρα*, i. e. the first, reckoning from below); further and finally beneath these are the Archontes of the way of the midst, with whom the *μοῖρα* has her seat, and through whom (according to the fourth book) punishments are executed on such souls as are condemned to a second earthly life.

In order to bring back the rebellious Archontes to a lasting obedience, Melchizedek comes down to them from the place of the right, deprives them of light-power, and all finer elements, the breath of their mouth, the tears of their eyes, and the exhalations of their bodies, and restores to the *θησαυρὸς luminis* all the purer elements of light contained in these. Out of the coarser remnant these Archontes next proceed to form the souls of men and animals, and, urged on by their innate love of rule, find themselves compelled to continue in this occupation till they are completely emptied of even the less pure elements of light. In this creative work concur also the *παραλήμπτους solis et lunae*, who, collecting the scattered elements of pure light on the one hand, and, on the other, the still relatively finer sediments of these, form out of them on their own account, also the souls of men and animals.

Underneath the Way of the Midst is the World or *κόσμος*, which consists of (1) the *σπερέωμα*, or firmament, with the innumerable spirits; (2) the earth, or *κόσμος hominum*; and (3) the under world. This last is divided into three places of punishment, (a) Orcus, (b) Chaos, or *Orcus Chai*, and (c) the Outer Darkness (*caligo externa*), into which are cast the souls incapable of redemption. Over Orcus rules the *ἄρχων ἐρναῖος*, Ariel; over Chaos, the lion-headed Ialdabaoth, along with whom are mentioned (in the fourth book) Persephone, and (as it seems) also Adonis. *Caligo externa*, the place of weeping and gnashing of teeth, is (in the third book) described as a great dragon which encircles the earth and carries its tail in its mouth, while the sunlight is obscured by the smoke and mist which issue from its darkness. In this dragon are twelve chambers of punishment (*ταμιεῖα κολάσεως*), in which are housed all sorts of brute-shaped Archontes. The upper approaches to these receptacles are under the guardianship of the good angels, whereas, souls thrust down into the outer darkness are made to enter them by means of the opening and closing dragon's tail. In Orcus, souls are tormented with flames of fire; in Chaos, with added darkness and smoke; in *Caligo externa*, with further additions of ice, hail, snow, and cruel cold.

The origination of human souls is particularly described in the third book. They are of different kind, according to the matter, more or less pure

put of which they are formed. In this formation each of the five rulers or planetary spirits contributes his part; after which a Lethe-potion is offered them, *ε σπέρματι κακίας*, and full of stimulant to evil lusts. This forms itself into their evil enemy, a spiritual substance surrounding the soul (*ἀντίμιμον πνεύματος*). By the provident care of the sun and moon spirit, every soul has a spark of light intermingled with it (thence *μίγμα*). The soul is then brought down from above by the Archontes of the Way of the Midst, and by them associated with its *μοῖρα*, or Genius of Death, whereupon follows its investiture with the *σῶμα ὑλικόν ἀρχόντων*. As soon as the various psychical elements of the future human being, which exist apart in man and wife, have been united in conception, the 365 ministers of the Archontes proceed to fashion in the *μήτρα*, the future body consisting of 365 parts, impressing on it the *σφραγίδες* of the days which will prove most significant in the formation of the man and the length of life assigned to him. These *σφραγίδες* they then make known to the *ἄρχοντες ἐριναῖοι*, and a child is born, which, apart from the indwelling spark of light, is a mere creature and formation of the Archontes, and stands wholly under their power. All future life-fortunes befall the man thus formed with absolute necessity, and in consequence of the *μοῖρα* by which he is accompanied. Even the sin into which the soul falls under the influence of the *ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα*, is an inevitable fate, a consequence *per ἀνάγκην εἰμαρμένης*; but every single act of sin is put on record in order to be punished. After the man's death his indwelling spark of light goes back to the Light-Maiden, while his soul is laid hold of by the *παρλήμπτρες* of the *ἄρχοντες ἐριναῖοι*, and after being led about for three days in all the *τόσοι κόσμου*, is finally brought into the Orcus Chai. If not then condemned to eternal torment, the soul is, on the expiration of her term of penance, brought up out of chaos and placed before the *ἄρχοντες viae medii*. She is there questioned concerning the mysteries of the *μοῖρα*, and if ignorant of them, is again condemned to yet more terrible punishments. When these have been endured, the soul is brought before the light-maiden, and again by her, on account of past sins, brought back into the *σφαῖρα ἀρχόντων*, and from thence into a second earthly life. Endued once more with her old light-power, she is again born in the same way as before; and these *μεταβολαὶ* or *μεταγρισμοί* repeat themselves till the soul has completed the number of *κύκλοι* assigned her in accordance with the extent of her guilt. Should she now have passed through all this cycle of trials without having found the mysteries of light, or if, having received the highest mysteries, she has made no repentance, she will then be cast for ever into the outer darkness. Yet can many souls be delivered out of this outer darkness if they know the mystery of one of the twelve chambers of punishment in the dragon. In such cases they will be led upwards by the watch-keeping angels of Jeû, and being no longer capable of returning in new bodies to this world, will receive baptism from the seven light maidens, be set free from all punishments, and be translated into the lower-most *τάξις* of the treasury of light.

The necessity of sinning is not, however,

universal. The apostles, for instance, were exempt from it, their souls having been formed out of pure elements of light. The possibility, moreover, of a soul keeping herself free from sin is elsewhere occasionally assumed. A soul initiated into the higher mysteries, and yet sinning, will be more severely punished than one which has only received the lower mysteries. These lower mysteries, on the other hand, lose through persistence in sin their power of atonement, till at length only the highest mystery of all is able to absolve from sin. In this way the work before us seeks to combine a strictly ethical position with that Gnostic esteem for pure knowledge without which no one can attain to the upper world of light. It represents the mysteries whose knowledge is required for any entrance into the treasury of light, as, on the one hand, a free gift vouchsafed to man, and, on the other, an object of striving and spiritual warfare. The absolving power attributed to them may be compared with the similar operation attributed to the sacraments of the church.

The fourth book describes, with special fullness, the fates of souls after death, the punishments which await them for their sins, as well as the circumstances of their regeneration and the condition under which they may obtain forgiveness. The five Archontes of the *via medii*, and their subordinate *ἀρχιδαιμόνια*, are first the tempters of the souls to sin, and afterwards the most terrible tormentors. The demons of the *Παραπλήξ*, an Archon, with woman's hair flowing down to her feet, lead souls astray to wrath, evil-speaking, and slandering; the demons of *Ἀριούθ* Aethiopia, who is also a female Archon, lead on, in like manner, to murder and bloodshed; and those of the three-headed Hecate to false-swearing, lying, and deceit; those of *Παρόν* Typhon to uncleanness and adultery; and, finally, those of *Ιαχθανάβας*, to unrighteous judgment and oppression of the upright and the poor. Souls that have been carried off by these demons are tormented by them, according to the nature of their transgressions, for one hundred years, or longer, and only after a corresponding favourable conjunction of the planets can they be rescued from their tormentors by the five Archontes of the Aeons (*i.e.* the planetary dynasts themselves), assisted by the higher spirits of the right and of the midst. Such souls, as on account of sin have to undergo regeneration, are, after death, first tormented in orcus by Ariel, then in chaos by Ialdabaoth, then again by the Archontes of the way of the midst, and so, finally, are led before the light-maiden, who pronounces her judgment upon them. They are then brought back into the *σφαῖρα*, and after being purified by the *λειτουργοὶ σφαίρας* through the instrumentality of fire, smoke, and water, they receive from Jaluham the *παρλήμπτως* of Sabaoth-Adamas, the drink of forgetfulness, and are then invested with a new body, the nature of which will be such as to put hindrance in the way of repetition of former sins.

Those, on the other hand, who have been guilty of greater sins, such as murder, blasphemy, sins against nature, or have performed the impure mysteries of the Cainites (a Gnostic sect), are not again invested with new bodies, but cast into the outer darkness where, along with the

dragon, they will be destroyed at the last judgment. Good souls, on the other hand, who, without having committed grievous sins, have failed to find the mysteries of light, will (according to the consentient representations of the third and fourth books), so soon as the favourable conjunction of the planets has taken place, be, after death, led about during three days in all τόποι of the universe, and likewise in chaos, and made acquainted with all the forms of punishment there; the punitive spirits of those regions will have but little power over them, and being rescued from these and safely conducted past the Archontes of the way of the midst, they will then be led before the light-maiden, and by her be signed with a σφραγίς *p. aeternis*. They will then remain with the little Sabaoth till the favourable time has come for their renewed descent to earth. Each soul being then supplied with a wisdom and watchfulness inspiring potion, and a σώμα δίκαιον, will set herself to seek the mysteries of the upper world, the Gnosis of which will render her worthy of a share in the kingdom of light. But, not these only, sinning souls also, who after they have found the mysteries of light, leave off sinning, may yet attain to the treasury of light. Such souls, when the favourable conjunction of the planets has come, will be once more sent back as righteous souls into the world. From all this it would seem that the fates of men after death will indeed depend on their moral conduct on the one hand, but also, on the other hand, on the conjunctions of the stars and the influence they exercise on the mysteries of light. Souls born under unfavourable constellations become bad, and will be unable to find the mysteries.

The redemption of human souls is, according to this, accomplished chiefly by initiation into the sin absolving mysteries. Into this Jesus first initiates His own disciples, and then commissions them to impart the knowledge of the same to others. In this impartation of absolving mysteries consist, according to the fourth book, the work of Jesus upon earth. For which end He brings down water and fire from the τόπος *luminis luminum*, wine and blood from the τόπος of the Barbelo. His Father sends Him the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove; fire, water, and wine, serve for the cleansing of all the sins of the whole world; while the blood serves Him as a token *propter σώμα generis humani*, i. e. (probably) of His own corporeity. The word of Jesus, I have come to send fire upon the earth, points to the purification of the sins of the whole world by fire; in like manner, the saying to the woman of Samaria about the water of life (John iv. 10, 14), the issuing of water and blood from the pierced side of Jesus, and the consecration of the eucharistic cup as the blood of the covenant; all three refer to the forgiveness of sins accomplished by these mysteries of light. Of special energy and power for this end is the mystery of the eucharist, consisting of oblations and special prayers. Jesus Himself celebrates it, in the first instance, for the cleansing of His disciples, and bids them henceforth repeat it for the like cleansing of all future believers. The particular description here given of this celebration, the offering of water, wine, and bread, with solemn mystic forms of prayer,

is of special importance as characteristic of the ritual and worship of the Gnostic party, among whom this work originated.

Beside the mystery of the eucharist, which is also designated as that of the true baptism, we find mentioned a βάπτισμα *fumi*, a βάπτισμα *πνεύματος sancti luminis*, an *unctio pneumaticή*, and as the highest mystery, that of the seven φωναί, and their forty-nine δυνάμεις and ψήφοι. These mysteries disclose to the souls of men the entrance to the kingdom of light, and the thus initiated have only to leave the σώμα βλης, and then restrained no longer by any hostile or subordinate power, they mount up freely through all those regions to the treasury of light.

The Christology and Soteriology of the three first books is also much more developed and detailed than that of the fourth book. Jesus is in them represented as the universal Redeemer, whose historical manifestation and redeeming work on earth accomplishes at the same time a cosmical redemption. The prophets, patriarchs, and other righteous ones of the Old Testament, must wait in patience till Jesus have brought His disciples into the kingdom of light. Three only, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are at once, at the time of our Lord's ascension, received with Him into that kingdom; the rest have to return once more into earthly existence, and there receive the mysteries of light.

Jesus, who proceeds from the first mystery, i. e. from His Father, bears Himself the name of *primum mysterium*. The end of His mission to the earth is the revelation of the upper (higher) mysteries. As, on the one hand, even before His earthly manifestation, He had begun to work through the instruction of Enoch, as given in paradise; so, on the other hand, He makes the perfect communication of Gnosis and the accomplishment of His redeeming work coincident with the ascension.

The deliverance of the Pistis Sophia is a prelude and foretype of the redemption of humanity. In her, indeed, is typically represented the original descent and implanting in the lower world of the spark of divine light. But Pistis Sophia herself obtains her full deliverance only at the ascension.

The process of the work of redemption is as follows:—The Σωτήρ rises from His seat in the 24th mystery, leaves there His ἔνδυμα *lucis* behind, and descends unrecognised by the Archons (who take Him for the angel Gabriel) into the lower regions. From the θησαυρός *lucis* He carries with Him twelve powers of light, out of which the souls of the apostles are formed in the σφαίρα; from the little Jao, in the place of the midst, He takes another power of light, with which He combines the soul of Elias, and out of this the soul of John, the forerunner, is formed. Thereupon He announces, and once more in the form of Gabriel, to Mary, that she is to become the mother of the Σωτήρ, and brings down to her a ψυχή and a σώμα. The former is a *vis luminis*, from the great Sabaoth, in the place of the right; the latter is a robe of light from the Barbelo in the 13th Aeon, which, though a βλη needing some measure of purification, is yet no earthly or material corporeity. From these two constituents Jesus is formed. With Him in His very childhood a πνεύμα is associated, called the *simile*

Jesu or *frater Jesu*, which keeps Him free from all hylic influences, and impels Him to receive the baptism of John. The *Σωτήρ* Himself descends at the baptism, in the form of a dove, upon Jesus.

The work of redemption upon earth, or the imparting of the mysteries of the upper world, is now proceeded with, partly in the way of instruction given concerning the *τόποι ἀληθείας* in general, partly in that of revelations concerning the remission of sins as mediated by various sacred actions and formulae. During His life on earth Jesus imparts the mysteries to His disciples, in the first instance, in parabolic and symbolical language, i. e. in the numerous parables and discourses of our canonical gospels, the deeper significance of which is not disclosed to them until after His ascension. His death is described as an actual crucifixion. After the resurrection He remains yet eleven years longer with His disciples, and then being re clothed with His heavenly *ἔνδυμα lucis*, on which are inscribed the secret names of all celestial and supercelestial beings, He mounts upwards through all the middle regions to the higher world of light. On His way He overcomes the opposing world-rulers of the 12th Aeon, and the *Αὐθάδης*, the ruler of the 13th Aeon, depriving them of their power of light, and compelling them to yield up again the souls which they have devoured, so that the *ἀριθμὸς ψυχῶν τελείων* may be completed. After this He brings the *Πίστις Σοφία* with Him into the upper realm of light. From thence, adorned with a triple crown of beams, He descends again to earth in the glory of world-redeemer, and initiates His disciples into all mysteries, *ab internis usque ad externa et ab externis usque ad interna*.

The personal apprehension of the work of redemption by individual souls is then proceeded with, through the mediation of the mysteries of light. After these, men must seek day and night, and render themselves worthy to receive them, by renouncing the world and the *βλῆ*, and all their cares, and sins, and occupations. These mysteries are again, in their turn, numerous and manifold. The "mystery of baptism" imparts, by water and fire, the cleansing from sin and the soul's deliverance from the *ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα*, the *μοῖρα* and the *σῶμα*. But in order fully to accomplish this deliverance, further mysteries are also required from the *πρῶτον χάρημα a parte externa* (the lowest region of the realm of light upwards to the highest mystery, that of the *Ineffabilis*). These mysteries are imparted to penitent souls in a regular series, one after the other, because (as has been already observed) the lower mysteries lose their power after fresh relapses into sin, till at last the *Mysterium Ineffabilis* alone is of any help. The higher the mysteries that have been received, the severer is the punishment for relapses into sin. He who, after receiving the *mysterium Ineffabilis*, falls again into sin and departs impenitent out of this life, will be cast into the outer darkness. But even out of the *Caligo externa* deliverance is possible, through the mediation of others, who pronounce the *mysterium Ineffabilis*. A soul thus delivered is brought before the light-maiden, and she sends it back once more to earth, clothed in a righteous body (*σῶμα δίκαιον*). And even when it is no

longer possible for a soul to return to earth in a new body, yet the possibility of deliverance (as was shown above) is not fully excluded.

The same series of mysteries, rising step by step up to the highest, serves also for the initiation of the *δίκαιοι* and *ἀγαθοί*. Those who have died penitent need not, after receiving the mysteries, to submit again to a fresh metempsychosis. Souls perfectly pure, who have been partakers of the highest mysteries, ascend upwards robed in glorious light, and without encountering any hindrance, through all the intermediate realms up to the place of the inheritance. Others who have received only the lower mysteries, and have not lived perfectly free from sin, are required to produce at every stage their *ἀπολογία* (*ἀπόφασις, σύμβολα*), are taken up, step by step, by *παρλήμπτους* from the realms of light, examined by the Light-Maiden, and finally transmitted by Melchizedek into the *ultima τάξις humanis*. Of human souls, however, in comparison with all other spiritual existence, the saying is especially true—"the last shall be first"—for though once the mere dregs and last deposit of the light of the middle regions, they will, after passing through conflicts and sufferings, be raised above all the world-rulers (Archontes) and introduced into the realm of light.

After the reception into that realm of the pre-determined number of perfect souls (*ἀριθμὸς αἰῶνος τελείων*), the end of the world (*συντέλεια αἰῶνος*) will come. No sooner has that number been fulfilled than the gates of light will be finally closed, and no one more suffered to enter therein. Then will follow the *solutio mundi*, the dissolution by fire of the material universe, the *κερασμὸς* likewise will be dissolved, and all the powers of evil, yea, the outer darkness itself, and all its inhabitants, will be annihilated. The last act of all is the *evectio universi*. Jesus takes His station in the place of the inheritance, surrounded by fully purified souls. He then conducts the souls, which still abide in the lowest regions of the treasury of light, to the fitting place appointed for them, the curtains are then updrawn which have hitherto separated the *θησαυρὸς lucis*, the place of the right and the place of the midst from the realm of light, and all souls inhabiting those regions, mount up into the place of the inheritance. The same salvation will be vouchsafed to the penitent Archontes of the 13th Aeon, and those of the other twelve Aeons. But even after the whole has been perfected different ranks and orders will still be found in the realm of light. Above all stand the souls of the apostles, and of the just made perfect, who have received the first mystery of the *Ineffabilis*. To these belongs the saying—"they shall be one with Jesus"—*homines illi sunt ego et ego sum illi* (p. 230). Beneath these are placed the other souls of men in various ranks, according to the mysteries of which they have been made partakers. Among the Aeons, also, finally admitted into the realm of light, a corresponding order of ranks will be found, according to the places occupied by them in the times before their perfecting. Each one finally reaches the place pre-ordained for him (*τόπος τάξεως*) from the beginning, and enjoys henceforth that measure of knowledge which has been procured for him by the corresponding mysteries.

The four books of the work before us afford a clear insight into the changes and reconstructions to which the Gnostic systems were subjected. The fourth book, as we have already observed in our introductory statement, presents a yet simpler form of Gnostic doctrine, and variously connected with the older systems, such as those of Saturninus, the Ophites, Basilides, etc. The subsequent developments consist, like those of the Valentinian School, in the introduction of ever fresh series of spiritual beings, and of names of Aeons, as well as in the endeavour to push back to even greater and greater distances from this earthly world, the highest ranks and powers of the world of light. The system of the Pistis Sophia resembles, moreover, that of Valentinus in its (not so much dualistic as rather) monistic-pantheistic character. The *ὕλη*, or material substance, stands, not as in the older Syrian Gnosis, over against the world of light as a primeval realm of darkness, but is, in fact, a symbol of that finite narrowness and imperfection which increases in the same measure as the spirits which have emanated from the world of light, depart further and further from their original source, and its pure and perfect lustre. In this system, moreover, the antithesis of pneumatic, psychic and hylic souls, which the Valentinian system still retained, is given up; as, in all souls alike, the germ of spiritual life is found, so are they all likewise (those of the apostles alone excepted) burdened with a *ὕλη*, abandoned to an evil impulse by the *ἀντίμιμον πνεύματος* and the *μοῖρα*, and subjected by the *κακία πρυφῶν* to the *εἰμαρμένη* and the dominion of the Archontes. But as they all lie under a necessity of sinning, so there exists for all the possibility of deliverance by repentance and purity of life. The impartation of the mysteries of light, like that of the sacraments of the church, has for its first object the deliverance of souls from evil spirits, and the empowering them to exercise true repentance and a genuine morality of conduct. Even for souls abandoned to the outer darkness there still exists a possibility of salvation. Those only who have defiled themselves with specially grievous sins (the so-called mortal sins of the church's system) are finally shut up in the outer darkness, and so become obnoxious to ultimate annihilation. The degrees and differences which will continue to exist in the realm of light and the state of perfection are not independent of the differences in men's moral conduct. But especially the doctrine of the transmigration of souls shows how earnestly this Gnostic system endeavoured to disclose for all sinners fresh possibilities of repentance and an entrance into the kingdom of light.

This notwithstanding the Pistis Sophia is also cognisant of numerous degrees and differences of spiritual perfection which are not based on the free ethical position of individual souls, but on original differences of nature. The very elements out of which souls are originally formed are of very different (now finer, now coarser,) kinds. More especially the conjunctions of the planets, under which souls are born on earth, exercise a decisive influence on their subsequent ethical character. Under certain conjunctions good and righteous, under others, again, sinful souls are born; and so it is expressly said that at the

final redemption every soul will reach the place which, from the beginning, was assigned her.

It is a peculiar and profoundly significant idea in the work before us that human souls although originally inferior to and immeasurably weaker than the Aeons and Archontes to whom they owe their existence, are yet destined in the end, when the universe reaches the goal of its perfection, to take their final place above them. Thereby also expression is given to the ethical principle which lies at the basis of the whole system, namely, that spiritual purification and gradual deliverance from hylic elements is essentially dependent on a moral process, and this forms a distinguishing peculiarity of human souls in comparison with all other spiritual beings. And so it is that the very creation of human souls ultimately subserves the purpose of depriving the apostate world-rulers of that power of light which they have abused. For even as their selfish endeavour to extend their power and dominion by the continual procreation of fresh series of ministrant spirits has a limit assigned to it by a higher will, so on the other hand must these Archontes, by an involuntary concurrence in the creation of human souls, themselves contribute to the undermining of their own sovereignty. No sooner has this purpose been accomplished by the completion of the number of predestined souls and their entrance into the kingdom of light, than the *Consummatio* and the *Solutio Universi* follow.

With the endeavour moreover to derive from different beings and regions of the spiritual world the distinctions and differences observable in this and its manifold kinds and ranks of creatures is closely connected the vast multiplicity of spiritual essences and mysteries, which this system provides for in excess even of that of Valentinus. As every degree in the spiritual world has its own approximate mysteries, so does the place assigned to individual souls at the end of the world depend on the degree of initiation attained to here. But although such an influence on the ultimate fate of human beings is assigned in this system to ethical conduct, the endeavour is no less obvious to refer the manifold differences in the good and the evil to an ultimate metaphysical basis, and the influence exercised by a multiplicity of higher powers on the origination and subsequent fate of human souls. While therefore the ethical features of this system and its denial of qualitative differences between pneumatici, psychici and hylici, constitutes on the one hand an approximation to the ethical standpoint of Catholic theology, so on the other hand is the reference of all spiritual differences to original differences of natural elements a genuine characteristic feature of Gnosticism. At the same time one must not overlook the close approximation of the doctrine of the mysteries contained in this work to that of the sacraments in the church. Both are media of supernatural help and grace; and so great as is the importance attached to the possession of Gnosis and initiation into its mysteries, the absolving and cleansing power of these is made to rest not on the Gnosis with which they are connected, but on the sacred mystic actions themselves. It is in accordance with these conceptions that a greater significance is attributed to the work of redemption as an historical phenomenon, and more

especially to the death of Jesus and His bloodshedding, as that of the covenant (αἷμα διαθήκης) than is the case with other Gnostic systems.

In all these points the system of the book Pistis-Sophia exhibits an approach to the conceptions current in the Catholic church. And great as in other respects may seem the gulf which separates these endless genealogies of Aeons and spirits, divine essences and mythological figures, from the simple faith of Catholic Christendom, it must yet be remembered that in the Christian circles also of that time angelological speculations and astral-logical dreamings found especial favour. In this respect also the difference between Catholic and Gnostic opinions must be regarded as rather a quantitative than qualitative one. But the clearest indication of the Gnostic character of this work is found in its Mythos of the fall and penitence of Pistis-Sophia. Attempts have been made to draw from this Mythos a proof that the work itself was a product of the Valentinian school; nay, some (as Woide and Dulaurier) have even thought that Tertullian expressly refers to it when he mentions (*Adv. Valent.* c. 2) the "Sophia" of Valentinus. This last assumption is perfectly arbitrary. But as to the Mythos itself we find it as much at home in the Ophite and Bardesanian systems as in that of Valentinus. We meet indeed, in the most various forms, this mythic history of the Sophia as symbol of the human soul which, having forgotten her heavenly origin, sinks ever deeper into the corrupting pleasures and pains of this earthly existence till reminded by help sent from above of her celestial home, and after enduring all manner of pains and distresses she is at length brought back to the place from whence she has fallen.

The points of connection between the system of the Pistis-Sophia and the Ophitic system are much more numerous than those between it and the Valentinian. This is clearly proved by Köstlin (*in loc. cit.* p. 185 sqq.): "First," he observes, "many single instances may be alleged; such as the significance possessed by the serpent (in this system also) as both a good and evil genius, the fall of the Sophia into the ἕλη, her penitence and her redemption by Christ, the names Ialdabaoth, Iao, Sabaoth, Adonis (the Adonaius of the Ophites), the animal forms assumed by evil spirits, the view that not a single world-ruler (the Demiurg) but several Archontes spake to the prophets, the notion that Christ by assuming another form in His descent through their realms remained unknown to these Archontes (cf. *Iren.* I. 30, 12), the importance attached in both systems (*videm*) to the perfect purity of the body of Jesus, as organ for the σωτήρ, the long abiding of Jesus upon earth after the resurrection, the high significance of sacramental acts (e.g. of the σφραγίς in baptism, *Orig. c. Cels.* vi. 27), and yet more of the ἀπολογία which the soul has to make before the Archontes on her upward passage through their respective realms (*ibid.* and c. 31), the doctrine of the immediate elevation of redeemed souls after death to the heavenly world, and also the essentially anthropomorphic conceptions of the supreme being (His σῶμα and μέλη) notwithstanding the assertion of His infinitude and "Unspeakableness"—(cf. *Iren.* I., 30, i. *primum lumen—beatum et incorruptibile et indeterminatum, esse autem hoc*

Patrem omnium et vocari primum hominem). Again, and this is specially to be observed, the fundamental conception of the whole system that the development of the universe is nothing else but the return of the light-power from the realm of the ἄρχοντες to the heavenly world, their evacuation against their will and knowledge accomplished by the deprivation of the *humectatio luminis* or of its *virtus* (*ibid.* 6 sqq. 12 sqq.) is essentially Ophitic. In both systems the light-power is arbitrarily misused by the world-rulers for the production of *angeli, potestates, and dominationes*. In both the creation of man is the means of depriving them of this power. In both Christ draws by degrees to Himself the light-power confined in the earthly sphere, and the complete restoration of these elements of light to the upper world is the final close of the whole development. One other main point of doctrine in our system, that namely of the distinction made between souls which issue from the *primum lumen* and those whose origin is merely from the ἕλη (as for instance from the *habitus* of the Archontes) is found again in that doctrine of the Ophites which distinguishes between *animae sanctae* ('*ex substantia luminis*') and '*animae ex substantia Ialdabaothi*' or '*ex insuflatione*' (*ibid.* 14)."

So far Köstlin. It must be granted that several of the features here alleged as common to the Pistis-Sophia and the Ophitic system are not so exclusively, and on the other hand, that the doctrines concerning the Aeons in the two systems have but few points of contact. The Gnostic sects were however continually changing in these respects, and the so-called Ophitic parties were so various and divided that we should have no right to judge or measure them by the descriptions of Irenaeus. To the same group also belong the Gnostic sects mentioned by Irenaeus (I. 29) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* 26) who among other names bore also that of Barbelites (Epiph. 26, 3). Among these we meet again the mythological figure of the Barbelo so often mentioned in the book Pistis-Sophia. The light-maiden of the Pistis-Sophia recurs in one frequently mentioned among these Gnostics (Epiph. 26, 1; cf. *Iren.* I. 30, 9) (though in a different mythological connection) as the Virgin (Norea, i.e. נְרֵהַ puella or Barthenós, i.e. παρθένος) who, against the will of the Archontes, reveals to men the higher powers and the Barbelo in particular, and announces the necessity of gathering and bringing back the sparks of light which the Archon and the θεοί, ἄγγελοι and δαίμονες in alliance with him have made their prey. Epiphanius mentions 26, 8) as books made use of by these Gnostics the small and great ἐρωτήσεις Μαρίας, and (26, 13) an *Evangélium Philippi*. Renan has recently (*Marc Aurèle*, p. 120 sqq.) endeavoured to identify these ἐρωτήσεις Μαρίας with the book Pistis Sophia. This is however quite impossible; for what Epiphanius tells us of the contents of those questions of Mary has nothing in common with our work, but rather agrees with the licentious practices (which are here so severely condemned) of another Gnostic sect, the so-called Cainites. These Cainites however, it must be observed, themselves belonged to the

large group of Ophitic parties, and Mary Magdalene does actually play a distinguished part in the Pistis Sophia among the female disciples of Jesus, and is remarkable among all, both male and female, for her thirst for knowledge and her unwearied activity in asking questions. If then it seems impossible to identify those *ἑρωτήσεις Μαρίας* with our Pistis Sophia, we are nevertheless confirmed in the conclusion that this book really belonged to the Ophitic Gnosis. It agrees further with the notice in Epiphanius of the use made by his Gnostics of an *Evangelium Philippi*, that our Pistis Sophia (p. 39-62 sqq.) also mentions Philip along with Thomas and Matthew as having been entrusted with the office of committing to writing the instructions given to His disciples by the risen Jesus. That moreover which Epiphanius tells us of the contents of his *Evangelium Philippi* agrees right well with the whole tone and range of thought in the Pistis Sophia. The following fragment of the *Evangelium Philippi* has had, quite improperly, an impure sense interpreted into it by Epiphanius: "The Lord has revealed to me what the soul must say when she mounts to heaven, and what she will have to answer to each of the higher powers. I have, he says, known myself and have gathered up myself from all quarters, and have sown to the Archon no children, but have torn up his roots, and gathered together the scattered members, and I know thee who thou art. For I, saith he, derive my origin from those above." The book Pistis Sophia exhibits moreover, along with great and striking differences, some remarkable points of contact with the views of the Barbeliotes of whom Irenaeus speaks. Köstlin (*loc. cit.* p. 187) has already compared with good reason the description given of the fall of the Sophia in Iren. I. 29, 4, with that in our book. More especially does what is there related of the sufferings of the Sophia from *Ignorantia* (i.e. the Demiurge) and *Αὐθάδεια*, remind us of the persecutions which, according to the Pistis-Sophia, she has to endure from the *Αὐθάδης*. The continual progress and changes of use in regard to names, figures, and symbols among the Gnostic sects need not puzzle us any more than the circumstance, that these names are continually occurring in different connections and significations.

From all this we may regard ourselves as justified in assigning (with Petermann and Köstlin) the book Pistis Sophia to one of the large group of Ophite sects, though nevertheless the system it contains is not identical with any one of the other Ophite systems known to us. From most of these it clearly differs in not having like them a dualistic but, like the systems of the Naassenes and Peratae known to us from the so-called Philosophumena, a pantheistic and monistic character. Its home moreover is not in Syria, like the systems described by Irenaeus and Epiphanius, but in Egypt. While of the many non-Greek names which occur in the fourth book a large part certainly are of Aramaic or Syriac origin, others are as clearly from Egyptian sources. Egyptian also is the mode of computing time (*mensis* Tobe, p. 4, i.e. Tybi), and so also the symbols of the sun-dragon and the moon-ship. The book, notwithstanding its Egyptian character, must have been originally

written in Greek. The Coptic (Thebaic) text is a translation. This is proved by the numerous Greek words which it contains.

In comparison with the other Ophite systems known to us, that of our book is later and more developed. This remark applies not to the first three books only, but also to the fourth book. Köstlin is quite right in pronouncing it incredible that the far more richly developed world of Aeons and spirits described in this work should have subsequently shrunk up to the few mythological forms with which the earlier Ophites contented themselves, and that it was only by more recent speculations that the infernal potentate Ialdabaoth was exalted to the position of Demiurge and God of the Jews.

As indications of a comparatively later origin of the system may be further mentioned the numerous points of contact between it and Manichaeism (as already observed by Köstlin, *loc. cit.* p. 190 sqq.); to these belong the conceptions of a light-maiden, a world of light, trees of light, and light saviours (*σωτήρες θησαυροῦ luminis*), of sun and moon as good spirits which take part in the enlargement of the sphere of light, and the liberation of the light-spark from the *ἄλη*, and more especially the conception of the moon as a ship of light, and further the formation of the *σῶμα Christi* after a prototypical light-form, the doctrine of the members (*μέλη*), of the *Ineffabilis* and the like. One must at the same time agree with Köstlin that no actual dependence of the Pistis Sophia on Manichaeism views and teaching can be assumed. The one is a dualistic, the other a pantheistic system; if one is in any way dependent on the other, it is Manichaeism to which we must assign that position. The grand figure of the light-maiden finds its meaning and motive only in the connection in which we find it in the Pistis Sophia. Her activity is here very striking and significant, whereas in the Manichaeism system she holds only a very subordinate and obscure position. It is indeed possible that a literary connection may exist between the book Pistis Sophia and the four books *περὶ μυστηρίων* of Terebinthos mentioned in the Acts of the Disputation between Archelaos and Manes. This Terebinthos is said to have been initiated in Egyptian wisdom, and his writing to have been one of the sources of the Manichaeism doctrine; and though we may not at present be able to find other support for the conjecture, it may be assumed as probable that the book Pistis Sophia was written before the rise of the Manichaeism system, and therefore before A.D. 270. Moreover, as the system contained in it is evidently more recent than the other Ophitic systems known to us, we shall have, with Köstlin, to assign its composition to the first half of the third century.

But if on the one hand the book points to Manichaeism, it exhibits on the other a remarkable approximation in a Gnostic work to the views and conceptions of the Catholic church. It has been remarked already that the Gnostic antitheses of psychici and pneumatici are here sensibly modified. The tone of moral earnestness which pervades the system is common to it with that of some other Gnostic parties, such as the Basilidians and the Marcionites; but a yet further approach to Catholic sentiment is found

in its assumption that salvation is obtained in the twofold way of right moral conduct and the use of cleansing and atoning mysteries. The condemnation of the immoralities practised in some Ophitic sects is as severe in the book of Pistis Sophia (p. 386 sq.) as it could possibly be among Catholics. It also takes a more friendly position in regard to the Old Testament and its religion than did the olden Ophites. If on the one hand it is said that the *ἔρχοντες αἰώνων* imparted the *μυστήρια αἰώνων* to the prophets of the Old Testament (p. 354), so again on the other hand it was through David, Solomon, Isaiah, and other prophets, as unconscious agents, that the *vis luminis* is said to have prophesied of the future redemption. Accordingly we find Davidic and pseudo-Salomonic psalms cited in the penitential prayers of the Sophia, and allegorically interpreted by the disciples male and female. The reception of the Old Testament prophets, patriarchs, and other righteous persons into the kingdom of light is expressly foretold; and to Israel's forefathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, special distinctions are vouchsafed in the redemption wrought by Christ.

Besides the passages quoted from the Psalms and prophets of the Old Testament, we find in this writing numerous citations from all four canonical gospels, without reckoning the not less frequent allusions to evangelical utterances, and one citation from the Epistle to the Romans (p. 294). The interpretation of citations made from the Gospels, like that of those from the Psalms, is allegorical after the manner otherwise known to us of the Gnostic schools. To the teaching of Jesus in the four Gospels the instructions vouchsafed to His disciples in our book are supposed to stand in the relation of a higher grade, developing and completing, but by no means superseding what has gone before. It is also worthy of remark that this higher teaching is not given to otherwise unknown disciples of Jesus, but to the Apostles themselves. Along with the older Apostles St. Paul is once mentioned and designated by Mary Magdalene as "our brother" (p. 294). Beside male disciples certain females also appear, as Mary Magdalene, Mary the Mother of Jesus *secundum σῶμα ἕλης*, Martha and Salome. The instructions which Jesus imparted to them are for the most part elicited by questions which they put to Him, Mary Magdalene distinguishing herself as the chief questioner. The first three books are those which put special honour on the Apostles by relating that they alone in place of the *ψυχὴ ἀρχόντων* carry in themselves the treasure of light, being thus from the first sinless and righteous (p. 149), and that therefore in the perfecting of all things they will take the highest place among the blessed (p. 231, 244).

Beside the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments various apocryphal writings are made use of, all probably being of Gnostic origin. Among these may specially be noticed the Pseudo-Salomonic odes published separately by Münter; which also, like the citations from canonical Scripture, are allegorically interpreted. To these must be added the book Jehu, which Jesus is supposed to have dictated to Enoch in paradise (p. 245 sq. 354). It is cited as an authority for the knowledge of the mysteries of the three *κλήροι luminis*, and appears to have

been the main source of the fully developed Gnostic doctrine of the three first books. We find also some allusions to an apocryphal gospel of the childhood (p. 120), and, perhaps to the gospel of Philip (p. 230).

A complete interpretation of the book Pistis Sophia is only then to be hoped for when the complete text shall have been recovered. Further light as to its meaning may be looked for from the publication of the hitherto unprinted Gnostic writings which have been preserved in Coptic MSS. and are now to be found in the British Museum, as well as in the libraries of Oxford and Leyden.

Compare—besides the treatise of Kōstlin already referred to—the following works:—Woide, in Cramer's *Beiträge*, l. c.; Dulaurier, *Journal Asiatique*, l. c.; Münter, l. c.; Matter, *Geschichte des Gnosticismus*, German translation by Dörner, ii. 69 sqq. 163 sqq.; Baur, *das Christenthum und die Christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (2 Aufl. p. 226 sqq.); Lipsius, in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopaedic, Artikel Gnosticismus* (separately published, Leipsic, 1860, p. 95 sq. 157 sqq.); Renan, *Marc Aurèle*, p. 120 sqq., *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, Paris, 1872, p. 333 sq.; Jacobi, in Herzog's *Theol.-Realencyclopaedic*, 2 Aufl. Artikel *Gnosis*. [R. A. L.]

PISTUS (1), Arian priest of the Mareotis, and intruding bishop at Alexandria, is first met with as a follower of Arius, and condemned with him in a council at Alexandria, A.D. 321 (Alexand. *Epist. Synod.* in *Pat. Gr.* xviii.; Gelasius Cyz. *Opp.* l. viii. ed. Cotel.). Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, continued to warn his clergy against him as an Arian and ex-communicate; at Nicaea, A.D. 325, he sided with Arius, and was condemned. In 335, he was admitted to communion at the council held at Jerusalem under the influence of the Eusebians. When St. Athanasius was banished to Trèves in A.D. 336, or before his return in the end of 338, Pistus seems to have been consecrated bishop by the Eusebian bishop Secundus; he was at least so brought forward in opposition to Athanasius's restoration, and an attempt was made to carry pope Julius in his favour. At Alexandria Pistus had himself to yield to the intrusion of Gregorius the Cappadocian about A.D. 340, and then disappears from history. [ATHANASIUS, p. 187-8.] (Athanas. *Ap. Cont. Ar.* §§ 19, 24, *Ep. Encyc.* § 6; Hefele, *conc. Gesch.* i. 488, sq.; Tillemont, *H. E.* vi. 221, sq.) [J. G.]

PISTUS (2), Egyptian bishop, who attended the council of Tyre (A.D. 335) and signed the decrees of Sardica (A.D. 343) on the Athanasian side (Athanas. *Ap. c. Ar.* §§ 50, 79; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 335, 347; Binius, *Conc.* i. pt. i. 378; Hefele, *Conc. Gesch.* i. 468 sq.) Pistus, of Greece, an orthodox bishop, is mentioned by Athanasius in *Ep. ad Episc.* § 8. [J. G.]

PISTUS (3), presbyter of the Mareotis, on the Athanasian side, was one of the signatories on behalf of Athanasius (Athanasius, *Ap. c. Ar.* § 73; Binius, *Conc.* i. pt. i. 379). [J. G.]

PISTUS (4), deacon in Alexandria, assented with Colluthus and others to the condemnation of Arius, A.D. 321 (Athanas. *Opp.* 282, Paris, 1581; Binius, *Conc.* i. pt. i. 444). [J. G.]

PISTUS (ϖ), a solitary of Egypt early in the 5th century, of whom some anecdotes occur in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (Cotel. *Eccl. Gr. Mon.* i. 641; Tillem. xii. 462). [C. H.]

PITHIANI (Πιθιανοί), heretics in the list of Sophronius anathematized in the sixth synod (Mansi, xi. 850 D; Hard. iii. 291 A). Hardouin's margin and Latin version give Σηθιανοί and Sethiani as the true name [SETHITES]. [C. H.]

PITHO, mentioned by Theodoret as a disciple of Marcion. (*Haer. Fab.* i. 25.) [G. S.]

PITHYRION, a monk who lived in a cave near the Thebaid in the 4th century. He was a disciple of Antony, and was said to know the special vices which particular evil spirits infused into the minds of men. (Ruf. *Hist. Mon.* 13; Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* 74; Sozom. iii. 14.) [W. H. F.]

PITRUM (Πιτρουμ, PITERIUS, PYOTERIUS), a solitary in the country of Porphyrites in upper Egypt, directed, it is said, by an angel to visit the female monastery of Tabenna, where he would find a poor woman whose patience in a hard lot would make him think humbly of his own virtues. The visit and its good effects are related in full (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 42; Rosweyd. *Vit. Pat.* v. libell. xviii. 19; Cassiod. *Trip. Hist.* viii. 1). [C. H.]

PIUS I., bishop of Rome after Hyginus in the middle part of the 2nd century, during the reign of Antoninus Pius. The dates of the bishops of this early period cannot be fixed with certainty, the traditions about them being contradictory. The Liberian Catalogue (354) gives twenty years four months and twenty-one days as the duration of his episcopate, but is inconsistent in giving the consuls of the years 146 and 161 as those of its commencement and its close. The Felician Catalogue (530) gives the same consuls for its commencement without naming those of its close, but assigns it a duration of eighteen years four months and three days. Both name Antoninus Pius (A. D. 138—A. D. 161) as the contemporary emperor. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 11) does the same, but says that Pius died in the fifteenth year of his episcopate. His chronicle also gives the same duration. Lipsius (*Chronol. der röm. Bischöf.*), after full discussion of the chronology of the period, accepts this duration, assigning from 139 to 154 as the earliest, and from 141 to 156 as the latest tenable dates. The absence of distinct early records of the early Roman bishops is further shown by the fact, that both the Liberian and Felician Catalogues place Anicetus between Hyginus and Pius. So also Optatus (ii. 48) and Augustin (*Ep.* 53, *ordo novus*). But that the real order of succession was Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, may be considered certain from the authority of Hegesippus (quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 22), who was at Rome himself in the time of Anicetus, and, when there, made out a succession of the Roman bishops. His own words, as given by Eusebius, are, "When I was in Rome I made a list (διαδοχὴν) of bishops to Anicetus; and Anicetus was succeeded by Soter, after whom was Eleutherus." Irenaeus, who visited Rome in the time of Eleutherus, gives us the same order of

succession (*adv. Haeres.* iii. 3; cf. Euseb. iv. 11 and v. 24; also Epiphanius, *adv. Haer.* xxvii. c. 6).

The episcopate of Pius is important for the introduction of Gnostic heresy into Rome at the time rather than for any recorded action of his own. The heresiarchs Valentinus and Cerdo had come thither in the time of his predecessor Hyginus, and continued to teach there under Pius (*Iren.* i. 27; iii. 4; cf. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 11). Marcion of Pontus, who took up the teaching of Cerdo and developed from it his own peculiar system, arrived there after the death of Hyginus (Epiphanius *Haer.* xlii. c. 1; cf. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 11). The account given by Epiphanius of his arrival in Rome is that, having been excommunicated by his own father, who was a Catholic bishop, for seducing a virgin, he fled from his own city (supposed to have been Sinope) to Rome; that he applied to the elders there for admission to communion; that they replied that, being united in the same faith, they could not receive him without the consent of the bishop his father; and that he thereupon began to be a teacher of heresy.

Pius, according to the MURATORIAN FRAGMENT (*circa* 170) and the *Liberian Catalogue*, was brother to Hermas, the writer of "the Shepherd." The first of these authorities alleges that the work was written in the time of Pius by Hermas, a brother of that bishop—"Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit, sedente in cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre ejus." In the second it is said of Pius, "Under his episcopate his brother Hermes wrote a book, in which is commanded and contained what the angel taught him when he came to him in the habit of a shepherd." Also, an early Latin poem against Marcion (attributed to Tertullian) contains the lines,

Post hunc deinde Pius, Hermas cui germane frater,
Angelicus Pastor, qui tradita verba locutus.

In this last quotation the confusion between Hermas himself and the angel who appeared to him in the habit of a shepherd does not invalidate its testimony to the tradition of the relationship between Hermas and Pius. The only ground for doubting the truth of this important early testimony (that of the Muratorian Fragment being especially weighty) is the fact, that in the work itself the writer is instructed to send two copies of the revelations made to him, one to Clement for transmission to foreign churches, the other to Grapte for admonishing the widows and orphans. The name of Clement naturally suggests Clemens Romanus, accounted (see art. on CLEMENS ROMANUS) the third, or, according to some, the second, bishop of Rome after the apostles. Whatever his exact date, it is evident that, if he were the Clement to whom the revelations of "the Shepherd" were to be transmitted, the work could not have been written, as the Muratorian Fragment asserts, in the time of Pius; though it is possible that a brother of Pius might have been contemporary with Clemens Romanus, and thus that the relationship between Hermas and Pius might be a fact, though the date assigned to the former were erroneous. But the identification of the Clement referred to in "the Shepherd" with

Clemens Romanus is after all a conjecture only; a very tempting one, it is true; for to whom were the supposed revelations so likely to be given for transmission to foreign churches as to the head of the Roman church at the time of writing? But tempting conjectures are often delusive. And, even if we deemed it inevitable to regard Clemens Romanus as the Clement intended by the writer of "the Shepherd," we must remember at the same time that he is but giving an account of what had been told him in a vision, whereas the author of the Muratorian Fragment is speaking historically of what had occurred very recently in his own times (*nuperine temporibus nostris*). Lipsius (*Chronol. der röm. Bischof.*) considers the alleged relationship of Hermas to Pius to be well established. Westcott also (*Canon of the New Test.* pt. i. ch. 2) accepts it, and adduces internal evidence in the work of Hermas itself of the later against the earlier date. But see art. on HERMAS in this Dictionary, where the other view is taken. It is hardly necessary to add, that the identification of the Hermas who wrote "the Shepherd" with his namesake in the Epistle to the Romans (*Rom. xvi. 14*) rests only on a conjecture of Origen (*Comm. in Rom.* x. 41).

Those who maintain the view of the presbyterian constitution of the early Roman church, and of the earliest so-called bishops having been in fact only leading presbyters, to whom a distinct episcopal office was afterwards assigned by way of tracing the succession, would assign the development of the later episcopal system to the age of Pius. Thus Lipsius (*Chronol.*) speaks of him as the first bishop in the stricter sense (*Bischof im engeren Sinn*). He supposes both Hyginus and Pius to have presided over the college of presbyters, though only as *primi inter pares*, and the need of a recognized head of the church to resist Gnostic teachers to have led to the latter obtaining a position of authority which, after his time, became permanent. The advocates of this view adduce passages from "the Shepherd of Hermas," in which messages are sent "τοῖς προηγουμένοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῖς πρωτοκαθεδρίταις," in rebuke of strifes for precedence among the Christians at Rome (*Vis. iii. 9; Mandat. ix.; Simil. viii. 7*). These strifes are supposed to denote the beginning of struggles for episcopal power in the supposed later sense. But there is no evidence in the passages themselves of the strifes referred to having had anything to do with such struggles. (See art. on HERMAS, p. 918.)

More cogent is the argument from the fact that, in the account given by Epiphanius of Marcion's arrival in Rome, he is represented as having applied for communion to the presbyters, without mention of the bishop. Those to whom he applied, and who gave judgment in his case, are called "the seniors (*πρεσβῦται*) who, having been taught by the disciples of the apostles, still survived" (*adv. Haeres. xlii. 1*); also "the presbyters (*πρεσβύτεροι*) of that time" (*ib. c. 2*); also *ἐπιεικῆς καὶ πανάγιοι πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διδασκαλοὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας*. But these expressions do not in themselves disprove the existence of a presiding bishop, acting in and through his synod, who would himself be included in the designation *πρεσβύτεροι*. For it was certainly

not till some time after the apostolic period that the names *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος* were used distinctively to denote two orders of clergy. Even Irenaeus, though enumerating the bishops of Rome from the first as distinct from the general presbytery, still speaks of them as presbyters; using in one place (*iii. 2, 2*) the phrase "successiones presbyterorum," though in another (*iii. 3, 1 and 2*) "successiones episcoporum." Cf. *iv. 26, 2, 3, 5; v. 20, 2*; and *Ep. ad Victorem* (*ap. Euseb. v. 24*); where the bishops before Soter are called *πρεσβύτεροι* of *προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας*. Tertullian also (*Apologet. c. 39*) calls bishops and presbyters together *seniores*. If, however, the omission by Epiphanius of any mention of a head of the Roman presbytery at the time of Marcion's visit seem still to require accounting for, a reason may be found in the probable supposition of a vacancy in the see. For all that is said about the time is, that it was after the death of Hyginus, with no mention of Pius having succeeded him. In such circumstances the college of presbyters would naturally entertain the case.

This is not the place for a discussion of the apostolic origin of episcopacy, at Rome or elsewhere. But it may suitably be remarked in passing that, certainly very soon after the period before us, both Pius and his predecessors from the first were spoken of as having been bishops (however designated) in a distinctive sense, and that Anicetus, the successor of Pius, appears historically as such on the occasion of Polycarp's visit to Rome (*Iren. ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 24*).

Four letters and several decrees are assigned to Pius, of which the first two letters (to all the faithful and to the Italians) and the decrees are universally rejected as spurious. The two remaining letters, addressed to Justus bishop of Vienne, are accepted as genuine by Baronius, Binius, and Bona, but have no real claims to authenticity. [See PASTOR.] In the letter to all the faithful, Easter is ordered to be kept universally on a Sunday according to the Roman use, and the angel who appeared as a shepherd to Hermas is said to have so commanded. The same statement appears in the Felician Catalogue in addition to what has been quoted above from the Liberian Catalogue about the book of Hermas. In the book itself there is no foundation for the statement.

The Felician Catalogue also states that Pius was an Italian, and that his father's name was Rufinus; also that he was buried beside the body of St. Peter. He is commemorated in the Roman martyrology on the 11th of July as a martyr "in persecutione Marci Aurelii Antonini." But the silence on this head of both the Liberian and Felician Catalogues, of Irenaeus and all early authorities, invalidates his claim to the martyr's crown. [J. B.—Y.]

PLACIDIA (1), empress. [GALLA (5).]

PLACIDIA (2), daughter of Valentinian III. and Eudoxia, and wife of the emperor Olybrius Anicius, whom she married in 464. She had previously been taken captive by Genseric in

* See also the letter, quoted by Eusebius, from Dionysius of Corinth to the Romans in the time of Soter, the successor of Anicetus. [SOTER.]

455. She had one daughter called Juliana Anicia. After the death of her husband in A.D. 472, she is said to have devoted herself to study, and to have visited Jerusalem where she lived for a long time. She then returned to Italy, and died at Verona. (Cf. Ducange, *Familiae Byzantinae*, p. 74; Clinton's *Fasti*, p. 674-676; Gibbon, cap. xxxvi.; Olybrius in *Dict. G. & R. Biog.*) [GENSERIC; EUDOXIA (3).] [G. T. S.]

PLACIDIANUS, a young man descended probably from Furius Placidianus, consul, A.D. 273. Placidianus died under Constantine the Great. His epitaph in the style of Commodian has been recovered from the excavations in the church of St. Agapetus in Palestina. It is important for its description of the funeral offices, the funeral attended by the bishop and clergy, and its commendation of his soul to St. Agapetus for introduction into Paradise. The basilica is called in it the "Atria Sancti Martyris." The Placidiani probably built the church of St. Agapetus near Praeneste. (De Rossi, *Bullet. Arch. Crist.* 1883, p. 112.) [G. T. S.]

PLACIDUS (1), a friend and admirer of the literary works of Sidonius Apollinaris. See the letter written to him at Grenoble (*Epist.* iii. 14). [S. A. B.]

PLACIDUS (2), mentioned with Euticius, and thirty others as martyred in Sicily, on Oct. 5th, in the Hieronymian Martyrology (PLACITUS) and those of Ado and Usuard. Placidus, son of the patrician Tertullus, was brought as a boy to St. Benedict, at Sublaqueum, where the alleged miracle of his rescue from the lake took place. (Gregorii *Dial.* ii. 3, 7, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxvi. 140, 146.) According to *Acta*, purporting to be written by his companion, Gordianus, he was sent by Benedict to Sicily, founded a monastery at Messina, and suffered there with his brothers, Eutychius and Victorinus, his sister, Flavia, and thirty-three companions. These *Acta* were, however, not written at the earliest till the time of pope John VIII., A.D. 872, and are full of blunders, e.g. by a monstrous anachronism they attribute the martyrdom to Saracen invaders from Spain. It is probable that the writer started by identifying Placidus the Benedictine with the Placidus or Placitus of the Martyrology, a person of much earlier date, and dressed up a story with incidents from the actual Mahometan invasions of Sicily in the ninth century. Whether any substratum of facts, except those stated by Gregory, underlies the narrative, it seems impossible to decide. (*Acta SS.* Oct. iii. 65; Mabillon, *Ann. Ben.* ii. 3; iii. 2, 25; iv. 14.) [F. D.]

PLACILLUS of Antioch. [FLACILLUS.]

PLATO (1), July 22. Martyr at Ancyra, under a certain Agrippinus. He is only known by a letter of St. Nilus, disciple of Chrysostom; read at the second council of Nice. (*Mart. Rom.*; Ceillier, viii. 224; Ruinart, Pref. xxii.) [G. T. S.]

PLATO (2), 20th bishop of Poitiers (A.D. 592-9), was archdeacon at Tours before his

elevation to the episcopate, and suffered with his bishop, Gregory the historian, from the persecution of count Leudastes, even to the extent of being imprisoned and threatened with torture and death (*Hist. Franc.* v. 50). Gregory was present at his installation at Poitiers, as appears from the congratulatory ode composed by Venantius for the occasion (*Misc.* x. 18, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 342). Nothing is known of his episcopate beyond an anecdote, related by Gregory, of his having saved the church buildings at Poitiers from imminent conflagration by holding up a reliquary containing some dust from the tomb of St. Martin at Tours (*De Mirac. S. Martini.* iv. 32). [S. A. B.]

PLATO (3), (Πλάτων ὁ τοῦ Σακκουδίου ἡγούμενος), abbat of Saccudion and of Symboleon, and a recluse in Constantinople. He has no *Acta* beyond the *oratio funebris* of Theodorus Studita, translated into Latin by Sirletus, in *Boll. Acta SS.* Apr. 4, t. i. 364 sq. with commentary, *ib.* 362-4; Surius, *Vit. SS.* xii. 269, ed. 1618. *Vid.* also *Theoph. Chronog.* A. C. 788, 798, 801, and *Theod. Stud. Epp.* lib. i. epp. 1, 2, 3, 57. About A.D. 735 Plato was born of rich and noble parents in Constantinople, named Sergius and Euphemia. Left an orphan at an early age, he was educated by his uncle, the emperor's treasurer, whom in course of time he assisted in his work. Thus he amassed great wealth, and had every prospect of advancement, but his heart longed for the religious life, and his chief resort was to the churches and monasteries. At last he set free his slaves, sold all his goods, distributed his money among his sisters and the poor, and went to Mount Olympus, in Bithynia, where he became a monk under Theocistus in the monastery of Symboleoa, c. A.D. 758. He became the abbat's assistant, and in A.D. 770 his successor, where he was assiduous in his duties, and especially in making copious extracts from the writings of the fathers. When he afterwards visited Constantinople, he refused the offer of a monastery and of the bishopric of Nicomedia, and returned to his monastery. But when his relatives founded the monastery of Saccudion near Constantinople, he was induced to be its first abbat, A.D. 782, and as such attended the second council of Nice, where we find the signature attesting the Creed, Πλάτων ἡγούμενος καὶ ἀρχιμανδρίτης Σακκουδίων (Binius, *Conc.* iii. pt. i. p. 598, and sect. post, p. 55). Some time after he fell ill, and, resigning the abbacy in favour of Theodorus his nephew, became a recluse from A.D. 794 to 807. Yet this was probably the most anxious and painful part of his life. When the emperor [CONSTANTINUS VII. PORPHYROGENITUS] divorced his queen Marina and married Theodota, Plato united with his nephew Theodorus in separating from the communion of the patriarch Tarasius and excommunicating the emperor, thereby incurring imprisonment and exile (Baronius, *Annal.* A.D. 795, 42, 45). But his example supported the opposition of the monks, and seemed to excite the pity and favour of the empress Irene, by whom at Constantine's deposition A.D. 797, he was released; he went to Studium and became a monk under Theodorus. When Tarasius died

in 806, the emperor Nicephorus I. consulted, among others, Plato and Theodorus regarding the selection of a successor, but their recommendation was not taken, and the emperor appointed Nicephorus; for refusing all inducements and arguments to approve of the appointment, the two were cast into prison. The emperor then convened a largely attended council, and the aged and decrepit Plato was borne to it on men's shoulders. The marriage of Constantine was declared valid by dispensation, and the two monks were excommunicated and deposed along with all that disallowed the dispensing power. They were banished to separate prisons in the islands near Constantinople, until Michael I. became emperor and the exiles were recalled A.D. 811. In the remaining years of his life he was bed-ridden, but had the pleasure of receiving visits from Nicephorus and others who wished to efface all trace of former wrongs. He died on March 19, A.D. 813, and was buried at Studium on April 4, which is the day of his feast; on that occasion Theodorus pronounced the *oratio funebris* above alluded to (Baronius, A.D. 812, 5 sq.) Two sermons were afterwards delivered by Theodorus (*Bibl. Pat. et Auct. Eul.* ii. 1316, 1347, Nos. 33, 69, Paris 1610) in his memory (Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 775, 795, 808, 809).

[J. G.]

PLENIUS (Πλήνιος, Πλήνης), an Egyptian bishop banished by the Arians in 356 (Athanasius, *Ap. de Fug.* § 7; *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 72; Tillem. viii. 697).

[C. H.]

PLINIUS SECUNDUS. [TRAJANUS.]

PLINTHAS (Πλωθᾶς, PLINTA in Marcellinus), commander of the army in the reign of Theodosius II., and consul in 419. In his time the Arians were torn by dissensions, and he, who belonged to the Psathyrian division of that body, was the means of restoring unity among them. (Soc. v. 23; Soz. vii. 17.) This he did in 419 if it was, as Socrates says it was, in the year of his consulship (*κατὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν*); but Sozomen says that Plinthas was at the time a consular (*ἀνὴρ ὑπατικός*). The length of the internal Arian schism (for which these authors are the authority) was thirty-five years, according to both of them; but the Latin version of Socrates gives twenty-five years, as does Cassiodorus (*Hist. Trip.* lib. ix. c. 40), and this shorter period is adopted by Valesius. Valesius deals with another difficulty presented by a passage in the *Chronicon* of Marcellinus Comes, who under the year 418 states that an insurgent count Plinthas was put down in Palestine that year. The chronology is discussed by Tillemont (vi. 632, 803) and by Clinton (*F. R.* i. 596). The latter makes the Arian schism to have begun in 385 and ended in 419. Plinthas is met with again in 431 endeavouring to put Saturninus in possession of the see of Marcianopolis in Moesia, in opposition to Dorotheus (*Synod. adv. Trag. Iren.* c. 46 in Mansi, v. 823; Tillem. xiv. 297, 498).

[C. H.]

PLOTINUS, an account of the philosophy of this remarkable man has been given in

the article NEOPLATONISM. It will be sufficient here to give those particulars which are known of his life and personal character; in respect of which the biography by Porphyry is almost our sole authority. The very brief notices of him by Eunapius and Suidas add nothing deserving credence to the account by Porphyry, except the assertion that he was born at Lycopolis in Egypt (Sivouth). This may be true, notwithstanding that Porphyry tells us that Plotinus would never disclose his native land, or his race, or the names of his parents. Neither, says Porphyry, would he ever suffer himself to be painted; but a portrait of him was procured by stealth; his friend Amelius bringing the famous painter Carterius to hear his lectures, by whom his features were afterwards delineated from memory. This reluctance of his to have the likeness of his bodily form perpetuated is not surprising in a man who (we are told) blushed to think he had a body. So far did his contempt for his bodily organs go, that he refused to take any remedy for a colic from which he suffered, regarding it as unworthy of an aged man to use means of this kind.

But to revert to the beginning of his life. When he was eight years of age, and already under instruction, he used to suck his nurse's breast (this he himself related to Porphyry); till one day, ashamed by her reproof, he desisted from the practice. At the age of twenty-eight, he devoted himself to philosophy; but could find no satisfaction in any of the recognised teachers, till one day a friend took him to hear Ammonius Saccas; after hearing whose exposition of principles, he cried out, *τοῦτον ἐζητοῦν*, "this is the man I was seeking," and continued without any cessation to attend his school. At the age of thirty-nine, impelled by the desire to learn the philosophy of the Persians and Indians, he accompanied the emperor Gordian in his military expedition against Persia. But Gordian was slain in Mesopotamia, and Plotinus had difficulty in making his way safely back to Antioch. The next year he went to Rome, Philip being then emperor; and he now began to teach. He had some time before made an agreement with two others of the disciples of Ammonius, Herennius and Origen (not the Christian), that they should keep the doctrines of their master secret. But Herennius, and afterwards Origen, broke the compact; after which Plotinus thought himself no longer bound to keep it. Yet even now he confined himself to oral instruction; and we are told that owing to the free permission which he gave his class to put questions to him, there was some lack of order in his lecture room. This Porphyry was told by Amelius, who began to attend the classes in the third year of Philip's reign, and continued to do so for twenty-four years, till the first year of Claudius, second emperor of that name (i.e. A.D. 268). It was about fifteen years previously to this latter date, that Plotinus first began to commit his philosophy to writing. He had written twenty-one books of his *Enneads* when Porphyry was first introduced to him by Amelius, in the year 262 A.D., and during the six following years (the time during which Porphyry had personal intercourse with him) he wrote twenty-four books more. In the brief remainder of

his life he wrote nine more books which he sent to Porphyry. Porphyry regards the twenty-four books of the middle period as the finest of the works of Plotinus; he thinks them perfect, except in a few passages.

Plotinus died in the second year of Claudius II., or A.D. 269. It was in a time of pestilence, but he does not appear to have died of the pestilence; his malady was a quinsy, complicated by weakness of sight (to which, to some extent, he was always liable), and ulcers on his hands and feet. This illness was brought on through the want of that attendance to which he was accustomed. He had never used baths; but his servants had been used to rub him every day, and these had now died of the pestilence. Finding that his illness grew worse through his inability to resist conversation with his friends, he retired to Campania, to a house which had belonged to his old friend Zethus, an Arabian physician, now deceased. His friend Eustochius alone was present at the death of the philosopher; to him Plotinus said shortly before his last moment, "I have been expecting you; now I seek to reunite the divine part of myself with the divine principle that is in nature." As he died, a dragon (or serpent) that had been under his bed glided through a hole in the wall and disappeared. He had completed his sixty-sixth year; he would, however, never tell his birthday, being unwilling that it should be celebrated with feasts or sacrifices. Yet he himself celebrated the birthdays of Plato and Socrates with such ceremonies, and also with recitations, probably in praise of those philosophers.

The names of several of the disciples of Plotinus (besides those above named), both men and women, are given by Porphyry. Plotinus appears to have inculcated on them that abstinence from politics which he himself invariably practised; but in two cases, we are told, unsuccessfully; Zethus the physician, and Castrius Firmus (who discharged towards Plotinus the duties of an intimate attendant) continued to engage in public affairs. It is, however, very notable that Plotinus himself requested the emperor Gallienus, to restore one of the ruined cities of Campania, to rename it Platonopolis, and arrange for its government according to the laws of Plato. This design, says Porphyry, would have been carried out if it had not been frustrated by private jealousy. We may suspect that there were other obstacles. Yet it is certain that Plotinus was very highly esteemed; for many well-born persons, both men and women, in their dying moments appointed him guardian of their children; and hence his house became full of young boys and girls; a curious picture of the home of a philosopher! He is said to have managed their pecuniary affairs carefully.

Plotinus had bad eyesight; and for this reason, and also because he composed with extraordinary ease, he never revised what he had written once. Whether any amount of revision could have made his writings easy to understand, is to be doubted; the character of his philosophy, so totally divorced from practical life, made it intrinsically lacking in points of tangible clearness. His slips in orthography, which Porphyry commemorates, do not affect

his modern readers. His demeanour, while he was lecturing, is characterised as full of a mild and radiant enthusiasm.

Porphyry relates various instances of the spiritual power of Plotinus. Some are not very edifying; as when an Egyptian priest, who had determined to astonish Plotinus by an exhibition of a demon, was himself astonished to find that a god, of an order superior to the demons, responded to the summons; or when Olympius, the enemy of Plotinus, found that the magical charms with which he sought to injure Plotinus recoiled upon himself—a result which Plotinus himself announced to his friends at the moment it was happening. A more certain as well as a more satisfactory instance of the good feeling as well as the perspicacity of Plotinus lay in his detecting an intention of Porphyry to commit suicide, and successfully dissuading him from it. Porphyry followed the advice of Plotinus and travelled; he was cured of his melancholy, but lost the satisfaction of staying with Plotinus till the death of the philosopher. When we read that the senator Rogatianus, in his zeal for the doctrines of Plotinus, abandoned not only his luxurious habits, but also his praetorial duties, and thereby became cured of severe and long-standing gout, we cannot but admire such a result of temperance and philosophy, but we must wonder how the city of Rome fared while the office of praetor was practically in abeyance.

Plotinus was, as far as we can judge, very far from mixing himself up with the heathen religion in the way habitual to the later Neoplatonists. This appears not only from the absence of reference to it in his writings, but from the anecdote related to us by Porphyry; that when Amelius, who was a strict observer of religious ceremonies, and paid especial regard to the feast of the new moon, requested Plotinus to assist in such a ceremony, Plotinus answered, "Those gods of yours must come to me, not I to them." Porphyry and his friends did not comprehend, and did not dare to ask the reason of so bold an answer; but it is sufficiently intelligible. It may be observed, that though Plotinus was certainly not a Christian, some of the Christian bias which was implicated with the origin of the Neoplatonic philosophy appears in this answer. Plotinus nowhere mentions Christianity; but the Gnostics, whom he attacks (Ennead ii. 9), were in some cases Christian Gnostics.

The fifty-one hexameters which the Delphic oracle returned as answer to Amelius, who had inquired after the death of Plotinus whither the soul of his master and friend had gone, and received hence the intelligence that he was partaker of immortality with the blest, will scarcely influence modern readers so much as the esteem in which the eminent critic Longinus held the philosopher. Longinus indeed appears in the interesting character of being at once an admirer and a philosophical opponent of Plotinus; at first, judging from hearsay, he had altogether despised him, and even to the end failed to understand many of his speculations; but he nevertheless writes to Porphyry that "he loved and revered beyond measure the manner of the writing of Plotinus," that the books of Plotinus were "most excellent;" and

no was most anxious to procure trustworthy copies of them. [LONGINUS.]

On the whole, Plotinus, in so far as we have records of him, was in his personal character one of the purest and most pleasing of all philosophers, ancient or modern; and his philosophy, though its defect on the practical side must ever prevent its exercising a commanding influence, is yet by no means without a true fervour and inspiration.

The best edition of Plotinus is probably still that by Dr. F. Creuzer (professor at Heidelberg) which was published at Oxford in 1835, 3 vols. 4to. An edition by Kirchhoff was published at Leipsic in 1856. Translations of various parts of the writings of Plotinus were published by Thomas Taylor, London, 1834. The French translation by Bouillet, Paris, 1857, may be recommended; it contains much information. The histories of the Alexandrian school of philosophy by Vacherot and Jules Simon, the last volume of Zeller's *Philosophie der Griechen*, the work of Kirchner, *Die Philosophie des Plotin* (Halle, 1854, 8vo), and the article on PLOTINUS in the Dictionary of *Greek and Roman Biography*, may also be consulted. Quite recently (1882 and 1883) studies on Plotinus have been written by H. F. Müller (Berlin) and Hugo von Kleist (Heidelberg). But the most elaborate and enthusiastic work on Plotinus is probably the set of essays by Arthur Richter, *Neuplatonische Studien: Darstellung des Lebens und der Philosophie des Plotin* (Halle, 1867). Richter supplies us with the following tribute to Plotinus by St. Augustine, with which the present article may fitly end: "Osque illud Platonis, quod in philosophiâ purgatissimum est et lucidissimum, dimotis nubibus erroris, emicuit, maxime in Plotino, qui Platonicus philosophus ita ejus similis judicatus est, ut . . . in hoc ille revixisse putandus sit."—*De Civitate Dei*, viii. 12. [J. R. M.]

PLUSIANUS (Πλουσιανός), a Meletian bishop reconciled to the church (Athanas. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 69; Tillem. viii. 658, 664). [C. H.]

PLUTARCHUS, June 28. Martyr at Alexandria with Potamiaena and others in the persecution of Severus. He was converted by Origen, and was brother to Heraclas, afterwards bishop of Alexandria, in succession to Demetrius. (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 3, 4, 5.) [G. T. S.]

PNEUMATOMACHI [HOLY GHOST, p. 121.]

PODDA, the sixth bishop of Hereford. He succeeded Cuthbert on his election to the see of Canterbury, in the year 741 (*M. H. B.* 621; *Flor. Wig.* ad ann. 741; *ib.* 543). He was present with the other two Mercian bishops at the great council of Clovesho in 747 (*Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 362; *Will. Malmesb. G. P. i.* § 5). His successor Hecca appears first in a charter of 758. The date assigned in some MSS. of Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* 546) for Podda's death, A. D. 786 is a mere matter of calculation. [S.]

POEMEN (1), (Ποιμήν, PASTOR). Aug. 27, a famous anchorite of Egypt. He retired when very young into the monasteries of Scete, about

the year 390, and continued there seventy years, dying about 460. He had five brothers, solitaries like himself, two of whom were ANUPH and PAËSIUS (Cotel. i. 586; Tillem. xi. 449). His life occupies much space in Rosweyde's *Vitæ Patrum*, v. 15, in *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii., and in Cotelieri *Monum. Eccl. Graec.*, t. i. pp. 585-637. The anecdotes told in the last-mentioned authority give the best idea of the man. He treated his aged mother with neglect, refusing to see her when she sought him. His solitary life destroyed all feelings of human nature. On one occasion some presbyters came to visit the solitaries, commissioned we suppose by the bishop to see after their spiritual life. Paësius came to Poemen and proposed to entertain them, but could extract no answer from him. Paësius thereupon waxed wroth and demanded a reply, when Poemen opened his mouth and replied, "I am a dead man, a dead man does not speak." The governor of the province desired on another occasion to see a man so famous for sanctity. He could devise no other plan than that of arresting Poemen's nephew, his sister's only son. He announced that he would put him to death unless Poemen came and sought his release. His sister besought him to free her son, but all in vain. "He had no children and no trouble," and therefore would not trouble himself about her son. The governor thereupon volunteered to release him if Poemen simply asked the favour. But he would not take even this step, but said, "If the youth has deserved death, let him suffer it. If not let the governor release him." The life of Poemen was however considered a marvel of divine grace, as the Greeks in their office for August 27, describe him as "the light of the universe and the model for monks." His story is concisely told in Ceillier, viii. 468-470, and Till. *Mém.* xv. 147. In the *Vitæ Patrum*, iii. 19, Poemen tells a story which shows how these Egyptian solitaries scattered themselves over the world. One took up his abode near Constantinople, where the emperor Theodosius II. visited and consulted him. After the imperial visit he fled back into Egypt, fearful of the notoriety he had obtained. [G. T. S.]

POEMEN (2), one of the three "wretched Egyptian bishops" (ἐλεεινοὶ ἐπίσκοποι) sent by Theophilus to Constantinople by the canon of Antioch forbidding the restoration of a deposed bishop, this canon being intended to be used as a weapon against Chrysostom. (Pallad. p. 76.) [E. V.]

POEMENIUS (1), a presbyter of Sebaste, who vehemently opposed Basil at the synod at Sebaste in 372 (Basil, *Ep.* 99 [187.]) [E. V.]

POEMENIUS (2), bishop of Satala in Armenia, a near relation of Basil, who had been brought up with him, and with whom he lived in close intimacy. In 372, in obedience to the imperial mandate to appoint bishops for Armenia and to the earnest entreaties of the people, Basil disregarding his own convenience, Poemenius's own wishes, and the lamentations of his widowed mother, and the people of Caesarea, by whom he was highly esteemed, appointed him to the see of Satala, which had been for a long time without a bishop. Basil earnestly commended his friend to the good offices of his new flock in a

letter sent by Nicias (Basil, *Epp.* 102 [183]; 99 [187]). The following year, 373, Basil wrote to Poemenius on the subject of Faustus's irregular ordination to an Armenian see by Anthimus [ANTHIMUS, Vol. I. p. 119 b], stating that he declined to admit Faustus to communion until he had received a testimony to his character and conduct from Poemenius. Basil wrote again to him in 375, warmly commending the promptitude of his action in translating Euphronius from Colonia to Nicopolis (*Ep.* 122 [313]; EUPHRONIUS, (2), Vol. II. p. 297 a). [E. V.]

POETRY, SACRED. [VERSE WRITERS.]

POLEMIUS (1) (Πολέμιος), a disciple of Apollinaris and a founder of a branch of his sect, teaching that in the person of Christ, there was a combination of substance (συνουσιωσις), and a mixing (κρᾶσις) of the divine and bodily natures. [SYNUSIASTÆ.] (Theod. *Haer. Fab.* iv. 9; Tillem. vii. 605, 631.) [C. H.]

POLEMIUS (2), a prefect of Gaul in the 5th century, descended from Tacitus the historian and Ausonius the poet. A letter addressed to him by his friend Sidonius Apollinaris survives (iv. 14). Sidonius also addresses an epithalamium to him and his wife Araneola (Carm. xiv. xv., with prefatory Epistle; Tillem. xvi. 262, 263). [S. A. B.]

POLEMIUS (3), bishop of Astorga, attended the second council of Braga in A.D. 572. It was to him that MARTINUS (2) of Braga addressed his sermon *de Correctione Rusticorum*. (*Esp. Sag.* xvi. 108; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 631.) [F. D.]

POLEMO (1) (Πολέμων), an Apollinarist, who wrote against Gregory Nazianzen (Phot. *Cod.* 230 in *Pat. Gr.* ciii. 1045; Tillem. ix. 518). [C. H.]

POLEMO (2), bishop of Myra, who when presbyter of that church is named by Basil among those who desired to separate themselves from the bishops of Asia and unite themselves to him (Basil, *Ep.* 218 [403]). As bishop he attended the Council of Constantinople in 381 (Labbe, i. 665). [E. V.]

POLEMO (3), Neocorus of Smyrna. He conducted the preliminary examination of St. Pionius and his companions, but had no power of life and death, as he acknowledges in cap. x. of the Acta Pionii. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 124.) On the office of Neocorus, see Le Bas and Waddington's *Asia Minor*, t. iii. p. 63. [G. T. S.]

POLIANUS, bishop of the colony of Milev, (Mileum, or Milevum), colonia Sarnensis Milevitana (the see of Optatus) in Numidia, near Cirta, *hod. Mila.*—Sent. 13. *Episcopos.* in Syn. Carth. de Bap. 3. *Ep.* 70—one of the eight with NEMESIAN, q.v.—To subscription of *Ep.* 79, is added "Polianus legi." [E. W. B.]

POLITIANUS, Melchite patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 780 (Pagi). Being a physician he healed a daughter of the caliph Haroun al Rashid, and thus brought about a temporary reaction in favour of the orthodox or Melchite party. The Jacobites, however, soon regained their ancient superiority. Eutychius in his

Annal. fixes his death at A.D. 801, and the duration of his episcopate at forty-six years. Politianus is called Balatianus by this last-mentioned writer. He was represented in the 2nd Nicene council by the monks John and Thomas (Mansi, xiii. 624). (Le Quien, ii. xvii. 462; Renaudot, *Hist. Pat. Alexand.* 240; Neale, ii. 128–136.) [G. T. S.]

POLLENTIUS, a friend of St. Augustine, known through the treatise of St. Augustine, *De Conjugiis Adulterinis*, in two books. i. In his discourse on the Sermon on the Mount, then some years old, St. Augustine had given his opinion, that women who leave their husbands on account of their unfaithfulness to them ought not to be allowed to marry again, in order to give an opportunity of return, and shews that St. Paul added a necessary rider or condition to our Lord's command in this respect, viz. that this prohibition is meant to extend only to the lifetime of each party respectively (*Serm. de Serm. Dom. in Mont.* i. 14, 39, see Matt. v. 31, xix. 7, 8; 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11). With this opinion Pollentius disagreed, thinking that St. Paul's meaning is to prohibit re-marriage only to women who leave their husbands for other reasons than that of unfaithfulness; but St. Augustine points out that, except for this cause on the part of the wives, they ought not to leave their husbands at all, much less be allowed to marry again. For if this liberty were allowed on both sides a cause of divorce might on the plea of continence be created leading to re-marriage. Thus, says St. Augustine, where no fornication has been committed on either side, three courses are open both to husband and to wife. 1. To remain with each other. 2. To separate, but continue unmarried. 3. If separated, to return to each other. He then condemns any separation for the sake of continence except by mutual consent, and refutes the opinion of Pollentius that the reason why a woman, leaving her husband when he is unfaithful to her, is forbidden to marry is only in order to save her from reproach, and shews that his view of the divine precept leads to separation, even without the cause of unfaithfulness on either side. Again Pollentius thought that it is not lawful for Christians to put away wives who are not Christians, and that a Christian widow or widower ought not to marry any one but a Christian. St. Augustine thinks that, on the principle laid down by St. Paul, these things are lawful but not expedient; that a man who repudiates his wife for unfaithfulness, and marries another in order to make her a Christian, is guilty of adultery, and that those who make vows of continence, and wish to break them on a similar plea, are guilty of grievous sin. He concludes by saying that nothing can be expedient which is not lawful, nor can anything be lawful which the Lord forbids. But Pollentius propounds another very difficult question as to the meaning of St. Paul's advice respecting a widow marrying, when he says, "only in the Lord," and which may be understood in two ways, (a) remaining a Christian, (b) marrying a Christian. Nowhere, St. Augustine says, does Scr. forbid Christians to marry persons who are not Christians; and though St. Cyprian was distinctly opposed to this, what

does St. Paul say? see 1 Cor. vii. 12-39. It seems therefore to be lawful to do this, but not expedient. Pollentius appears also to have put another question as to baptizing catechumens at the point of death without any request for baptism on their part, perhaps for inability on their part to do so. St. Augustine thinks that such cases may be treated like those of infants; that it is better to give what is not refused than to refuse what is requested, and that it is permissible to do this even for married persons living in adulterous connection with others, either in hope that if they recover they may repent and amend their lives, or that if they do not this sin may with the rest be blotted out in their baptism; for the church ought not to be willing to let them depart without an earnest at least of peace on their behalf. ii. Since addressing his questions to St. Augustine, Pollentius put together some more to which he wished him to reply, and St. Augustine would have included his replies in his former book, but that in compliance with the importunity of his friends it had been already published, and he was now in consequence obliged to put forth a second. Pollentius suggested that "dead" (1 Cor. vii. 39) means guilty of adultery, and that consequently a woman who left her husband or a husband his wife for this cause, was at liberty to marry again. St. Augustine replies that if fornication is to be regarded as equivalent to death, and if a wife is tied to her husband as long as he lives, the commission of this act would at once set free either husband or wife, and enable them to marry some one else. He proceeds to speak of the iniquity of husbands guilty of adultery who sought to punish their wives for similar conduct, and to pronounce an eloquent eulogy on the law of Antoninus which, extending the operation of the Julian law, enacted equal punishment on this offence for both husband and wife (Baron. ann. 161. ii.; see also Digest. xlviii. 8. Tit. v. 13. 2). He also replies to other difficulties arising out of the view taken by Pollentius, and states his own opinion as to the true purpose of matrimony in which his influence upon the composition of the Anglican marriage-service may perhaps be traced (lib. ii. 12, 12; see *Serm.* li. 22).

[H. W. P.]

POLLIO (1) (POLIUS, PUBLIUS, according to the Greek *Menaëa*), proconsul of Pamphylia, under whom Nestor of Side or Magyda, Feb. 26, suffered in the Decian persecution. [NESTOR.] See Acts of Nestor by Aubé, *Rev. Arch.* April, 1884, p. 219.

[G. T. S.]

POLLIO (2), April 23, lector; martyr, by fire, at Abalis, an episcopal city in Pannonia, about A.D. 304, under a president named Probus. [IRENÆUS (3).] (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 435. Le Blant, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 72.)

[G. T. S.]

POLLUX (Πολυδύκης), a Libyan bishop ordained by the deposed bishop Secundus of Ptolemais, and accused of some offence (Athan. *De Synod.* § 12).

[C. H.]

POLYBIUS (1), bishop of Tralles (Ignat. *ad Trall.* 1).

[G. S.]

POLYBIUS (2), a lay friend of Chrysostom's at Constantinople, to whom he wrote after his arrival at Cucusus in 404 (Chrys. *Ep.* 43); and again in 406 from Arabissus (*Ep.* 127). The second letter contains a moving description of the perpetual panic caused by the incursions of the Isaurians.

[E. V.]

POLYBIUS (3), fabulous bishop of Rhinocorura, to whom is ascribed the life of Epiphanius prefixed to his works; see Migne, *P. G.* t. xli col. 63, 73. Tillemont (x. 802, 804) points out the absurdities of his story and pretended writings. Polybius claims to have been a contemporary of Epiphanius, cf. cap. lxvii. of the life.

[G. T. S.]

POLYCARPUS (1), bishop of Smyrna, one of the most prominent figures in the church history of the second century. He owes this prominence less to intellectual ability, in which he does not appear to have been pre-eminent, than to the influence gained by a consistent and unusually long life. Born some thirty years before the end of the first century, and raised to the episcopate, as it would seem, in early manhood, he held his office to the age of eighty-six or more. He claimed to have himself known at least one apostle, and must in early life have met many who could tell of things they had heard from actual disciples of our Lord. The younger generation then into which Polycarp lived on, naturally recognised him as a source of peculiarly trustworthy information concerning the first age of the Church. During the later years of his life Gnostic speculation had become very active, and many things unknown to the faith of ordinary Christians were put forth as derived by secret traditions from the apostles. In the face of such pretensions it was a matter of course that high value should be attached to the witness Polycarp was able to give to the genuine tradition of apostolic doctrine, his testimony condemning as offensive novelties the figments of the heretical teachers. Irenæus states (iii. 3) that on the occasion of Polycarp's visit to Rome this testimony of his was the means of converting many disciples of Marcion and Valentinus. And Polycarp crowned his other services to the church by a glorious martyrdom. When he was now at the extremity of human life, and it seemed as if he could do no more for the church than by the pattern he had already set of holiness, piety, and orthodoxy, a persecution broke out in which his position as the venerated head of the Christian community in Asia Minor marked him out for special attack. He gave then a noble exhibition of calm courage, neither courting nor fearing martyrdom, sheltering himself by concealment while concealment was possible, and when it was no longer so, resolutely declaring in defiance of threats his unshaken love to the master he had served so long. Such a death, following on such a life, made Polycarp's the most illustrious name of his generation in the Christian annals.

Irenæus states (III. iii. 4) that Polycarp had not only been instructed by apostles and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but had also been established "by apostles" as bishop in the church at Smyrna; and we cannot doubt that Tertullian (*De Præscrip.* 32) is right in understanding this to mean that he had been so estab-

lished by St. John, whose activity in founding the episcopate of Asia Minor is spoken of also by Clem. Alex. in his well-known story of St. John and the robber (*Quis div. salv.* p. 959). The testimony of Irenaeus is conclusive evidence as to the current belief in Asia Minor during the old age of Polycarp, and if we have any hesitation in accepting that belief as decisively establishing the fact, it is only because in the case of one so venerated and whose episcopate had lasted so long, the known fact that he had been a hearer of St. John would under any circumstances be likely to receive the addition that he had been made bishop by John. In any case we count it as certain that Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna at the time of the martyrdom of Ignatius, i.e. somewhere about A.D. 110. Ignatius on his journey from Antioch to Rome made his first halt at Smyrna, where, as at his other resting-places, the Christians flocked to him from all the neighbourhood to receive his counsels and to bestow attentions on him. From the city where he next halted he wrote back in separate letters to the church of Smyrna and to Polycarp its bishop. A later stage of his journey was Philippi, to the church of which city Polycarp some time after wrote a letter still extant, sending them copies of the letters of Ignatius, and enquiring if they could give him information about Ignatius, the detailed story of whose martyrdom appears not yet to have reached Smyrna.

The question concerning the genuineness of the extant epistle of Polycarp is very much mixed up with the question concerning the genuineness of the Ignatian letters. The two bear witness to each other, the letter of Polycarp, as has been said, speaking of letters written by Ignatius, and the Ignatian letters containing directions that letters should be written by Polycarp. The theory then that the Ignatian letters were a forgery, naturally received as a necessary complement the addition that Polycarp's letter is also a forgery, proceeding from the same workshop and intended to help on the success of the Ignatian imposture. However, the course of modern investigation has been decidedly favourable to the genuineness of the Ignatian letters (see the article **IGNATIUS**, Vol. III. 209), while the epistle of Polycarp is guaranteed by external testimony of exceptional goodness. It is mentioned by Polycarp's disciple Irenaeus (III. iii. 4), and an important passage, of which we shall speak presently, is quoted by Eusebius. Further, as Lightfoot has conclusively pointed out (*Contemp. Rev.* May 1875, p. 840), it may confidently be pronounced impossible that Polycarp's letter and those of Ignatius could have had any common authorship. Some of the topics on which the Ignatian letters lay most stress are absent from that of Polycarp; in particular, Polycarp's letter is silent about episcopacy, of which the Ignatian letters speak so much, and it has consequently been thought probable either that episcopacy had not yet been organised at Philippi, or that the office was vacant at the time. The forms of expression in the two letters are different; New Testament quotations, which are profuse in Polycarp's letters, are comparatively scanty in the Ignatian; and, most decisive of all, the Ignatian letters are characterised by great originality of thought and expression while Polycarp's is but a commonplace echo of

the apostolic epistles. And when we compare Polycarp's letter with the extant remains of the age of Irenaeus, the superior antiquity of the former is evident, whether we attend to their use of the New Testament, their notices of ecclesiastical organisation, their statements of theological doctrine, or observe the silence in Polycarp's letter on the questions which most interested the church towards the close of the second century. The question has been raised whether, admitting the genuineness of Polycarp's epistle as a whole, we may not reject as an interpolation chap. xiii. which speaks of Ignatius. The extant MSS. of Polycarp's letter are derived from one in which leaves were wanting, containing the end of Polycarp's letter and the beginning of that of Barnabas, so that the remaining part of Barnabas seemed to be the continuation of Polycarp's epistle. The concluding chapters of Polycarp are therefore only known to us by a Latin translation.* But the hiatus in the Greek text begins not at chap. xiii. but at chap. x.; and the part which speaks about Ignatius is exactly that for which we have the Greek text assured to us by the quotation of Eusebius. There is therefore absolutely no reason for rejecting chap. xiii. unless on the supposition, that the forgery of the Ignatian letters has been demonstrated.

It has been already stated that Polycarp's epistle is remarkable for its copious use of New Testament language, but there are no formal quotations, except that the fact is mentioned that Paul had written to the church of Philippi to which Polycarp's epistle is addressed. The language in which Paul's letters are spoken of, both here and in the epistles of Ignatius, is decisive refutation of the theory, that there was opposition between the school of John and of Paul. It illustrates the small solicitude of Eusebius to produce testimony to the use of the New Testament books undisputed in his time, that though he takes notice (iv. 14) of the use made by Polycarp of St. Peter's first epistle, he passes over in silence this express mention of Paul's letters. Polycarp's Pauline quotations include distinct recognition of the epistles most assailed by modern criticism, viz. that to the Ephesians and the two to Timothy. There are besides passages clearly shewing a use of Rom., 1 Cor., Gal., Phil., 2 Thess. The employment of 1 Peter is especially frequent and may well have arrested the attention of Eusebius. There is one unmistakable coincidence with the Acts. The use of 1 and 2 John is probable. The report of our Lord's sayings agrees in substance with our gospels, but may or may not have been directly taken from them. The coincidences with Clement's epistle are beyond what can fairly be set down as accidental, and in fact it seems to me likely that it was the celebrity gained by Clement's epistle which set the example to bishops elsewhere of writing to foreign churches. Polycarp states, however, that his own letter had been invited by the church of Philippi. Some church use of Polycarp's epistle would seem to have continued in Asia down to the time of Jerome; if we can lay stress on his rather

* Zahn in his edition of Polycarp runs the risk of misleading a hasty reader by printing in his Greek text, though with the protection of brackets, his own restoration of those chapters.

obscure expression (*Catal.*) "epistolam quae usque hodie in conventu Asiae legitur." The chief difference between Clement's and Polycarp's letters is in the use of the Old Testament, which is perpetual in the former, very rare in the latter. There is coincidence with one passage in the book of Tobit, two in the Psalms, and one in Isaiah; and certainly in one of the last three cases, possibly in all three, the adopted words are not taken directly from the Old Testament, but from the New. This difference, however, is explained when we bear in mind that Clement had in all probability been brought up in Judaism; Polycarp, on the contrary, was the child of Christian parents and familiar with the apostolic writings from his youth.

Our knowledge of the life of Polycarp between the date of his letter and his martyrdom is almost entirely derived from three notices by Irenaeus. The first is contained in his letter to Florinus, on which see the articles FLORINUS (II. 544), and IRENAEUS (III. 254); the second is in the treatise on Heresies, III. iii. 4; the third is the letter of Irenaeus to Victor, of which a portion is preserved by Eusebius, v. 24. Irenaeus, writing in advanced life, tells how vivid his recollections still were of having in his youth been a hearer of Polycarp, then an old man; how well he remembered the place where the aged bishop used to sit, his personal appearance, his ways of going out and coming in, and how frequently he used to relate his intercourse with John and others who had seen our Lord, and to repeat stories of our Lord's miracles and teaching all in complete accordance with the written record. One characteristic of the reminiscences of Irenaeus, in which they are in striking agreement with Polycarp's extant letter, is the picture they present of his attitude towards heresy. He does not appear to have had the qualifications for successfully conducting a controversial discussion with erroneous teachers, nor perhaps to have had the capacity for feeling the difficulties which prompted their speculations, but he could not help strongly feeling how unlike these speculations were to the doctrines which he had learned from apostles and their immediate disciples, and so he met with indignant reprobation their attempt to supersede Christ's gospel by fictions of their own devising. Irenaeus tells how, when he heard their impiety, he would stop his ears and cry out, "O, good God! for what times hast thou kept me that I should endure such things!" and would even flee from the place where he was sitting or standing when he heard such words. In so behaving he claimed to act in the spirit of his master, John, concerning whom he told that once when he went to take a bath in Ephesus and saw Cerinthus within he rushed away without bathing, crying out, "Let us flee, lest the bath should fall in, for Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within." And on one occasion when Marcion meeting Polycarp asked him, "Do you recognise us?" he answered, "I recognise thee as the first-born of Satan."

This last phrase is found in the extant letter. He says, "Every one who doth not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is antichrist; and whosoever doth not confess the testimony of the Cross is of the devil; and whosoever perverteth the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts

and saith that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, this man is a first-born of Satan." This coincidence between the anecdote and the letter has, not very reasonably, been taken as a note of spuriousness of the latter; the idea being that a writer under the name of Polycarp who employs a phrase traditionally known as Polycarp's betrays himself as a forger striving to gain acceptance for his production. It might rather have been supposed that a coincidence between two independent accounts of Polycarp's mode of speaking of heretics ought to increase the credibility of both; but even if we admit that one who once used such a phrase as "first-born of Satan," was incapable of using it a second time, and that we therefore cannot accept both the anecdote and the letter, it is the former which in that case we must reject. Irenaeus who reports it was acquainted with the letter, and it is conceivable that his recollection of it may have coloured his version of the story he was repeating.

One of the latest incidents in the active life of Polycarp was a journey which, near the close of his episcopate, he made to Rome, where Anicetus was then bishop. We are not told whether the cause of the journey was to settle points of difference between Roman and Asiatic practice; but points of difference we are told they had, which however were not allowed to interrupt their mutual accord. In particular Asiatic Quartodecimanism was at variance with Roman usage. We cannot say with certainty what kind of Easter observance was used at Rome in the time of Anicetus, for the language of Irenaeus implies that it was not then what it afterwards became; but it is certain that the Asiatic observance of the 14th day had been unknown in Rome, and that although Polycarp averred the practice of his church to have had the sanction of John and of other apostles, and therefore to be what he could by no means consent to change, Anicetus was equally determined not to introduce into his church an innovation on the practice of his predecessors. Yet this difference was not allowed to disturb their mutual communion, and Anicetus, we are told, shewed his reverence for his aged visitor by "yielding to him the eucharist in his church." This phrase seems capable of no other interpretation than that generally given to it, viz. that Anicetus permitted Polycarp to celebrate in his presence. This suggests the interesting question in what language did Polycarp celebrate? and what was at the time the habitual liturgical language of the church of Rome?

We come now to the martyrdom of Polycarp, the story of which is told in a letter still extant, purporting to be addressed by the church of Smyrna to the church sojourning (*παροικουσα*) in Philomelium (a town of Phrygia), and to all the *παροικια* of the holy Catholic Church in every place. This document was known to Eusebius, who has transcribed the greater part of it in his *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 15. The occurrence of the phrase "Catholic Church" which we have just quoted, has been regarded as a note of spuriousness; but not very reasonably, in the absence of evidence to make it even probable that the introduction of this phrase was later than the death of Polycarp. All we know for certain is that the phrase is very early. It is

used in the Ignatian letters (*Smyrn.* 8), by Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* vii. 17), in the Muratorian fragment, by Hippolytus, *Ref.* ix. 12, and by Tertullian. Remembering what we have already remarked as to the warfare waged by Polycarp against heresy, we know not why it should be imagined that in his lifetime the need could not yet have arisen for a name to distinguish the main Christian body from the various separatists. To us the whole narrative of the martyrdom appears so plainly to bear the stamp of a story told by an eye-witness, that to imagine, as Lipsius and Keim have done, that some one was capable of inventing it a century after the death of Polycarp, seems to require a great stretch of critical credulity. In our acceptance of the martyrdom as authentic Hilgenfeld coincides (*Zeitschrift*, 1874, p. 334), and Renan (*Église Chret.* 462). We see no good reason for doubting that the narrative was written, as it professes to be, within a year of the martyrdom, by members of the church where it occurred, and who had actually witnessed it; and we believe it to have been written with the special object of inviting members of other churches to attend at the commemoration held on the anniversary of the martyrdom. The narrative has been rejected because it is deeply tinged by a belief in the supernatural; but when the question is not as to the occurrence of a fact, but as to the genuineness of a document, it is uncritical to assume that Christians of the 2nd century, under the strain of a great persecution, must have held exactly the same views as their 19th century critic, with regard to the possibility of their receiving supernatural aid or consolation.

The story relates that Polycarp's martyrdom was the last act of a great persecution, which took place on the occasion of games held at Smyrna, and in which eleven others had suffered before him. In all probability these games were held in connection with the meeting of the Asiatic diet (*τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας*), which met in rotation in the principal cities of the province.^b If more information should come to light as to this rotation, and as to the seasons when these meetings were held, it is likely we should be able to fix the date of Polycarp's martyrdom with more certainty. The proconsul came from Ephesus, the ordinary seat of government, in order to preside. It may have been in order to provide the necessary victims for the wild beast shows that the Christians were sought for (some were brought from Philadelphia) and were required to take part in the imperial cultus of the season, by swearing by the fortune of the emperor and offering sacrifice. The proconsul appears to have discharged his unpleasant duty with the humanity ordinary among Roman magistrates, doing his best to persuade the accused to save themselves by compliance, and no doubt employing the tortures, of which the narrative gives a terrible account, as a merciful cruelty which might avert the necessity of proceeding to the last extremities. In one case his persuasion was successful. Quintus, a Phrygian by nation, who had of his own accord presented himself for martyrdom, on sight of the wild beasts lost

^b On these provincial councils, see Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 503 sqq. and on the office of Asiarch, *ib.* p. 523.

courage and yielded to the proconsul's entreaties not to throw away his life. The Christians learned from his case to condemn the wanton courting of danger as contrary to the teaching of the gospel. The proconsul lavished similar entreaties on a youth named Germanicus, but the lad was all the more resolute in his resistance, and instead of showing fear of the wild beast to which he was exposed, provoked it in order to gain a speedier release from his persecutors. The act may have been suggested by the language of Ignatius (*Rom.* v. 2); and certainly this language seems to have been present to the mind of the narrator of the story.

At sight of the bravery of Germanicus, a conviction seems to have seized the multitude that they had wrongly chosen their victim, and that the guilt most deserving of punishment was that of the teacher who had inspired the sufferers with their obstinacy. A cry was raised "Away with the atheists! Let Polycarp be sought for!" Polycarp's own wish had been to remain at his post, but he yielded to the solicitations of his people and retired for concealment to a country house, where he spent his time, as was his wont, in continual prayer, not for himself and his own people only, but for all the churches throughout the world. Three days before his apprehension he saw in a vision his pillow on fire, and at once interpreted the omen to his friends: "I must be burnt alive." The search for him being hot, he retired to another farm barely in time to escape his pursuers. But they seized two of the slave boys and put them to torture, under which one of them betrayed the new place of retreat. It was late on a Friday night when the noise of horses and armed men announced to Polycarp's party that the pursuers were at hand. There seemed still the possibility of escape, and they urged him to make the attempt, but he refused, saying "God's will be done." Coming down from the upper room, where he had been lying down, he ordered meat and drink to be set before his captors, and only begged that before he was carried off he might be allowed an hour for uninterrupted prayer. This was granted him; and for more than two hours he prayed, making mention by name of every one whom he had known, small or great; and besides for the whole Catholic Church throughout the world. At length the time for departure came, and he was set on an ass and conducted to the city. Soon they met the irenarch Herod, the police magistrate under whose directions the arrest had been made, in whose name the Christians afterwards found one of several coincidences which they found pleasure in tracing between the arrest of Polycarp and that of his Master.^c Herod, who was accompanied by his father Nicetes, took Polycarp up to sit with them in their carriage, and both earnestly urged him to save his life: "Why, what harm was it to say Lord Caesar, and to sacrifice, and so on, and escape all danger?" Polycarp at first was silent; at last he bluntly answered, "I will not do as you would have me." When their persuasion

^c A most absurd suspicion has hence been suggested, that the story was invented in order to exhibit such coincidences. If this were so, Polycarp would surely have been made to suffer on Friday, not Saturday.

availed nothing, disgusted at the old man's obstinacy, they thrust him out of the carriage so rudely that he scraped his shin, the marks no doubt being visible to his friends when he afterwards stripped for the stake. But at the time he took no notice of the hurt, and walked on as if nothing had happened. When the party reached the racecourse, where the multitude was assembled, there was a prodigious uproar; but amid the din the Christians could distinguish a voice which cried as Polycarp went in, "Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man!"^d Under the protection of the tumult the speaker remained undiscovered; and the Christians believed that the voice had come from heaven. After the formal preliminary interrogatories, the proconsul pressed Polycarp to have pity on his old age: "Swear by the fortune of Caesar, say 'Away with the atheists!'" Then the martyr, sternly looking round on the multitude of assembled heathen, groaned, and looking up to heaven said, "Away with the atheists!" "Swear then, now," said the proconsul, "and I will let you go; revere Christ." Then Polycarp made the memorable answer, "Eighty and six years have I served Him, and He has never done me wrong; how, then, can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour?" The eighty-six years must clearly count from Polycarp's baptism; so that if we are not to ascribe to him an improbable length of life, we must infer that he was the child of Christian parents, and that he had been baptized, if not in infancy, in very early childhood. When the magistrate continued to urge, Polycarp cut matters short by plainly declaring himself to be a Christian, and offering, if a day were assigned him, to explain to him what Christianity was. "Obtain the consent of the people," answered the proconsul. "Nay," replied Polycarp, "I count it your due that I should offer my defence to you, because we have been taught to give due honour to the powers ordained of God, but as for these people, I owe no vindication to them." The proconsul then had recourse to threats, but finding them unavailing, ordered his crier thrice to proclaim in the midst of the stadium, "Polycarp has confessed himself to be a Christian." Then arose a furious outcry from heathen and Jews against this "father of the Christians," this teacher of Asia, this destroyer of the worship of the gods. Philip the asiarch, or president of the games, was called on to let out a lion on Polycarp, but he refused, saying the wild beast shows were now over.^e Then with one consent the multitude cried out demanding that Polycarp should be burnt alive; for his vision must needs be fulfilled. And rushing to the workshops and baths they collected wood and fagots, the Jews, as their custom was, taking the most active part. We have evidence of the activity of the Jews at Smyrna at an earlier period, Rev. ii. 9, and at a later in the story of the martyrdom of Pionius. When the pile was ready Polycarp proceeded to undress himself; and here the story has an autoptic touch,

^d The words are those of Josh. i. 10, translated in our version, "Be strong and of a good courage."

^e Riddell, quoted by Simcox (*Early Church History*, p. 321), suggests that the beasts had been already fed that morning.

telling how the Christians marked the old man's embarrassment as he tried to take off his shoes, it having been many years since the reverence of his disciples had permitted him to perform such an office for himself. When he had been bound (at his own request, not nailed) to the stake, and had offered up a final prayer, the pile was lit, but the flame bellied out under the wind like the sail of a ship, behind which the body could be seen, scorched but not consumed. The fumes which reached their nostrils seemed fragrant to the Christians, whether this were the effect of imagination, or that really sweet scented woods had been seized for the hasty structure. The heathen seeing that the flame was dying out without doing its work, an executioner was sent in to finish with the sword, when so much blood came out that the flame nearly went out altogether. The Christians were about to remove the body; but Nicetes, already mentioned, here further described as the brother of Alce,^f interfered and said, "If you give the body, the Christians will leave the crucified one and worship him," an idea deeply shocking to the narrator of the story, who declares that it was impossible for them to leave, for any other, Christ the holy one who died for the salvation of the world. Him, as the Son of God, they worshipped; martyrs they loved on account of the abundance of their zeal and love for Him. The Jews eagerly backing up Nicetes, the centurion had the body placed in the midst of the pyre, and saw to its complete consumption, so that it was only the bones, "more precious than jewels, more tried than gold," which the disciples were able to carry off to the place where they meant on the anniversary to commemorate the martyr's "birthday." The epistle closes with a doxology. Euaerestus^g is named as the writer, Marcion [or Marcianus] as the bearer of the letter.

Then follows by way of appendix a note, stating that the martyrdom of Polycarp took place on the 2nd of the month Xanthicus, the 7th before the kalends of March [there is a various reading May], on a great Sabbath at the 8th hour; the arrest having been made by Herod, Philip of Tralles being chief priest, Statius Quadratus proconsul, and Jesus Christ King for ever.

A second note states that these acts had been transcribed by Socrates (or Isocrates) of Corinth, from a copy made by Caius, a companion of Polycarp's disciple Irenaeus. A third note states that this again had been transcribed by Pionius from a copy much decayed by time, the success of his search for which was due to a

^f The Alce thus mentioned must have been a well-known personage, and since the chronology fits perfectly, we cannot doubt that she is the same as the Alce who is recognised as a leading member of the church of Smyrna in the salutations of the letters of Ignatius both to that church and to Polycarp. Simcox suggests that she may have been the wife of Polycarp; but his reasons are considered and refuted by Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, i. 424, ii. 349).

^g The name is found in inscriptions from Smyrna (Boeckh, 3148, 3152, 3162). We have mentioned, Vol. III. p. 254, the tale noted in the Moscow MS. of the martyrdom that the news of Polycarp's death was miraculously communicated to Irenaeus, then teaching at Rome.

revelation made by Polycarp himself, "as will be shewn in what follows," from which we may infer that the martyrdom was followed by a life of Polycarp.

To speak first of the last note, it seems clear that by the Pionius there mentioned is intended the presbyter of Smyrna whose martyrdom Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 15) found subjoined to the same volume as that which contained the martyrdom of Polycarp. Eusebius hastily speaks of the two martyrdoms as having occurred at the same period of time, and accordingly Jerome in his *Chronicle* places them under the same year. But there is every reason to believe (see PIONIUS) that the martyrdom of Pionius took place under the emperor Decius, nearly one hundred years after that of Polycarp. The extant Acts of Pionius, which are probably founded on those known to Eusebius, state that the arrest of Pionius took place on the 2nd Xanthicus, the day on which the martyrdom of Polycarp was then commemorated. It seems probable then that Pionius, a leading member of the church of Smyrna, did strive to brace the minds of his brethren for the then impending persecution by reviving the memory of the heroic acts of their former martyred bishop Polycarp. And we may reasonably believe that Pionius did then save from perishing the epistle to the church of Philomelium, which he found in a very old MS. with the two appendix notes already cited. This epistle is so amazingly different in freshness and marks of antiquity from the other literature connected with it, that it may be pronounced impossible to have been forged by the authors of this other literature; and there seems no good reason for refusing to accept the pedigree of its transcription which the document itself claimed.^b We believe then that the text as copied by Pionius was that read by Eusebius, and is the parent of our extant MSS. And here it is necessary to speak of a corruption which we believe Pionius to have introduced into the text. In what the MS. evidence obliges us to recognise as the Pionian text, we read that when the executioner struck Polycarp with the sword, there came out a *dove* and a great quantity of blood. Eusebius omits the dove, yet the probability that he used the Pionian recension is so great that we assent to the opinion of those who hold that Eusebius was staggered by the miracle and designedly left out a word which he found in his copy. We do not know whether the phrase used by Eusebius, that the document proceeds *κατὰ λέξιν ὡδὲ πως*, will bear to have stress laid on it as an acknowledgment that he is not quoting with absolute accuracy. But we believe that he might well, on critical grounds, have rejected the words as no part of the original document. The words, where they occur, interrupt the sense in such a way as to bear the marks of being intrusive—"There came out a dove and a great quantity of blood, so as to quench the flame," &c. If the narrator had intended to relate so great a miracle as the coming

^b The above stands as it was in type before the publication of Lightfoot's *Ignatius*. There strong reasons are given for regarding the last appendix note as coming not from the true, but from a pretended, Pionius. Lightfoot agrees with the above in looking on 'the dove' as an addition made by this Pionius, but he holds Eusebius to have used a pre-Pionian text.

forth of a dove, he surely would have thought the matter worth a sentence or two, and would have told what became of the dove; he never would have been content to dispose of it in two words. This is not like his method of dealing with other circumstances which seemed to him supernatural, nor do we believe that there is any parallel in all hagiology for such a way of telling a miraculous story. Certainly Lucian's story, which has been imagined to be a parody on this one, occupies several sentences.¹

It has been contended that Lucian must have read our martyrdom with the word *περιστέρα*, because in his story of the burning of Peregrinus he represents a vulture as flying up from the pyre, which it was supposed was meant for a parody on Polycarp's dove. But no one who reads the story of Peregrinus will find the least evidence that Lucian was thinking of Polycarp. Lucian tells that, when he had come away from the burning of Peregrinus, he was much questioned by persons who had been too late to see it; that to sensible persons he told the simple truth, but that he hoaxed the silly ones by dressing up the story in order to see how much they could swallow; that among other things he told how he had seen a vulture fly up from the pyre uttering, in human voice, the words, "I leave the earth and go to Olympus," and that next day he was much astonished when a respectable personage told him back his own story and assured him he had witnessed it himself. There is nothing in all this to indicate that Lucian was thinking of, or had even read, the story of Polycarp; and as he had mentioned a little before that Peregrinus had referred to the story of the phoenix in connection with his own death by fire, it is natural to think that Lucian's vulture was intended to take the place of the phoenix of Peregrinus and not of Polycarp's dove. It may also have been suggested by the letting loose of an eagle as part of the ceremonial performed at an emperor's funeral pyre. See the account given by Herodian (*Hist.* iv. 2 § 11) of the funeral of Severus, and also an epigram in the life of Plato by Diogenes Laertius, where Plato's soul is represented as flying off in the form of an eagle.

We come now to the chronological note, which we accept as, if not part of the original document, at least added by one of its first transcribers, and therefore deserving of high confidence.² Recently it has received a new

¹ Bishop Wordsworth ingeniously accounts for the presence of the intrusive words by supposing that the original story told that when the sword was plunged in, there came out a quantity of blood "round the hilt," and that Pionius in his copy, which he tells us was much decayed by age, misread the words *περὶ στήρακα* into *περιστέρα καί*. I would gladly accept this solution if I could find evidence that *στήραξ* is ever used to denote the hilt of a sword. Another conjecture is that the original had *ἐν ἀριστέρα*. Bishop Fitzgerald suggests, that instead of *πλήθος αἵματος* there was a marginal variant *περισσεία*. But we are safe in rejecting the Pionian addition, whether we can explain or not how it came to be made.

² Lightfoot has given a decisive proof that it was part of the original document. The opening of that document is clearly imitated from the opening of the epistle of Clement of Rome. The doxology at the end of this note bears an equally striking resemblance to the doxology at the end of the same epistle.

confirmation from a lately discovered Olympian inscription, *Archäolog. Zeitung*, 1880, i. 62, referred to by Lipsius (Schürer. *Theol. Literaturzeit.* 1881, p. 304), which mentions PHILIP OF TRALLES [see that article] as asiarch in the year 149. The office was one which could be held more than once, and indeed was so oftener than not, the number of persons rich enough suitably to discharge it being limited. It may therefore be regarded as a coincidence that our document represents him as filling the same office a few years later. But the most important name is that of the proconsul Staius Quadratus, which gives our best guide to the determination of the date of the martyrdom. Eusebius in his Chronicle had put it in the 6th year of Marcus Aurelius, i.e. A.D. 166, and his authority had been generally accepted as decisive, although on account of the difficulty of reconciling so late a date with what is told of Polycarp's acquaintance with the apostle John, Dodwell (*De Succ. Rom. Pont.* p. 286) and others had endeavoured to put back Eusebius's date some twenty years. A recent investigation by M. Waddington (*Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, 1867, xxvi. 235) has made it possible to dispute Eusebius's date with more success. And we need have the less scruple in doing so, because Eusebius seems to have had no real knowledge of the date, and to have put it down somewhat at random, for he places Polycarp's martyrdom and the Lyons persecution under the same year, though it is now generally recognised that the Lyons martyrdoms were as late as 177. The proconsulship of Asia was an annual office, and it has now been ascertained that at the period with which we are concerned the rule was that the two senior men of consular rank (if otherwise unobjectionable) who had not yet received high appointment, drew lots for the proconsulships of Asia and Africa. A man who had been named as consul was on the ladder of promotion and might count on high provincial office when his turn came. It has also been ascertained that at this time the ordinary interval between the consulship and proconsulate ranged between twelve and sixteen years. There is often a difficulty in turning our knowledge of this rule to account, arising from the fact that we have no records of the *consules suffecti* of each year, although these had a right to proconsular appointment as well as the two after whom the year was named. But this difficulty does not arise in the case of Quadratus, whom we know to have been consul A.D. 142. We are at once led to reject Eusebius's date as placing the inadmissible interval of twenty-four or twenty-five years between the consulship and proconsulate. And, for the same reason, we cannot place the proconsulate in the reign of M. Aurelius at all; * the accession of that emperor only taking place in 161, or nineteen years after the consulship of Quadratus. Waddington confirmed this conclusion by an extant inscription (Boeckh, 3410) belonging to the proconsulship of Quadratus, in which mention is made of the *fiscus* of the emperor, in the singular number, not emperors;

* Consuls of the years 141, 143, 144, 145, are proved by inscriptions to have held one or other of the two great proconsulships during the reign of Pius (Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 448).

from which he inferred that it belongs to the reign of the sole emperor Antoninus, not of M. Aurelius, who from the first took his brother Verus to share his throne. However, in deference to Mommsen he has since ceased to lay stress on this argument. But independently of it there are sufficient grounds for the conclusion, that the proconsulship of Quadratus is to be placed in the reign of Antoninus, and in all probability between the years 154-158 inclusive. So far we are on firm ground. A more precise determination of the date has been sought from the orations of Aelius Aristides. Aristides was a rhetorician, greatly admired in his own day, but whose extant remains would now be scarcely rated above the level of schoolboy exercises. They are frigid declamations on mythological and historical subjects, panegyrics for instance on Jupiter, Minerva, and Bacchus, imaginary orations supposed to have been delivered in the Athenian Assembly after the battle of Leuctra, &c. Aristides has even the courage to take subjects treated by Isocrates and Demosthenes, and attempt to improve on them. He was contemporary with Polycarp, and lived for some time in the same city; but he never mentions either him or his religion. No doubt he would have been equally incredulous and humiliated, if he could have been told that it is only in the hope of gaining some light on the history of Polycarp that any one at the present day cares to look into his orations. The orations serviceable for that purpose are called Sacred Discourses, *Ἱεροὶ Λόγοι*. They are autobiographical, containing details of a sickness under which he laboured for seventeen years. Though the medical science of his age can boast of Galen and other eminent representatives, he did not seek to physicians for his cure, but relied on the interposition of the god Aesculapius, whose advice was communicated to him in dreams and visions. It may be doubted whether modern practitioners would regard either the mode of treatment or the rapidity of the cure such as to do great honour to the god of medicine; but it was with the object of doing honour to the god that the grateful orator, when at length restored to health, published these Sacred Discourses containing details of the changes of his malady, and of the dreams which guided his treatment of it. In these there are several occasional notices of proconsuls who ruled Asia in various years of the illness, and of the honours they bestowed on our orator. From these Waddington elicits an argument to determine the date of Quadratus, of which the following are the steps: (1) Julianus was proconsul of Asia from May 145 to May 146. This is satisfactorily proved by inscriptions. (2) Julianus was proconsul in the second year of the illness of Aristides. This is not directly stated, but is inferred from a comparison of what Aristides says about the features of his malady; in one place, during the proconsulate of Julianus, in another, during the second year of his illness. (3) Severus was proconsul in the tenth year of the illness, i.e. (if there is no flaw in the last step of the proof) in the year 153-154. (4) Quadratus was proconsul the year after Severus and therefore from May 154 to May 155, so that the martyrdom of Polycarp, which took place in February, must have been in 155. This last step of the proof is the most doubtful of all. What Aristides says is only "Severus, I think,

was proconsul the year before my companion," *ἡμετέρου ἑταίρου*. Quadratus is supposed to be the companion, because both were rhetoricians by profession, and because in an earlier part of the same oration mention is made of honours bestowed by Quadratus on Aristides. On the other hand it does not appear that they had known each other before this year, and bearing in mind the possibility that Aristides had other friends among the proconsuls, we cannot consider this step of the argument to have been at all certainly established, and therefore we do not think that Waddington has made out of Aristides more than a probable case for the year 155. But another argument for the same year appears to be more decisive. The martyrdom is stated to have taken place on Saturday, Feb. 23, and among the years between which our choice lies, 155 is the only one on which Feb. 23 fell on Saturday. The reading of this chronological date is not free from variations. Polycarp is stated to have been martyred on a great sabbath, the 2nd of Xanthicus, the 7th before the kalends of March. Here some MSS. read May instead of March, and an inferior authority gives April. But we can account for these variations. The great sabbath would in Christian times have been understood to mean the Saturday in Easter week, and as Easter could not occur in February, there was an obvious temptation to alter March into May, but none to make the opposite change. Besides we have independent knowledge that Feb. 23 was the day on which the Eastern church celebrated the martyrdom. But there remains the difficulty, that no explanation can be given why Feb. 23 should be a "great" sabbath. It has been suggested that perhaps it was a Saturday of the feast of Purim, but that feast was held at the full moon, which the day in question was not.

We believe the true explanation of this difficulty to be that the Latin date in this note is not of the same antiquity as the date by the Macedonian month. In fact, we suppose that Pionius, when, as already stated, he recovered the very ancient copy of the martyrdom, translated the date 2nd Xanthicus, which he found there, into one more widely intelligible, and thus determined the date of subsequent commemorations of the martyrdom. The Macedonian months were originally regulated solely by the moon. In later times they were determined to fixed dates in the solar year. When this change was made Xanthicus became the sixth month of a year, beginning with the autumnal equinox, and accordingly the 2nd Xanthicus did correspond to February 23. We have every reason to believe that this change was fully established in the time of Pionius, but the age of Polycarp was exactly one of transition. Ideler (*Chronol.* i. 412) borrows from Ussher a quotation from Polycarp's contemporary Galen, which states (*Comm. i. in Hippoc. Epidem.* l. 1, *Opp.* Hippoc. and Galen, ix. P. 2, p. 8, or xvii. 21, ed. Kühn) that in his time the solar year was generally used in Asia, but that the Greek cities mostly retained the lunar reckoning.

If Xanthicus be here taken as a lunar month, all chronological difficulties disappear. When it was a lunar month it corresponded to the Jewish Nisan, and since the Jewish day began with the evening, the 1st Nisan

commencing with the appearance of the moon on the evening of the 1st Xanthicus would include the morning of the 2nd, so that Polycarp suffered not only on the 1st Sabbath, but on the 1st day of the Jewish ecclesiastical year, a day which would therefore count as a great sabbath. Again, by taking Xanthicus as a lunar month the date of the martyrdom is transferred, as we shall see, from February 23 to March 23. We perceive then that the games at which Polycarp suffered were held at the time of the vernal equinox, a time which we might beforehand have conjectured as highly probable, while we have confirmatory evidence that this was the season of these annual games, the great time of danger for the Christians. For (see Vol. III. p. 896) the martyrdom of Sagaris took place at Laodicea on the 14th Nisan; but the 14th Nisan of one year very easily fell on the same day of the solar year as the 1st Nisan of another year; and, in fact, in the article referred to, we have given reason for thinking that the date of the martyrdom of Sagaris was almost precisely the same as that which we here fix for that of Polycarp. We accept, then, the 2nd Xanthicus as an original note of time faithfully preserved for us by a scribe who did not himself understand its meaning, because he interpreted according to the usage of his own day.¹

With respect to the martyrdom of Sagaris, to which we have just referred, it may be added that we can gain hence confirmatory evidence for the earlier date of the martyrdom of Polycarp. We have given (*u.s.*) independent reasons for thinking that the date of that martyrdom was 164 or 167. Now Polykrates (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24) mentions the Asiatic martyrs in the order—Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, from which we may infer that Polycarp's was the earliest. Perhaps we could tell the exact interval if we only knew the rotation of the meetings of the *Koivón*. Polycarp was martyred in a year when the assembly was held at Smyrna, Thraseas when the rotation came round to Smyrna again; Sagaris, after that, when it was the turn of Laodicea. It may be further added that this rotation of the meetings of the assembly explains how it was possible for the Christians to collect together to celebrate the anniversaries of their martyrs, as we know they did in the case of Sagaris, and as it was intended to do in the case of Polycarp. The time of the annual meeting would be exactly that when it would be most dangerous for Christians to attract the notice of their enemies; but the place where a martyrdom had occurred one year would be a place of safety the next year, as the assembly would meet elsewhere.

When we have abandoned the date Sat. Feb. 23 we lose one clue to fixing the exact date of the martyrdom, but we gain another in its place. Since the 2nd Nisan was Saturday, the year must be one in which that lunar month commenced on a Friday. Now the dates which

¹ The solution offered above was proffered in the *Academy*, July 21, 1883, but Lightfoot, i. 672, has since satisfactorily shewn that the lunar calendar had been superseded, at Smyrna, by the solar before the time of Polycarp. Nevertheless, I allow what has been printed above to stand, as presenting matter for consideration in the absence of any other admissible explanation of the 'great sabbath.'

we calculate for 1 Nisan are as follows: ^m—154, Sunday, April 1; 155, Friday, March 22; 156, Tuesday, March 10; 157, Sunday, March 28; 158, Saturday, March 19; 159, Friday, April 7; 160, Tuesday, March 26; 161, Saturday, March 18.

It is seen that among these 155 and 159 are the only admissible years, and since the former agrees best with the usual interval between consulship and proconsulate our calculation leads us to the same year as Waddington, viz. 155, only changing the month from Feb. 23 to March 23. The date April 8, which the year 159 would require, is likely to be too late, otherwise the claims of that year might deserve attention. The chief difficulty raised by the date 155 is that if we adopt it the chronology of the Roman bishops obliges us to put Polycarp's visit into the last year of his life and the first of the episcopate of Anicetus.

A life of Polycarp, purporting to have been written by Pionius, was published in Latin by the Bollandists, AA. SS., Jan. ii. 695, and a Greek text was edited from a MS. in the Paris library by Duchesne in 1881. It is so completely unhistorical that the only question to be discussed about is whether it may not be identical with a life of Polycarp read by Macarius Magnes at the end of that century, who refers (p. 109) to miracles wrought by Polycarp in producing change of weather at one time when the country was suffering from scorching heat, at another time from excess of rain. He also refers to the efficacy of Polycarp's laying on of hands at the time when he was acting as steward to a widow before his elevation to the episcopate. On comparing these notices with the extant life there is such a want of closeness of agreement that (independently of other reasons) we cannot believe that the extant life was that read by Macarius. But there is enough of general agreement to make it credible that the extant life is a reworking of a life current in the fourth century. Whether the latter were as old as the Pionius of the third century is a matter on which we have not materials to form a judgment. The letter to the Philippians is the only extant one of Polycarp's, though Irenaeus was acquainted with other letters of his both to churches and individuals (Euseb. v. 20). Jerome (*Ep. ad Lucinium*) contradicts a report that he had translated "the volumes of Papias and Polycarp," but we cannot build on this expression as proving that more writings of Polycarp were known to him than to us. Five fragments purporting to be Polycarp's were published from a Catena by Feuardentius in his notes to Irenaeus iii. 3. Pitra (*Spicileg. Solesm.* i. 266) has added two more, though, as Zahn (xlvii.) has pointed out, Pitra's authority produces them not as Polycarp's, but as from the *Liber Responsorum* of Victor of Capua. Pitra assumed the *Liber Responsorum* to be a work of Polycarp because the title cited by Feuardentius is "Victor episcopus Capuae ex responsione capitulorum Sancti Polycarpi, Smyrnenis episcopi, Discipuli Johannis Evangelistae." Zahn, accepting, on the authority cited by Pitra, that Victor was the author of a book of "Answers," rejects the two fragments

^m The calculation is made by the help of a table of new moons furnished me by Professor Adams.

which claim no higher origin, but prints, p. 171, five others which he supposes to have been quoted by Victor as Polycarp's in this book of "Answers." Zahn leaves the question of their authenticity to be determined by the reader. The impression they produce on us is that they are ancient but not Polycarp's.

We are here referring to the latest and best edition of the remains of Polycarp, by Zahn in Gebhardt's *Patres Apostolici*, vol. ii.ⁿ The letter of Polycarp is also published in almost all editions of Apostolic Fathers, besides in other works, of which we only mention Routh's *Script. Ecc. Opusc.* For the literature connected with Polycarp's letter it may be enough to refer to the list given at the end of the article Ignatius, adding Lightfoot's valuable article *Contemp. Rev.* May 1875. Of modern discussions on the date of martyrdom, in addition to Waddington's memoir already cited we mention Steitz, *Jahrb. f. deutsch. Theol.* 1861; Hilgenfeld, *Pascha Streit*, p. 230; articles by Hilgenfeld and Lipsius, *Zeitschrift für wiss. Theol.* 1874; by Lipsius, *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.* 1878; Schürer's *Literaturzeitung* 1881, p. 308; Wieseler, *Christenverfolgungen*, and *Stud. u. Krit.* 1880; Keim, *Aus dem Unchristenthum*. [G. S.]

POLYCARPUS (2), bishop of the wealthy colonia Hadrumetum (metropolis of Prov. Byzacena, in Prov. Afr. Proc.) mentioned by Cyprian as present at 1st Council of Carthage, A.D. 251 (*Ep.* 48), signs encyclical letters of Councils of Carthage 2nd, 4th and 5th, and gives 3rd suffrage in 7th Council (de Bap. 3), see *Epp.* 57, 67, 73 and *Sentt. Epp.* [E. W. B.]

POLYCARPUS (3), bishop addressed in a letter by the Pseudo-Dionysius (*Ep.* 7), suggesting arguments against the Sophist Apollonius (DIONYSIUS (1), p. 846; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 226; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 551-3, citing the editions). [J. G.]

POLYCARPUS (4), a bishop, translated from Sexantaprista in Moesia to Nicopolis in Thrace, mentioned with other examples of translation. (*Soc.* vii. 36; *Tillem.* xi. 328.) [C. H.]

POLYCARPUS (5), Moyses of Aghel (circ. 550) in a *Letter to Paphnutius* prefatory to his Syriac version of the *Glaphyra* of Cyril of Alexandria, prepares his readers to find variations from the Peshitto in Cyril's citations of Scripture after the Greek, by referring them to "the translation of the New Testament and of David into Syriac" from the Greek, which "the Chorepiscopus Polycarpus made for Xenaias [Philoxenus] of Mabug" (*Assem.* ii. p. 82; see also Dr. Ign. Guidi in *Rendiconti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, 1886, p. 397). Now we know from Gregory Barhebraeus (*Proem. in Horr. Mystt.*) that, "after the Peshitto, the New Testament was more accurately translated again from the Greek at Mabug in the days of Philoxenus." And the same facts are stated

ⁿ This article was in type before Bp. Lightfoot's edition of Ignatius, which now supersedes all previous works on the subject. It is not possible now to rewrite the article, but a few supplemental notes have been added.

in a note purporting to be written by THOMAS OF HARKEL in 616, appended in slightly varying forms to many MSS. of the version of the N. T. known as the Harklensian, one of which (Assem. xi., now Cod. Vat. 268) is probably (Bernstein, *Das Heil. Evang. des Joh.*, p. 2) of the 8th century. In this MS., and others, the note gives also the date of this Philoxenian version, A.D. 508. In all of them it proceeds to describe the Harklensian version as based on this,—in fact a revision of it; and the same description in more direct terms is given by Barhebraeus in two places in his *Chronicon Eccl.* (i. 49; ii. 22; Assem. ii. pp. 334, 411). We may safely infer that this earlier version was made by the Polycarp named by Moyses (though mentioned by no other writer) at the instance of his bishop, the great Monophysite leader (485–522). Barhebraeus indeed, in the passages last referred to, calls it “the version which was rendered by the care (ܩܘܠܘܢܝܘܨ) of Philoxenus,” “which was made by Philoxenus,” and other late writers have also spoken of it as his work (Assem. ii. 23, 91). But these are mere *obiter dicta*, and are to be read by the light of the more precise statement of Barhebraeus himself in his *Chr. Eccl.*, and of the much earlier MS. authorities, in which the expression “translated in the days of Philoxenus” distinctly implies that the translation was not executed by him. Indeed it might be pronounced *a priori* incredible that in the course of his busy and troubled life he could have found leisure for such a work. His aim in having the version made was probably, as the remark of Moyses suggests, to enable Syriac-speaking Monophysites to read the Scriptures as they were read by those Greek Fathers whom he owned as authorities, and by their Greek-speaking brethren within the Antiochian Patriarchate. But it does not appear that the translation shewed, or was ever impugned as shewing, a doctrinal bias.

Of the Philoxenian N. T. as it was before Thomas revised it, we only know with certainty the few small fragments of St. Paul recovered by Wiseman from the margin of his MS. of the Karkaphensian Syriac, and published by him in his *Horae Syriacae* (p. 178, n. 11). Adler (*Verss. Syrr.* p. 55) conjectured that the Gospels contained in a Florentine MS., dated 757 (*Biblioth. Laurent.* i. No. 40), usually regarded as the oldest Harklensian MS. extant, were of this version: but he himself admits that the internal evidence of its text is against him. Bernstein (l. l. pp. 3, 25) puts forward instead the claim of the Angelic MS., probably of the 11th century, belonging to the Augustinian Convent in Rome, and shews that the variations of its text from the usual Harklensian type are very numerous. But they are for the most part minute, and many of them are such as may naturally be ascribed to a copyist consciously or otherwise reverting to the familiar words of the Peshitto: and the subscription of the MS. (see above) asserts that its text is Harklensian; a fact apparently conclusive against Bernstein, but met by him with the explanation that the subscription has been wrongly appended by a later hand, as in the case of a Peshitto MS. noted by Adler (l. l. p. 76). Recently, Professor Isaac H. Hall, of New York has called attention to a peculiar recension of the

Gospels which he believes to be probably the true Philoxenian, contained in a MS. of the Syriac N. T., belonging to the “Syrian Protestant College” at Beirut, apparently of the 9th century (see *Academy*, vol. xii. p. 170, also in *Journal of Soc. of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1882), of which he has published a few specimens (two pages) reproduced by photography. It may be conjectured that these and other MSS. are examples of mixed texts, analogous to the well-known MSS. of the Vulgate which abound with Old Latin readings.

It seems highly probable that we have a considerable portion of this original Philoxenian, in the version of the four minor Catholic Epistles (2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude) not included in the Peshitto though printed with it in the Polyglots and in most Syriac New Testaments;—first published by Pococke (1630) from a MS. of no great age (Bodl. Or. 119). A copy of this version had previously been brought to Rome by the Maronites, whence these four Epistles, translated into Latin by Balthasar Etzel, a Jesuit, were printed by Nic. Serarius, also a Jesuit (both being of Mayence) in his *Comm. in Epp. Canonic.* (1612, p. 52; see also his *Prolegg. Bibl.*, xv. 1). It seems that another copy must have been in the hands of Gabriel Sionita, and furnished the text given in the Paris Polyglot (1633), and adopted thence by Walton, which is evidently derived from an independent source, and not (as it has been assumed to be) a mere corrected reprint of Pococke’s. This may perhaps have been part of the MS. of the New Testament in Syriac, including all the portions wanting to the Peshitto, which Andreas de Leon, in a letter to Le Jay (editor of that Polyglot) describes as written by himself for Pope Paul V. (Lelong, *Biblioth. Sacra*, tom. i. p. 184; Boerner’s edition, 1709). We hear also of a Syriac MS. brought by Moses of Marden when he returned from the East to revisit Europe (De Dieu, *Praef. in Apocalypsin*) containing these Epistles with the Apocalypse. A similar MS., transcribed for Archbishop Ussher and sent to him from Aleppo in 1626 (which has been wrongly described as a complete Syriac New Testament and supposed to be lost) is in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin (B. 5.16). These four Epistles in the version in question are found also in a few Paris MSS. (see Zotenberg’s *Catal.*), in one (formerly Wetstein’s) at Amsterdam, in Lord Crawford’s MS. (see under THOMAS HARKEL.), in the Cambridge MS. (Oo. i. 1, 2), and in several MSS. in the British Museum; one of which, Add. 14623 (7), written 823, is the oldest extant copy of this version. It is included also in the “Williams MS.” of the N. T. Epistles, whence Prof. Hall has recently issued it in photographic facsimile. This version is distinct from the Harklensian rendering of the same Epistles, which however, though more servilely exact and graecised, is unmistakably founded on it;—following it even (to give a decisive instance) in its curious mistranslation of *δεσμοῖς ἀδελῶν* (Jude 6) by ܩܘܠܘܢܝܘܨ, “unknown chains.” And where the Harklensian leaves it, to follow a different Greek reading, it most frequently retains on its margin the words that have been removed from its text. Inasmuch then as we have in this version the unmistakable basis of

the Harklensian, and as the Harklensian is known to have been a revision of the Philoxenian, the identity of this version with the Philoxenian proper (as distinguished from the Philoxenian usually so-called, viz. the Harklensian revision) follows by necessary inference. Assuming then that this version of the Epistles in question is the work of Polycarp, we have in it the materials for judging of his merits as a translator, and we find reason to form a high estimate of them. The translation is in the main accurate, and close without being servile. Dr. Scrivener (*Introd. to N. T.*, p. 646, ed. 3) justly describes it as one which "well deserves careful study . . . of great interest and full of valuable readings," siding as it does frequently with the oldest Greek uncials.^a The blunder just referred to is not a gross or strange one (the *Etymologicon Magnum* goes quite as wrong on the same word), yet it may indicate that Greek was not Polycarp's native tongue, but acquired, as we know it was in the case of Thomas. Here also we have a field of comparison between his work and Thomas's revision of it, in order to determine their mutual relation. (See THOMAS HARKL.) And the result we are led to is, that the latter work is not (as has been taken for granted by many) a mere corrected re-issue of the earlier one, with simply linguistic alterations in the text and variants inserted on its margin; but is substantially a new version, proceeding indeed on the lines of the former, but freely quitting them on occasion when the translator saw fit.

The Apocalypse as printed in modern Syriac Bibles, following the Polyglotts, differs materially in diction from the Four Epistles, and comes much closer to the manner of the Harklensian New Testament. See for it under THOMAS HARKL. A fragment (Rev. vii. 1-8) in a version distinct from, though akin to the printed text, preserved in Add. 17193 (f. 14b), may perhaps belong to the unrevised Philoxenian. Another possible remnant is that from Rev. xvii. 3-6 cited in a *Cutena* in Genesis, printed in the Roman edition of Ephraim Syrus (*Op. Syr.* tom. i. p. 192). But inasmuch as this *Cutena* consists in part of extracts from Jacob of Edessa, the translation of these verses may perhaps be his work.

We are not informed what books of the Old Testament were included in the work of Polycarp. Moyses, as we have seen, mentions only his version of the Psalms, which is lost. But we have conclusive evidence that a Philoxenian Isaiah also existed: for a rendering of Isai. ix. 6, differing from the Hexapla and from the Hebrew, but closely agreeing with a reading found in several MSS. of the LXX. (Holmes's 22, 36, 48, 51, 62, 90, 93, 106, 147, 233), is inserted on the margin of the Ambrosian Syro-Hexapla (8th century), and is there introduced as being "from the other text which was rendered into Syriac by the care of Philoxenus, bishop of Mabus," the word being the same as in the first

citation (above) from the *Chron. Eccl.* of Barhebraeus. Moreover, a considerable portion of Isaiah in Syriac (about ten chapters with lacunae), translated from the LXX. but quite distinct from the Syro-Hexapla, preserved in a Nitrian MS. of the 7th century (Add. 17106: edited by Dr. Ceriani, *Monn. S. & P.*, V., i.) is supposed to belong to the same version as the fragment on the margin of the Ambrosian MS. This conjecture cannot be verified with certainty, as Isai. ix. 6—indeed all the first 27 chapters—are wanting from 17106; but there are good grounds for admitting the identification. The Greek text followed in 17106 is, in the main, that of the same MSS. of the LXX. whose reading of ix. 9 the fragment reproduces. And the character of the translation in its ten chapters harmonizes well with that of the fragment, and of the Pauline fragments given by Wiseman; being intermediate in literal accuracy, and in idiomatic propriety, between the Peshitto on one hand and the Syro-Hexaplar and Harklensian on the other (Ceriani, l. l. pp. 2, 5-7). Besides, it bears to the Hexaplar version of PAUL OF TELLA, of the same chapters, such a relation (similar to that above described, as borne by the ordinary version of the Four Minor Epistles to the Harklensian), as to prove that Paul used it in making his version just as his fellow worker Thomas is known to have used the Philoxenian New Testament as the groundwork of his. Moreover, confirmatory evidence is given by a Nitrian MS. of the 6th or 7th century (Add. 14555), which contains a Syriac version of part of the *Glyphyra* of Cyril of Alexandria, apparently that of Moyses above referred to. Several citations from Isaiah occur in this work. The present writer has compared with the text of 17106 such of these citations as fall within the ten chapters of Isaiah as given in that MS., and has found them to agree almost verbatim;^b a fact which raises well-nigh into a certainty the opinion that we have here the version known to Moyses, and described by him in the words cited in the opening of this article. Thus the external as well as the internal evidence confirms the natural supposition that Polycarp was the person employed by Philoxenus to translate not only the Psalms but Isaiah, and whatever other parts of the O. T. fell within the scope of his design. This Isaiah everywhere shows traces of the influence of the Peshitto; but whether the translator worked in the lines of any previous version from the LXX., we have no direct evidence. That the LXX. was in the hands of Syriac writers and translators before the time of Philoxenus is certain. Many Peshitto MSS., notably the great Ambrosian MS. of 6th century (B. 21 *Inf.*), nearly coeval with him, prefix to the Psalms a heading in which they are said to be translated "from Hebrew into Greek, and from Greek into Syriac." Yet internal evidence conclusively proves, that the Hebrew and not the LXX. is in the main the basis of the Peshitto Psalter. The LXX. however must have been known to the early Syriac translators of the O. T.;

^a The writer of this has collated the MS. Add. 14623 above mentioned, and some of the rest; and has found that it, and Add. 14473 (2), and others, yield many valuable readings, correcting most of the blemishes shewn by the printed texts of these Epistles, and bringing the version into still closer conformity with the best Greek text.

^b The passages which the writer has found available for this enquiry are four:—Isai. xxxviii. 14 (*Glaph.* 49 b); xliii. 10 (40 c); xlv. 21, 22 (87 d); xlix. 9 (432 c).

for all the books which are in the LXX. but not in the Hebrew (except Tobit and 1[3] Esdras) are contained in the oldest MS. of the Peshitto O. T., and their diction agrees with that of the canonical books among which they are inserted. The translators who had the LXX. in their hands when making their version of these Apocryphal books, can hardly have failed to consult, more or less frequently, its renderings of the canonical books. But the passage of Ephraim Syrus where he cites the LXX. rendering of Jonah iii. 4 (Greg. Barh. ap. Assem. i. 70), which has been adduced as bearing on this matter, fails to prove that in his time (4th century) a Syriac version of the LXX. existed, unless it can be established that Ephraim was unable to read Greek (see above, Vol. II. pp. 142, 143). A contemporary of Philoxenus, Mar Abas, a Nestorian [see THOMAS EDESSEUS], is said by Ebedjesu to have translated the Old Testament from Greek into Syriac (Assem. iii. 75); but it is not likely that a translator employed by Philoxenus would have used the work of a Nestorian, even if it were executed early enough to become known to him. That the Isaiah of Add. 17106, above described, cannot be part of the version of Mar Abas, seems to be satisfactorily established by Ceriani (l. l., p. 6), on the ground that that version was made at Alexandria, no doubt from MSS. there preserved, and would therefore represent a Greek text of Alexandrian type; whereas the type of the MSS. to whose text Add. 17106 most closely approaches, is Antiochian.* Assemani (i. 612, ii. 83) mentions also one Simeon "Abbas Monasterii Licinii," as having translated the Psalms into Syriac, but this seems doubtful. But it is certain that Rabulas, bishop of Edessa (412-435), translated the New Testament. (*Vita Rabulæ* ap. Overbeck, *S. Ephraemi, Rabulæ, &c., Opera*, p. 172; see also Wright, *Catal.*, p. 651). The evidence of Ephraim Syrus has also been called in to prove the existence in his time of a Syriac translation of the Four Epistles and Revelation, which he cites in his works; but as we have already seen, this argument cannot be relied on. Intrinsically however it seems highly probable that these books, all of which were admittedly current among the Greek-speaking Christians of the

* Bishop Marsh, note 1, on ch. vii. s. xii. of Michaelis's *Introduction*, says, "The only translation hitherto discovered of Mar Abba . . . is the Story of the Adulteress in the Cod. Barsalibæi;" and in note 41, s. ii. he states that this translation is "ascribed to Mar Abba" in that MS. (now in the Library of New Coll., Oxford, No. 334). But this is a manifold mistake. *First*, Mar Abba is confused with Maras (see under NONNUS (5)). *Secondly*, the MS. is given as the authority for Ridley's statement (*De Vers. Syrr. Indole*, p. 50) that Maras was the translator; whereas Ridley only gives his own opinion (no doubt founded on Assemani, *B. O.* ii. pp. 53, 61), and the MS. is silent on the subject. *Thirdly*, the Maras version (given in the *History of Zacharias Rhetor*; see Land's *Anecdota Syrr.* vol. iii. p. 252), is quite different from that found in Cod. Bars., which latter is the same as that printed in Walton's Polyglot (see PAULUS TELLENIS). And *fourthly*, Maras wrote in Greek, his recension of the passage being distinct from all known Greek copies; and the Syriac in which we have it is due to Zacharias's continuator or translator. Tregelles (*Introd.*, p. 282) corrects Marsh's error as to the person named, but introduces a fresh one as to his date, which he cites from Ridley incorrectly as A.D. 622, for 522.

East long before the time of Philoxenus, may have been rendered into Syriac early enough to serve as a groundwork for the version of the four minor Epistles which (as above shown) is apparently the work of Polycarp; as well as for his version, if he made one, of the Apocalypse.

For further information concerning the Philoxenian version, see THOMAS HARKL. For Simeon's, see Dr. Guidi as above (p. 416). For that of Jacob of Edessa, see above, Vol. III. p. 334. [J. Gw.]

POLYCHRONIUS (1), bishop of Babylon, martyred in the Decian persecution (Baron. a. 254, § 27); commemorated Feb. 17 (Bolland. Feb. iii. 5). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (2), martyr of Ancyra. [THEODOTUS.]

POLYCHRONIUS (3), an Arian bishop deposed by the Illyrian synod of A.D. 375 (Theodoret. iv. 9). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (4), brother of Theodore of Mopsuestia and bishop of Apamea on the Orontes in Syria Secunda. He belonged to a wealthy family of some position at Antioch, and the literary character of his remains justifies the belief that his early education was liberal and many-sided. A Polychronius was among the correspondents of Libanius (*Epp.* 27, 207, 228, etc.); but his identity with the subject of this memoir is more than doubtful. That the brother of Theodore fell more or less directly under the influence of Diodore may be taken for certain. Polychronius was probably the younger brother; at any rate his consecration to the episcopal office took place some ten years later than Theodore's. In the see of Apamea he must have followed Agapetus, who succeeded Marcellus A.D. 398 (Theodoret. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 27; *Hist. Reliq.* § 3). He was still bishop at the time of his brother's death, A.D. 428; comp. Theodoret. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 40: Θεόδωρος τοῦ Βλου τὸ τέλος ἐδέξατο . . . καὶ ὁ τοῦτον δὲ ἀδελφὸς Πολυχρόνιος τὴν Ἀπαμείων ἐκκλησίαν ἐποίμανεν. But within the next three years he had died or otherwise vacated the see, for in the records of the Council of Ephesus the name of Alexander occurs more than once as bishop of Apamea (Mansi, iv. 1235, 1270). Both Le Quien (*Oriens Christ.* ii. 911) and Gams (*Series Episc.* p. 436) strangely omit Polychronius from their lists of the bishops of Apamea. The testimony of Theodoret however is unequivocal, and it is that of the contemporary bishop of a neighbouring see. The city of Apamea was raised by Theodosius II. to metropolitan rank (Joh. Malal. *Chronogr.* xiv.; Migne, *P. G.* xvii. 543), and the see attained a corresponding dignity. If this change took effect during the episcopate of Polychronius, he filled a position of greater ecclesiastical importance than his brother, who as bishop of Mopsuestia was the subordinate of the metropolitan of Anazarbus.

In the history of the church, however, the name of Polychronius occupies a comparatively insignificant place. Our knowledge of him is drawn almost exclusively from the scanty encomiums of Theodoret re-echoed by Cassiodorus and Nicephorus. We must be content to learn that, as a bishop, he was characterized by the

excellence of his rule, the grace of his oratory, and the conspicuous purity of his life (ἐποίμανεν ἀρίστα καὶ τῆ τοῦ λόγου χάριτι καὶ τῆ τοῦ βίου λαμπρότητι χρώμενος. Theodoret. *H. E.* v. 40; cf. Cassiod. *Hist. Tripart.* x. 34; Niceph. xiv. 30).

It has been generally assumed that the bishop of Apamea is identical with the recluse of the same name whose ascetic life, fervent piety, and occasional miracles are enthusiastically depicted by Theodoret in his *Religious History* (§ 24). But such evidence as we possess points in an opposite direction. The monk passed his whole life in retirement (*Hist. Relig.* l. c.: γῆρα παλαιόντα . . . ἐν νόοις γεγηρακός), and was still alive when Theodoret wrote the *Religious History*, i. e. in A. D. 443-4 (cf. § 21, τῶν ἐτι περιόντων . . . τὴν πολιτείαν συγγράφομεν). The bishop, on the other hand, disappears before A. D. 431. Again, it is almost incredible that the duties of so important a see could have been reconciled with the habits of a recluse; yet in his account of the monk Polychronius, Theodoret seems unconscious of any break in his hero's solitary life. Lastly, though the *Religious History* was written several years before the *Church History*, the brief allusion of the latter to Theodore's brother is not supplemented by any reference to the ample story of the anchorite which is to be found in the earlier work. Indeed not a word is dropped in either of Theodoret's accounts which could suggest the identity of the bishop and the monk. They have nothing in common but the name—one sufficiently common in the annals of the church.*

As a disciple of the school of Antioch, Polychronius could not have failed to apply himself to the task of Biblical exegesis. No traces occur of any comments by him on the New Testament, but the catenae teem with scholia upon the Old Testament which bear his name. Mai was disposed to conclude that he had written on almost all the books of the Old Testament (*Scr. Vet. Nov. Coll.* i. p. xxx.); but the inference is scarcely a safe one, since there may have been more than one expositor of the name. The following have been ascribed to him: 1. Scholia on the Pentateuch in the catena of Nicephorus, printed at Leipzig, 1772 (Dowling, *Notit.* p. 210). 2. Prologue and fragments of a commentary on Job, first published in a Latin form by the Jesuit Comitulus in his *Catena Absolutissima* (Venice, 1587), and afterwards in Greek (London, 1637) by Patrick Young from two Bodleian MSS. of the catena of Nicetas (Fabricius, ed. Harles, viii. 647-8). One of the most important of these fragments, dealing with the causes of the obscurity of Holy Scripture, is appropriated by Photius (*Quaest. Amphil.* 152, Migne, *P. G.* ci. 816), but without acknowledgment (cf. Mai, *Scr. Vet. Nov. Coll.* i. pp. xxxi, 170-1). 3. Scholia on the Proverbs, printed in the Latin catena of Theod. Peltanus (Antwerp, 1614). 4. A MS. exposition of Ecclesiastes, said to be preserved in several of the libraries of Europe (Fabricius, ed. Harles, x. 363). 5. Scholia on the Canticles, printed by J. Meursius (Leyden, 1617). 6. Scholia on Jeremiah,

collected in Michael Ghisler's commentary (Lyons, 1623). 7. An exposition of Ezekiel, cited by Joannes Damascenus (*De Imag.* iii.; Migne, *P. G.* xciv. 1380, Πολυχρονίου ἐκ τῆς εἰς τὸν Ἰεζεκιήλ ἐρμηνείας). This work happily survives in an almost complete form, and has been given to the world by Mai (*Nov. Patr. Bibl.* vii. p. 2, pp. 92 sq.). 8. A commentary on Daniel, quoted in the 9th century by Nicephorus (Pitra, *Spic. Solesm.* i. p. 352: ἐκ τῶν Π. ἐπισκόπου Ἀπαμείας εἰς τὸν προφήτην Δανιήλ ὑπομνημάτων τόμου β'). It furnished Nobilius with some of the notes appended to his Latin version of the LXX. (Rome, 1588), and Broughton with materials for his English commentary (London, 1597). A copious collection of the Greek fragments was published by Mai from Vatican MSS. in the first volume of his *Scriptorum Vet. Nova Collectio* (p. 105 sq.).

Of these remains, however, the scholia on Proverbs, Canticles, and Jeremiah, are of more than doubtful genuineness. Those on Proverbs and Canticles are in some MSS. ascribed to "Polychronius the Deacon" [POLYCHRONIUS (5)]; and all these collections are characterized by a partiality for allegorical and mystical interpretations quite alien to the instincts of the Antiochians.

The style of Polychronius has been described (Bardenhewer, *Polychronius*, p. 36) as clear and concise, contrasting favourably with the loose and complex manner of his brother Theodore, a criticism which agrees with the verdict of Theodoret (*supra*).

As an expositor Polychronius follows the historico-grammatical method of his school, condemning expressly the Alexandrian tendency to convert history into allegory. "His manner of exposition is scholarly and serious, breathing at the same time an air of deep piety." So Mai, who points out also the especial value of his commentary on Daniel on the score of its fulness of historical illustration. His comments are based (the book of Daniel excepted) on the LXX., but he calls in the aid of Symmachus and Theodotion; and the frequency of his references to the Hebrew, taken together with the remarkable fragment on the "Obscurity of Scripture" already mentioned, show him to have possessed some acquaintance with that language. In dealing with questions relating to the Canon, Polychronius assumes an independent attitude. Against his brother he stoutly maintains the historical character of the narrative of Job. On the other hand, it is not a little remarkable to find him discriminating between the Hebrew Daniel and the Greek additions, refusing to comment upon the Song of the Three Children on the ground that it is not a part of the original (εἰδέναι δὲ δεῖ ὡς οὗτος ὁ ὕμνος οὐ κείται ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραϊκοῖς ἢ ἐν τοῖς Συριακοῖς βιβλίοις· λέγεται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰρημένων παρὰ τινῶν μετὰ ταῦτα συνθεῖσθαι διότι καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην αὐτῶν ἐρμηνείαν παρήσω, τῆς ἐρμηνείας μόνον ἐχόμενος τῆς βιβλίου).

As to the doctrinal standpoint of Polychronius little can be learnt from his published remains. Expressions such as ἡ ἐνωσις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἡ ἐνοικησις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, may suggest, but do not prove, that he shared Theodore's tendency to fall into what has since been known as the Nestorian view of

* The argument has been worked out with great care in the recent monograph of Dr. Otto Bardenhewer (*Polychronius Bruder Theodors*, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1879). The present writer had been led to the same conclusion independently, by a comparison of Theodoret's histories.

the Person of Christ. One of the catenists (Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coisl.* p. 61) describes him as "heretical," applying the same term however to Origen and Theodoret. But such has not been the general verdict of the church. The temper of Polychronius was not controversial, and his name claims no place in the history of polemical theology—a circumstance which has at once saved him from the stigma of heterodoxy, and consigned his life and his works to comparative obscurity. [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (5), deacon, to whom a letter was addressed by Nilus (*Epp.* iii. 11; Migne, *P. G.* lxxix. 372). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (6), presbyter, to whom Nilus addressed another of his letters (*Epp.* iii. 142; *P. G.* lxxix. 449). Bardenhewer (pp. 18, 19) is disposed to identify this Polychronius with the preceding, and both with the solitary (7). A Polychronius who was among the correspondents of St. Isidore of Pelusium (*Ep.* iv. 59) is possibly the same person. [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (7), bishop of Jerusalem mentioned in the Acts of Sixtus II., who is said to have claimed priority for his see, but to have been deposed by a Roman Council on a charge of simony, and deprived of all but a small portion of his lands. What remained to him (the story goes) he sold, and gave the produce to the poor; whereupon he was restored to his episcopal office. The story is repeated by Peter Damiani, Nicholas I. and others, but the Acts upon which it rests are manifestly spurious (Baron. a. 433, § 38; comp. Fabric. ed. Harles, xii. 241). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (8), bishop of Verdun and disciple of Lupus Trecentis, who was believed to possess miraculous powers of healing the sick (Baron. a. 479, § 15; cf. Bolland. Apr. iii. 751). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (9), bishop of Epiphania, one of the Oriental prelates who sided with John of Antioch at the council of Ephesus, and joined him in signing the deposition of Cyril and Memnon (Labbe, iii. 599); and was deposed with him by the opposite party. He took part in the synod of Antioch, which deposed Athanasius of Perrha in 445 (*ibid.* 728), and in the general council of Chalcedon, when he signed the condemnation of Dioscorus (Labbe, iv. 83, 329, 588 &c.). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 897; Baluz. 706, 726.) [E. V.]

POLYCHRONIUS (10), bishop of Antipatris in Palæstina Prima, attended the "Robbers' Synod," at Ephesus, in 449, as a supporter of Dioscorus (Labbe, iv. 117), but on the confession of his fault was acquitted and restored at Chalcedon (*ibid.* 82, 118, 738, 805). [E. V.]

POLYCHRONIUS (11), anchorite, warmly panegyricized by Theodoret, and styled by him "the Great" (ὁ μέγας, ὁ πᾶν, *Hist. Reliq.* § 24). He had been a pupil of the still more famous recluse, St. Zebinas, and reproduced the lineaments of his master's character as closely "as wax answers to the seal." His encomiast expatiates on his marvellous power of abstraction, his sleepless vigils, the miraculous efficacy of his prayers, his persistent labours in the teeth of

complicated disorders; his refusal to accept the smallest gift, even a goatskin cloak, which he declined as too warm and well made for a monk. This Polychronius has generally been identified with the brother of Theodore, but upon insufficient grounds [POLYCHRONIUS (3)]. He is commemorated together with his master Zebinas and two other anchorites on Feb. 23 (Bolland. Feb. iii. 377). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (12), presbyter of Constantinople, concerned in the discovery of the relics of the forty Cappadocian martyrs who suffered under Licinius (Soz. ix. 2; Niceph. xiv. 20). In his younger days he had been intimate with Caesarius, who was consul A.D. 397 (Soz. vi. 2) and Prefect of the East A.D. 401 (*cod. Theodos.* viii. tit. v. 62). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (13), abbat, to whom three letters were addressed by Maximus Confessor (Phot. *Cod.* 192). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (14), presbyter and monk of the Monothelite party, and who was condemned and deposed from the priesthood by the sixth Council (Mansi, xi. 606 sq.). He undertook to work a miracle before the Council in support of his heresy, but failed (Baron. a. 681, § 36; Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coisl.* p. 266). Proving incorrigible, he was sent to Rome and shut up in a monastery for the remainder of his life (Baron. a. 683, § 4; cf. Phot. *Cod.* 19). [H. B. S.]

POLYCHRONIUS (15), father of the Greek pope Zacharias (Baron. a. 741, § 13). [H. B. S.]

POLYCRATES (1), bishop of Ephesus in the last decade of the 2nd century. When Victor of Rome aimed at bringing the practice of the whole Christian world to uniformity in the matter of Easter celebration, he took the preliminary step of asking that meetings of bishops should be held in different places, in order to report the practice of their respective localities. This request was made, not in his own name, but in that of his church, as we learn from the use of the plural number in the reply of Polycrates. From every other place, as far as we can learn, the answer was that it was their practice to celebrate the feast of our Lord's Resurrection on no other day than Sunday; but Polycrates, writing in the name of the bishops of Asia, declared it to be the tradition which they had preserved untampered with, to celebrate only on the fourteenth day of the month, the day when the Jewish people put away their leaven. He appeals to the authority of the great luminaries which the Asiatic church could boast, and whose bodies lay among them, Philip, one of the twelve apostles, and his three daughters, John, who lay on our Lord's breast, a priest who wore the πέταλον,* Polycarp of Smyrna, Thraseas of Eumenia, Sagaris, Papius, Melito, all of whom had observed the fourteenth day, according to the Gospel, walking according to the rule of faith. Polycrates himself had followed the traditions of his kindred, seven of whom had been bishops before him, and had

* On this expression, see Lightfoot's *Galatians*, p. 345.

been confirmed in his view by his own study of the whole Scripture, and by conference with brethren from all the world. Although his letter bore no signature but his own, he claims for it that it had received the assent of a great number of bishops, who, notwithstanding his insignificance, revered his hoary hair, for he had been sixty-five years "in the Lord." The Roman church appears to have menaced the Asiatics with excommunication if they persisted in their singularity; but Polycrates declares that he was not scared by such menaces, for greater than he had said, We must obey God rather than man (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24). For the sequel of this story see the article IRENAEUS, Vol. III. pp. 255, 256. [G. S.]

POLYCRATES (2), an author mentioned only in PRAEDESTINATUS. [G. S.]

POLYCRATIA, Laodicean virgin, daughter of Publius, and said by St. Athanasius (*S. Ant. Vit. ap. Opp.* i. 842) to have been cured by the prayers of St. Anthony (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 223). [J. G.]

POLYEUCTUS, Feb. 13. Martyr in the Decian persecution at Melitina on the Euphrates. He was a centurion of the Legio Fulminata, stationed from the age of Augustus in that district (cf. Dion Cassius, lv. 23). His name is never found in any of the ancient Church historians till the time of Gregory of Tours, who mentions him in *Hist. Franc.* vii. 6, and in *De Glor. Mart.* § 103, where he writes his name Polyoctos, and tells us he was venerated at Constantinople as the avenger of perjury. His cult was, however, practised at Melitina prior to A.D. 377, cf. Migne, *Patr. Graec.* t. cxiv. p. 597. His name was also venerated in Egypt, cf. Boeckh *Corp. Ins. Graec.* No. 8981; De Rossi, *Bullet.* iv. 72. Corneille wrote his drama out of his acts, as told by Surius. Combesis, in 1660, found what he considered his original acts in the volume of MSS., whence he drew the Acts of SS. Phileas and Philoromus. [PHILEAS.] They profess to have been written by Nearchus, a friend of Polyuctus, and an eye witness of his martyrdom. Aubé has lately published them in Greek and Latin, with an elaborate defence of their authentic character, *Polyucte dans l'histoire*, par B. Aubé, Paris, 1882, pp. 116. [G. T. S.]

POMERIUS. [JULIANUS (72).]

POMPEIANA (1), matron at Thebaste in Numidia, who received the headless body of St. Maximilian A.D. 295 (Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 340), conveyed it on a litter to Carthage, and buried it near St. Cyprian. She died three days later, and was herself interred there (*ib.* 342; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* ii. 480). [J. G.]

POMPEIANA (2) (POMPONIANA), devout lady in Sardinia. [EPIPHANIUS (53).] In 573 Gregory directed the defensor Sabinus to assist her and Theodosia in coming to Rome, as they requested. (Gregorius, *Epp.* i. 48, iii. 36, xi. 25.) [F. D.]

POMPEIANUS (1), bishop of Emesa, took part in the council of Antioch which

deposed Athanasius, bishop of Perrha. (Labbe, iv. 727, 729.) Theodoret wrote commending to his charity Celestianus, a senator of Carthage, who when the city was entered by the Vandals had lost his all. (CELESTIANUS.) (Theod. *Ep.* 36; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 840; Ceillier, *Auteurs Eccles.* x. 66.) [E. V.]

POMPEIANUS (2), abbat of one of the twelve monasteries founded by St. Benedict. (Gregorius, *Dial.* ii. 4.) [F. D.]

POMPEIUS (1), African bishop in ii. Syn. Carth. (see Rettberg, 6) A.D. 252 sub Cyp.—almost certainly the same as Pompeius who was with Bp. Stephanus accidentally at Rome at the time of the counter-elections of Cornelius and Novatian to the papedom. They brought the particulars to the first Council of Carthage, A.D. 251, before the proper ambassadors returned; Cyp. *Epp.* 44, 45. Again, he is apparently the same as the Pompeius Frater to whom is addressed *Ep.* 74, of Cyprian on baptism and the Bp. of Sabrata on Syrtis, who votes by proxy through Natalis, Bp. of Oea in his neighbourhood suffr. 84 of Sentt. *Epp.* in Syn. Carth. vii. [E. W. B.]

POMPEIUS (2), nephew of the emperor Anastasius, and patrician: with his wife Anastasia, he was a great defender of the council of Chalcedon. He reported the peaceful condition of the Eastern church to Pope Hormisdas, and received a reply of thanks, A.D. 519 (Horm. *Epp.* ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 451, 457). [J. G.]

POMPEIUS (3), bishop, about whom Gregory the Great in A.D. 600 wrote to the bishop of Milan. Pompeius seems to have been convicted on some unnamed charge, and a confession to have been extorted from him, as he alleged by imprisonment and starvation. Gregory considered the case still doubtful. (*Epp.* x. 29.) [F. D.]

POMPONIA GRAECINA, a Roman lady, who is regarded as one of the earliest and most distinguished Roman converts. Tacitus, *Annals*, xiii. 32, tells us, referring to the year 57 or 58, "Pomponia Graecina, a distinguished lady, wife of the Plautius who returned from Britain with an ovation, was accused of some foreign superstition, and handed over to her husband's judicial decision. Following ancient precedent, he heard his wife's cause in the presence of kinsfolk, involving, as it did, her legal status and character, and he reported that she was innocent. This Pomponia lived a long life of unbroken melancholy. After the murder of Julia, Drusus's daughter, by Messalina's treachery, for forty years she wore only the attire of a mourner with her heart ever sorrowful. For this, during Claudius's reign, she escaped unpunished, and it was afterwards counted a glory to her. This is the only notice of her in ancient literature. She has in modern times come into prominence, owing to De Rossi's discoveries in the catacomb of Callistus (*Roma Sotterranea*, ii. 360-364). De Rossi's theory is that she was identical with St. Lucina, having adopted that name at her baptism (cf. Aubé, *Hist. des Persécut.* t. i. p. 180).

Schiller, *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, p. 446, refers the inscriptions which have been undoubtedly discovered in the Christian cemetery belonging to a family of Pomponii Graecini, to the end of the 2nd or beginning of the 3rd century, and denies that they have any connection with the Pomponia Graecina of A.D. 58. But this is a point on which archaeologists like De Rossi carry most weight. Cf. for other notices of her, Brownlow and Northcote's *Roma Sotterran*. t. i. p. 82, 83, 278-282. De Rossi, in his *Roma Sotterran*. t. i. p. 306-351, discusses the crypt and family of St. Lucia at great length (cf. also his *Bullettino di Archeol. Crist. passim*). [G. T. S.]

POMPONIUS (1), a deacon of Carthage, who with another named Tertius ministered to the martyrs Perpetua and Felicitas (*Passio SS. Perp. et Fel.* i. 2; ii. 2; iii. 2; Tillem. iii. 141). [PERPETUA.] [C. H.]

POMPONIUS (2), bishop of Dionysiana in Prov. Byzacena. 11th in Conc. Carth. iv. sub Cyp. de Basil. Cyp. *Ep.* 67, A.D. 254; 16th in Conc. v. de Bap. Haer. 1, A.D., 255, *Ep.* 70; and 48th in Conc. vii. Sentt. *Epp.* A.D. 256, called "Confessor" in the later marginal note on this place. Possibly the same bishop Pomponius to whom is addressed *Ep.* iv. de *Virgg. subintroductis*, A.D. 249. [E. W. B.]

POMPONIUS (3), a friend of Sulpicius Severus. (*Sulp. Dial.* iii. 18 in *Pat. Lat.* xx.; Tillem. xii. 595, 602.) [C. H.]

PONTIANUS (1), martyr A.D. 192. [EUSEBIUS (108).]

PONTIANUS (2), Jan. 19, a martyr at Spoleum, under a judge named Fabianus, in the reign of Antoninus Pius. His martyrdom is commemorated by the *Mart. Vet. Rom.*, Adon., Usuard, and discussed by the Bollandists in the vol. for Jan. 19, p. 929. He suffered on Jan. 14, and was buried on Jan. 19. His acts may contain some genuine fragments. [G. T. S.]

PONTIANUS (3), bishop of Rome from 21st July (?) A.D. 230 to 28th Sept. A.D. 235, during five years two months and seven days. These are the dates given in the Liberian Catalogue, and are in all probability correct, though later recensions of the Pontifical give them differently. The same record states that he was, with Hippolytus, a presbyter, banished to the island of Sardinia, which it describes as "nociva insula," implying, possibly, that he was sent to the mines there. His banishment may be concluded to have taken place under the emperor Maximinus, who succeeded Alexander after the assassination of the latter in May A.D. 235, and who, unlike his predecessor, was a persecutor. The date assigned to the end of the episcopate of Pontianus was probably not that of his death, but of his deprivation only. The expression in the Liberian Catalogue is "discinctus est," Antheros being said to have been ordained in his place on the 21st Nov. The Felician Catalogue gives the 30th Oct. as the day of his death, but without specification of the year, and adds that he had been previously "adflictus et fus-

tibus maceratus." Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 29) makes his episcopate end in the reign of Gordianus (237); but this is apparently due to a confusion between the dates of his death and of his burial at Rome, which was not effected till the pontificate of Fabianus, who succeeded to the see in 236, Anteros having intervened, and who, according to the Felician Catalogue, brought the body of Pontianus by sea to Rome, and buried it in the cemetery of St. Callistus. The 13th of August is given in the Liberian *Depositio Martyrum* as the day of his burial, which may be concluded to have been in the year 237 from an imperial rescript (referred to in evidence by De Rossi) allowing in that year the transference and burial of the bodies of the "deportati" (*Digest.* xlviii. 24, 2). To the fact of the burial of Pontianus having been effected by Fabian is probably due the further inference of Eusebius (*in loc. cit.*) that the latter was his immediate successor, and that Anteros, who intervened, succeeded Fabian.

The only act of Pontianus during his episcopate of which there is anything to be said is his probable assent to the condemnation of Origen by Demetrius of Alexandria. Jerome (*Ep. ad Paulam*, xxix. in *Benedict. edit.*; *Ep.* xxxiii. in *edit. Veron.*) says of Origen: "For this toil what reward did he get? He is condemned by the bishop Demetrius. With the exception of the priests of Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, and Achaia, the world consents to his condemnation. Rome herself assembles a senate (meaning apparently a synod) against him, not on account of novelty of dogmas, not on account of heresy, as rabid dogs now pretend to his disfavour, but because she could not bear the glory of his eloquence and knowledge, and because while he was teaching all else were accounted mute." This passage, from an epistle of Jerome written before his declaration against Origenism and his consequent controversy with Rufinus, is quoted by the latter in his Apology against Jerome during the course of the controversy (*Rufin. Apolog. in Hieron.* lib. ii. c. 20). The condemnation of Origen by Demetrius being supposed (though not with certainty) to have been *circ.* A.D. 231, the Roman bishop who assembled the assenting Roman synod was most probably Pontianus.

Two spurious epistles are assigned to this pope. He is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on the 19th November as a saint and martyr, as having been banished by the emperor (said to have been Antoninus) to Sardinia, and there killed ("mactatus" instead of the "maceratus" of *Cat. Fel.*) with clubs. [J. B.—Y.]

PONTIANUS (4), an African bishop, A.D. 540, who addressed a remonstrance to the Emperor Justinian against his edict about the Three Chapters. Pontianus rightly declined to anathematise men whose works he had not read, and feared that under pretence of condemning Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas men were only striving to restore Eutychianism. The letter of Pontianus will be found in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxvii. col. 995. [G. T. S.]

PONTICUS (1), a youth of the age of fifteen, who suffered with Blandina among the Martyrs of Lyons, A.D. 177 (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1). [G. S.]

PONTICUS (2), an ecclesiastic, to whom, along with another named Caricus, Serapion bishop of Antioch addressed a letter (not extant) against the Montanists. (Euseb. v. 19; vi. 12; Jerom. *Vir. Illust.* c. 41; Tillem. ii. 426.) Eusebius designates the two men *ἐκκλησιαστικούς ἀνδρας*. [C. H.]

PONTITIANUS, a soldier, perhaps of the praetorian guard, an African by birth, and a Christian, who indirectly contributed much towards the conversion of St. Augustine, who relates in his *Confessions* in his own simple and exquisitely pathetic way, how one day, while he was at Milan in company with Alypius, Pontitianus came, as it seemed by accident, having to visit his countrymen, and found on the table, perhaps a chess-board (*mensa lusoria*), a book containing the writings of St. Paul, and having expressed some surprise, informed the friends that he was a Christian, and in the constant habit of prayer to God both in public worship and at home. The conversation then turned upon Antony, the Egyptian monk, whose history was not unknown to them, but of which Pontitianus knew much more than they did. He told them how he had become acquainted with it. He was at Treves, in attendance on the emperor; and when one day he had gone to witness the performance in the circus, himself and three of his comrades, who are called agents, went to amuse themselves in the public gardens. Having separated, two of them met again at the dwelling of a recluse, and found there an account of St. Antony, which one of them read to the other until his spirit was stirred within him to relinquish his military life and enlist himself in the service of God as a monk, and not only so, but prevailed on his companion to join him. In a short time Pontitianus and the fourth member of the party came up, and the other two endeavoured to persuade them to follow their example, but without success. They returned to the palace while the disciples of St. Antony remained behind. Such was the tale to which Augustine listened, and he describes his agony of mind on hearing it, his vehement self-reproaches, his strong impulse to rise up and follow Christ, and the hindrances which held him back; the arguments refuted and shattered which dissuaded him from the step, but the strong curb of habit which restrained his effort, and wasted his life with nervous agitation. We hear no more of Pontitianus, and the sequel belongs to the history of St. Augustine himself. (Aug. *Conf.* viii. 6, 7.) [H. W. P.]

PONTIUS (1), May 14. Martyr under Valerian, in Cimela, a city of Gaul. The acts are very corrupt, and have afforded much trouble to hagiographers. See Henschenius on them under this date in *AA. SS. Boll.*; Baron. ad ann. cclxvi. Num. 9; Petav. *de Doct. Temp.* xi. 25; Tillem. *Mém.* v. 588; Usuard. *Mart.*; Ceill. x. 158. [G. T. S.]

PONTIUS (2), March 8, a deacon of Carthage, by whom the life of St. Cyprian was written. We know nothing about him save what we glean from his *Vita Cypriani*, found prefixed to all editions of St. Cyprian's works. From it we learn that he was a deacon attached to St. Cyprian, and as such regarded by the

people as specially qualified to write his biography. He was at the same time conscious of his own incapacity. Thus, he tells us, cap. I., "In qua parte si dixero nos opibus facultiae defici, minus dico. Facundia enim ipsa deficit digna facultate, quae desiderium vestrum pleno spiritu satiet. Ita utrimque graviter urgemur; siquidem ille nos virtutibus suis onerat, vos nos precibus fatigatis." He lived as a deacon with St. Cyprian, just as Cyprian himself, after his conversion, lived with the presbyter Caecilian. This, as it has been already pointed out under CYPRIAN, Vol. I. p. 740, is the only conclusion we can draw from the obscure words of Pontius, c. iv., "Erat sane ille etiam de nobis contubernium viri justi et laudabilis memoriae Caecilii," where "de nobis contubernium" seems to signify the collective body of deacons. He was chosen by Cyprian to accompany him into exile to Curubus c. xi. and xii. (cf. Dodwell's *Dissertationes Cyprianicae*, iv. 21). His *Vita* is evidently an authentic record. Its style is rugged, and in places very obscure; yet presents all those internal marks of truth and antiquity which Le Blant has noticed in his treatise *Les Actes des Martyrs*. It uses all the correct technical terms of Roman criminal law, and refers to all the usual forms observed in criminal trials. Le Blant, in fact, on p. 111 of his work, quotes the *Vita* of Pontius to illustrate the Roman formality of reading a prisoner's sentence from a tablet, cf. Pontius, capp. xii. and xvii. cap. xv., again speaks of Cyprian as kept, the night before his execution, in "custodia delicata," an allusion which can only be understood in the light of Le Blant's explanation, p. 49. Jerome, in his *Liber de Vir. Illust.* cap. 68, mentions the life of Pontius, describing it as "egregium volumen vitae et passionis Cypriani." The bibliography of Pontius' *Vita* will be found complete in Potthast's *Bibliotheca*, s. v. Cyprianus, p. 662. For a critical account of the MSS. thereof see Hartel's edition of Cyprian's works in the *Vienna Corpus Scriptt. Eccles. Latin.* t. iii., pt. 1, pref. p. lxxix. Ruinart gives the text in the *Acta Sincera*, p. 203; cf. also *Martyrol. Vet. Rom.*, Adon., Usuard. [G. T. S.]

PONTIUS (3), a Donatist bishop, but of what see does not appear, who with Rogatianus and others was the principal mover of a petition to the emperor Julian to reinstate the Donatists, A.D. 362. He was afterwards present at the council of Bagaia, A.D. 394 (Aug. *Ep.* 105, 9, c. *Petil.* ii. 92, 205; 97, 223; c. *Cresc.* iii. 53, 59). St. Augustine also mentions a man of this name, whom the Donatists claimed as the worker of a miracle, but his date was probably earlier, (*De Unit. Eccl.* 19, 49; *Tract. in Joann.* xiii. 17). [H. W. P.]

PONTIUS (4) LEONTIUS. [LEONTIUS (85.)]

POPPAEA. [SABINUS.]

PORCARIUS, ST., martyr, an abbat of Lérins, who, with 500 of his monks, is said to have been massacred by the Saracens about the year 730. According to the story, as told in old MSS. of the monastery, when the approach of the heathen was known, the abbat hid the sacred relics lest they should be contaminated,

sent away into Italy sixteen boys who were being educated there and thirty-six monks whose constancy was doubtful, and with the rest, to the number of 505, prepared for martyrdom. All but five of these were massacred, the churches and buildings utterly destroyed, and the island left desolate. A vast multitude of sea-birds came and circled over the corpses with incessant cries, as though to celebrate their obsequies, until the wretched survivors had buried them, before seeking their comrades in Italy. It should be mentioned that some have recounted this massacre as being the work of Genseric and the Vandals. Porcarius's day is Aug. 12. (Barralis Salerna, *Chronologia Lerinensis* i. 220 seqq.; Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 733-9.) [S. A. B.]

PORFIRIUS (PORPHYRIUS), PUBLILIUS OPTATIANUS, a Latin poet of the time of Constantine the Great. He is perhaps the same Optatianus who was praefect of Rome in 329 and 333, but nothing is known with any certainty concerning his life, except the episode connected with his book entitled *Panegyricus*. This work he composed when in exile for some unrecorded offence, (he himself says, on a false charge). The occasion, it would appear, was the Vicennalia of Constantine, in whose honour the work is designed. The emperor was either gratified by the flattery of the poems, or moved by the thought of the severe and prolonged suffering which their preparation must have caused to the unhappy author, and recalled him from banishment. The emperor's letter to the poet acknowledging the work is still extant, as well as a letter from Porfirius to the emperor. St. Jerome mentions this event in his continuation of the Chronicon of Eusebius under the date 329. The book must, however, have been sent to the emperor earlier, since it contains an address to Crispus, which could hardly have been inserted in a poem intended for presentation to Constantine after Crispus had been put to death by his orders:—

"Sancte salus mundi, arms insignibus ardens,
Crispe, avis melior."

This points to a date before 326. But the date assigned for Porfirius' recall may be accurate enough, if we take it as the date of his pardon, and not of his sending his extraordinary book to Constantine. If the date is right, the probability of his identity with the praefect of the city becomes very slight indeed.

Of the book itself, it can only be said that it is a monument of perverted ingenuity and bad taste. It consists of twenty-six pieces of verse, varying in length from four to forty lines. The author himself describes his work as "carmen quod artioribus Musarum ligaveram vinculis;" and the restrictions under which he placed himself have been observed with a certain regard to sense and metre. Some of the pieces are "shaped" poems, representing an "ara Pythia," a "syrinx," and an "organon." Others have some especial peculiarity belonging to each line, as to the number of words or letters, or parts of speech which it contains, or the variety of sense or form which can be obtained by reading the words backwards instead of forwards. Others are acrostics, while several are so

arranged that the number of letters in each line being equal, the whole poem forms a solid square of letters, over which a pattern or figure is traced out by rubricating those letters which fall in particular lines; the rubricated letters, in their turn, giving a reading with a sense of its own. Thus the words "Publius Optatianus Porfirius haec lusi, omne genus metri tibi pangens, optime Basse," result from the red letters which make a diaper pattern on the surface of one poem; another is inscribed with the monogram of the Labarum, which is made up of letters reading as follows:—

"Omnipotens genitor, tuque, o divisio mixta
Filius atque Pater, et Sanctus Spiritus, Unum,
Faveas votis."

Other rubrications are appeals to the vanity or the pity of the emperor, or expressions of good wishes for his safety and fortune. Some of them are made, by a free use of the Latin letters, to give a sense in Greek. The author has appended to each poem an instruction on its peculiarities.

The poems themselves are of course obscure in sense, and devoid of any merits or graces of style, and are useless except as a curiosity. The same may be said of the "versus anacyclici" of the cod. Salmasianus, which have the name of Porfirius attached to them.

The *Panegyricus* was first printed in P. Pithoei *Poem. Vet.* (Paris, 1590); again, in a fuller form, from a codex in the possession of P. Velsler, at Augsburg in 1595, and yet again from the same MS., with a "spicilegium criticum" by Daumius, as an addition to M. Velsleri *Opera* (Nürnberg, 1682). The three "shaped" poems mentioned are to be found (with an introduction and notes) in Wernsdorf, *Poet. Lat. Min.* ii. 365. The "versus anacyclici" from the cod. Salm. are to be found in Riese, *Auth. Lat.* (no. 81), and (with some others not retained by Riese), in Meyer's *Auth. Lat.* (nos. 236-40). An edition of the poems of Porfirius, with a preface by Luc. Müller, was published by Trübner in 1870. [H. A. W.]

PORPHYRIANI, a name affixed to the Arian party by the emperor Constantine immediately after the first general council. "As Porphyry, that enemy of piety, for having composed licentious treatises against religion, found a suitable recompense, and such as thenceforth branded him with infamy, overwhelming him with deserved reproach, his impious writings also having been destroyed; so now it seems fit both that Arians and such as hold his sentiments should be denominated Porphyrians, that they may take their appellation from those whose conduct they have imitated." (*Epist. Const. in Socrat. H. E.* lib. i. cap. 9.) [G. T. S.]

PORPHYRIUS (1) (Πορφύριος), commonly called by English writers PORPHYRY, was the most distinguished teacher of the Neo-Platonic school after PLOTINUS. Since he describes himself (*Vita Plotini*, c. 4) as being thirty years old when he went to Rome in the tenth year of Gallienus, he must have been born A.D. 232 or 233. He calls himself (*V. Plot.* 8) a Tyrian; so that even if, as Jerome (*Praef. in Galat.*) and Chrysostom (on 1 *Cor.* Hom. vi. p. 58) assert,

he was actually born at Batanea,* he was no doubt of a Tyrian family. His original name, *Malchus* (Eunapius, *Vitae Sophist.* p. 7, ed. Boiss.) i.e. מלך, *Melek*, a king, seems to indicate a Semitic origin. Longinus however called him Πορφύριος (Eunap. u.s.) a kind of playful synonym for his regal name. Some Christian writers (Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 23, p. 203) state that he was born of Christian parents, but left the church in consequence of the harsh treatment which he received from Christians. While still young, he somewhere, perhaps at Tyre, met with Origen (Vincent. Lirin. *Commonit.* i. 23), whose system of allegorical interpretation of Scripture he afterwards ridiculed (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). He became a pupil of Longinus at Athens (Euseb. *Praepar. Evang.* x. 3, 1), under whom he acquired literary culture. But his strongest bias was towards philosophy, and in the year 263, when he had already acquired a high reputation, he removed to Rome and joined himself to Plotinus. A few years later the master, perceiving that his pupil had fallen into a state of melancholy, sent him for change of air and scene to Sicily, where he still remained in the days of Eusebius the church historian (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19). He married in middle life a lady named Marcella, the widow of a friend (Eunap. *v. Soph.* p. 11). As he himself (*v. Plot.* 23) refers to an event which took place in his 68th year, he must have reached at least the year 301; and if Suidas (s.v.) is right in placing his death under Diocletian, he cannot have lived more than four years after that date. He is said (Eunap. p. 11) to have died at Rome.

Porphyry's learning was great and wide, but he lays no claim to originality; it is the teaching of Plotinus that he expounds and defends; but he states clearly and precisely what his master often left obscure. His gift of literary style was probably developed by the teaching of Longinus, the first critic of his time. Of the numerous treatises which Porphyry put forth on various subjects, there remain only the *Ἀφορμαὶ πρὸς τὰ νοητὰ* or *Sententiae*—a brief and clear exposition of his philosophic system—the tract on Abstinence from Flesh, a life of Pythagoras, a letter to Marcella, two little mythologic treatises on the Styx and on the Nymphs' Grotto, and an Introduction to the Categories of Aristotle. A certain number of very interesting fragments on the Soul and its Faculties may be gathered from Eusebius and Stobaeus; and Proclus, in his Commentary on the *Timaeus*, furnishes us with several passages of great value on the theological and cosmological views of Porphyry. We are here concerned mainly with his views on the nature of man and man's relation to the Deity, and especially with his attitude towards Judaism and Christianity.

Porphyry is with justice reputed the soberest of the Neo-Platonic philosophers; much more than Plotinus, he considers the bearing of philosophy on practical life. The end of philosophy is with him morality—we might almost say, holiness—the healing of man's infirmities, the imparting to him a purer and more vigorous life. Mere knowledge, however true, is not of

itself sufficient; knowledge has for its object *life* in accordance with reason (*voûs*) (*De Abstinencia*, i. 29). Of what value, says he, are the discourses of philosophers, if they cannot heal the sickness of the soul? The salvation (*σωτηρία*) of the soul is the proper object of philosophy (*Ad Marcellam*, c. 31; fragments in Euseb. *Praepar. Evang.* iv. 7, 1; 8, 1; xiv. 10, 4). Like all the Neo-Platonists, he held that the soul should be as far as possible freed from the bonds of matter. He begs his disciples—in terms which sound like an echo of the Gospel—to be ready for the salvation of the soul to cut off the whole body (*Ad Marcellam*, 34). For this reason he recommends the practice of abstinence, saying that we should be like the gods if we could abstain from vegetable as well as animal food. But with all his desire for the purification of the soul from the chains of matter, and uniting it with God (*De Abstin.* i. 57), he gave in slowly and reluctantly to the "theurgy"—the mystic incantations—which had so great a charm for most of the Neo-Platonists. This, he thought, was powerless to purify the truly intellectual or noetic portion of the soul; it could but cleanse the lower or psychic portion, and make it capable of perceiving lower beings, such as spirits, angels, and gods (August. *De Civ. Dei*, x. 9). Once only, in his sixty-eighth year, he believed that he experienced the mystic trance, and was united with the Deity (*Vita Plotini*, 23).

With Plotinus's views of religion as a personal purification and means of access to the highest divinity, it may well be supposed that he was not specially devoted to the civic and national worship of paganism. It is no matter to the philosopher what cities may do to appease their deities; for they look not to the care and culture of the soul, but to wealth and other external things, the want of which they think an evil. The true God is not honoured by sacrifice, but by pure silence and pure thoughts about Him (*De Abstinencia*, ii. 34, 43). It matters nothing in reality whether we neglect or tend the altars of the gods; but whoever honours a god as if he needed anything from him, unconsciously sets himself above the god. Do not therefore, he says, defile the divinity with the vain imaginings of men; you will not injure that which is forever blessed, and from which every impact of corruption glances off; but you will blind yourself to the perception of the greatest and most vital truths (*Ad Marcellam*, 18). Touching the gods, four principles should be held—faith, truth, love (*ἔρως*), hope. For we ought to have faith that our only salvation is in turning to God to be eager to learn the truth about him; when we have learned it, to be enamoured of what we have learned; and when we are enamoured to nourish the soul with good hopes (*Ad Marcellam*, 24). If we would be free from the assaults of evil spirits, we must keep ourselves clear of those things over which evil spirits have power, for they attack not the pure soul which has no affinity with them (*De Abstin.* ii. 43).

But with all this he by no means contemplates a revolution in the popular religion. For the most part, it is true piety to worship the gods according to the custom of one's country (*Ad Marc.* 18). And he was not, as indeed he scarcely could be, altogether uninfluenced by the polytheism in the midst of which he lived; he

* See on this point Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, v. 726, ed. Harless.

acknowledged astral spirits, and good and evil daemons of various kinds. But these daemons, or visible gods, being composite, unlike the supreme deity, are neither unchanging nor immortal (*De Abst.* ii. 36, 39). His enmity to Christianity was no doubt partly due to the fact, that it was clearly destructive of the Pagan worship, for which he had a kind of lingering affection. He very much preferred the conduct of Ammonius Saccas, who, born of Christian parents, had accepted his country's paganism, to that of Origen, who, born (as he supposed) in paganism, had gone over to Christian barbarism (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 19). Whatever the cause, Porphyry was keenly hostile to the Christian Church. However nearly he may have approached to the moral teaching of Christianity, he is regarded by the early fathers as the bitterest and most irreconcilable enemy of the faith. He wrote—for the hypothesis of an anti-Christian Porphyry distinct from the Neo-Platonist seems to rest on no evidence (see N. Lardner, *Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, iii. c. 37)—fifteen books against the Christians, which were honoured with refutations by some of the most eminent doctors of the age—Methodius of Tyre, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris of Laodicea. So far as we may judge from the fragments which remain, his attack was learned and skilful. He sought, as so many have done in modern times, to point out such contradictions in the Christian Scriptures as might disprove the infallibility attributed to them. He seized, for instance, on the conflict between St. Peter and St. Paul related in Gal. ii., to point out the variance between the heads of the Christian community (Jerome, *Prolog. in Galat.*, *Opp.* vii. 371). He blamed the seeming change of purpose in the Lord Himself as seen in John vii. 8 compared with vii. 14 (Jerome, *Dial. c. Pelag.* ii. 17). He seems also to have accused the writers of the Gospels of deliberate falsification (*Id. Epist. 57 ad Pam-mach.* c. 9; *Quaest. Hebr. in Genes.* init.). He took the words of St. Peter to Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 4 ff.) as a curse—foolishly, as Jerome says (*Epist. ad Demetr.* in Semler's ed. of Pelagius's *Epist. ad Demetriadem*, p. 12). Especially notorious was the twelfth book of his work, in which he contended that the Book of Daniel was not the work of the prophet whose name it bears, but of a later writer, who lived in Judaea in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The so-called prophecy therefore, up to that time, is not prophecy, but history (Jerome, *Praef. in Daniel.*, *Opp.* v. 617 f.). In his criticism of the Mosaic books, he blamed the allegorizing interpretations of Origen and others, which found mysteries in the plain sense of the law (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 19). He propounded, too, three difficulties often repeated in modern times. If Christ is the only way of salvation, why was He so late revealed? Why did Christians reject sacrifices, when the God of the Old Testament had instituted them? How can sin entail everlasting punishment, when Christ Himself has said (Matt. vii. 2), "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again"? (*August. Epist.* 102, or *Sex Quaestiones c. Paganos*, qu. 2, 3, 4; cf. Jerome, *Epist.* 133 ad Ctesiphont. c. 9).

Still, Porphyry did not rail at Christianity as Celsus had done. After all his fault-finding,

he still contended that there was something in the teaching of Christ worthy of all respect and even reverence. The Neo-Platonists, says Augustine (*De Consensu Evang.* i. 15), praised Christ while they disparaged Christianity; the railing, from which they exempted the Master, they bestowed upon the disciples. Jesus (they contended) said nothing against the pagan deities; rather, He wrought wonders by their aid (*ib.* c. 34). They could not follow the disciples in calling Him God, but they were ready to honour Him as one of the best and wisest of men (*ib.* c. 7; cf. *De Civ. Dei*, xix. 23; *Euseb. Dem. Evang.* iii. 8). It can scarcely be doubted that Porphyry wrote his life of Pythagoras with a view of raising the half-mythic Grecian sage to the same level with Christ. It was not without design that he represented his hero not only as the ideal of wisdom, but as a kind of incarnate deity. He can well suppose a god sojourning with men, but he cannot allot an undisputed pre-eminence to Christ. In fact, what Porphyry desired was not a new religion for mankind—for men in general might well be satisfied with existing forms of faith—but a special religion for philosophers.

Even in the storm of controversy, scarcely a word seems to have been uttered against the private life of Porphyry. His system prescribed purity, and there is no good reason to doubt that he practised it. Not one of the heathen thinkers approached in some respects nearer to the moral principles of Christianity; but the mysteries of the faith he seems to have been altogether unable to receive. Like many modern thinkers, he was ready to honour Christ as a man, even an inspired man, but the exclusive devotion which Christianity requires he refused to give. It does not appear that he gave in to Gnostic explanations of the nature of Christ's person and office; rather, he clung to the notion of His bare humanity. In fact, with his learning and candour, his evident acquaintance with the Scriptures both old and new, and yet his total rejection of the central mystery of the Christian faith, he presents a very interesting problem.

Literature.—Porphyry's *Life of Plotinus* was printed in Ficino's edition of Plotinus (Basel, 1580), and again in Creuzer's ed. of Plotinus (Oxford, 1835). His *Life of Pythagoras* was edited by Rittershuys (Amsterdam, 1707). The *Ἀφορμαὶ* or *Sententiae* were edited by Holstenius; also the treatise *De Abstinencia* (Rome, 1630; reprinted at Utrecht, 1769). The *Letter to Marcella* was first printed by Angelo Mai, *Auctores Classici*, iv. 356 ff. (Rome, 1831). The *Letter to Anebo* was first printed in the *Poemander* at Venice (1483); again in Gale's ed. of Jamblichus *De Mysteriis* (London, 1670); again in Parthey's edition of the same work (Berlin, 1857). There is a complete list of all the works known to have been written by Porphyry in Fabricius's *Bibliotheca Graeca*, v. 729, ed. Harless.

Information on Porphyry's life and writings may be found in the following works. Brucker, *Historia Philosophiae*, i. 236 ff.; Steinhart in Pauly's *Realencyclop.* v. 1917 ff.; *British Critic*, v. 234 (1829); Vacherot, *Histoire Critique de l'École d'Alexandrie*, ii. 11 ff.; Jules Simon, *Hist. de l'École d'Alexandrie*, ii. 17 ff.; Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2, 572 ff. [C.]

PORPHYRIUS (2), Feb. 16. A philosophical slave of Pamphilus, who suffered by fire soon after his master. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* xi.)

PORPHYRIUS, poet. [PORFIRIUS.]

PORPHYRIUS (3), bishop of some see not far from Cucusus, friendly to Chrysostom, to whom, with other bishops, he wrote soon after his arrival, expressing his kindly feeling, and his desire to open correspondence with him (Chrys. *Ep.* 235). The title of the letter names him bishop of Rhosus. Tillemont doubts the correctness of this on account of the distance of that city from Cucusus. (Tillem. tom. xi. p. 609, *Note sur Chrys.* 90.) [E. V.]

PORPHYRIUS (4), patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 404-413, successor to Flavian (Soc. *H. E.* vii. 9). Porphyrius is described by the author of the dialogue which goes under the name of Palladius as a man of infamous character, who had disgraced the clerical profession by his intimacy with jockeys and mountebanks and the other scum of the circus, in whose obscene representations of the old pagan fables he is even charged with having taken part. He is accused of licentious life, and darker rumours of unnatural crime are hinted at (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 143). Although the bad character of Porphyrius was notorious, and his name was found in the reports of the police courts, by his natural cleverness and adroit flattery he obtained considerable influence with the magistrates, and wound himself into the confidence of some of the leading bishops of the province. The power he thus acquired he employed most unscrupulously in browbeating such of the orthodox bishops and clergy as it was not worth his while to gain by adulation, and thwarting their plans for the good of the church (*ibid.* p. 142). He is said to have watched for the vacancies of sees, and by his arts to have procured the ordination of creatures of his own, even against the better judgment of the consecrators. As Porphyry had been a long time in holy orders at the time of his usurpation of the see, and he seems to have passed his life in Antioch, he and Chrysostom must have been well acquainted with one another, and their mutual aversion can be easily conceived. Flavian's death having occurred nearly contemporaneously with Chrysostom's deposition and exile, it became a matter of first importance to the leaders of the cabal which had accomplished his overthrow, to have the vacant throne of Antioch filled with a man who could be depended on to carry out their designs for the complete crushing of his adherents, who were naturally numerous and powerful in his native city, which had been so long the scene of his ministry. Porphyrius was the person fixed on. To clear the field Constantius, the trusted friend of Chrysostom, whom the love and reverence of the people of Antioch marked out as Flavian's successor, was accused at Constantino-ple as a disturber of the public peace. By his bribes and by his powerful influence with the party then dominant about the court, Porphyry obtained an Imperial rescript banishing Constantius to the Oasis. By the help of his friends Constantius anticipated the execution of the decree and fled to Cyprus (*ibid.* 145) [CONSTAN-

TIUS 4]. Porphyry then managed to get into his hands Cyriacus and Diophantus, and other presbyters of the orthodox party who were likely to be troublesome, and seized the opportunity of the first day of the Olympian festival, celebrated every fourth year at Antioch, when almost the whole population had poured forth to witness the spectacles in the suburb of Daphne, to lock himself and his three consecrators, Acacius, Antiochus and Severianus, whom he had kept in hiding at his own house, with a few of the clergy into the chief church, and to receive ordination at their hands. In fear of being surprised at their clandestine profanation of things sacred, the service was performed so hurriedly that some portions of the rite are said to have been omitted (*ibid.* 146). On the conclusion of the ordination the ordainers having received a pecuniary satisfaction, λαβόντες τὸ ἱκανόν, consulted their safety by flight over the mountain ranges. The Antiochenes, on their return from the shows, were indignant on hearing of the artifice which had imposed so unwelcome a prelate on them. That night they kept quiet. But the next morning they attacked the house of Porphyrius, and piling fagots round it sought to burn it over his head. Porphyrius applied for protection to the general in command, who sent a body of armed men, who dispersed the crowd and forcibly occupied the church, maltreating the worshippers and trampling under foot the cross which was being carried in procession through the vicinity of the city (*ibid.* p. 147). The influence of Porphyrius with the ruling powers secured the appointment of a savage old officer as captain of the city guards, who by his threats and open violence drove the people reluctantly to attend the church, φόβῳ τῶν αἰκισμῶν, inwardly reviling their infamous persecutor and invoking the Divine retribution his wickedness merited (*ibid.* 147). To afford him the means of securing the favour of those in power, Porphyrius was accused of not scrupling to melt down the sacred vessels of the church (*ibid.* 143). Forewarned of the real character of this infamous intruder into the patriarchal see, pope Innocent received Porphyry's request to be admitted to communion with dignified silence (*ibid.* p. 141). He was completely deserted by the chief clergy and all the ladies of rank of the city, who refused to approach the walls of his church and held their religious meetings elsewhere clandestinely (*ibid.* 149). In revenge for this religious ostracism, Porphyry employed all his influence at court to obtain a decree, issued by Arcadius Nov. 18, 404, sentencing all who refused communion with Arsacius, Theophilus and Porphyry to be expelled from the churches, and instructing the governor of the province to forbid their holding religious meetings elsewhere (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24; *Cod. Theod.* 16, tom. iv. p. 103). All his efforts to obtain the recognition of the Antiochenes as their lawful bishop proving fruitless, while Chrysostom's spiritual power in exile became greater for all his efforts to crush it, this miserable man's exasperated spirit drove him to take vengeance on the banished prelate for his disappointment. Through his machinations and those of Severianus, orders were issued for the removal of Chrysostom from Cucusus to Pityus, during the execution of which the aged saint's

troubles were ended by death (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 97). (CHRYSOSTOM, Vol. I. p. 531.) Porphyry's own death is placed by Clinton (*Fast. Rom.* ii. 552) in 413 (cf. Theod. *H. E.* iii. 5). He was succeeded by Alexander, by whom the long distracted church was united (ALEXANDER, bishop of Antioch). It is a misfortune that the chief and almost only source for the character of Porphyry is the violent party-pamphlet (as it may be not unjustly styled) of Palladius, whose warm partisanship for Chrysostom unduly blackens all who took the contrary side, and refuses to allow them a single redeeming virtue. That Porphyry was not altogether the monster of iniquity this author represents may be concluded from the statement of the calm and amiable Theodoret, that he "left behind him" at Antioch "many memorials of his kindness and of his remarkable prudence" (Theod. *H. E.* v. 35), as well as by a still stronger testimony in his favour in Theodoret's letter to Dioscorus, when he calls him one "of blessed and holy memory, who was adorned both with a brilliant life, and an acquaintance with divine doctrines" (Theod. *Ep.* 83). It is not easy to reconcile the two characters, and with our necessarily imperfect knowledge it is vain to attempt to do so. Fragments of a letter addressed to Porphyry by Theophilus of Alexandria, recommending him to summon a synod, when some were seeking to revive the heresy of Paul of Samosata, are found in Labbe (*Concil.* v. 472). [E. V.]

PORPHYRIUS (5), bishop of Gaza, A.D. 395-420. According to the biography of his disciple, Mark (MARCUS, No. 12), which, with the exception of one or two notices elsewhere, is the only authority for the facts of his life, Porphyry was born at Thessalonica, c. 352, of a good family. His parents were Christians, and took care to have their son instructed in the Holy Scriptures, as well as in secular learning. When he was about 25, he renounced the world, and retired to the desert of Scete in Egypt, which, at the end of five years, he left for Jerusalem, and passed another five years in a cavern near the Jordan. A painful disease, brought on by his austerities, having compelled him to revisit Jerusalem, he there made the acquaintance of Mark, who, from admiration of his virtues, attached himself to him as his devoted disciple and companion. By Porphyry's desire Mark visited Thessalonica, and turned the proceeds of Porphyry's share of his paternal property into money, the whole of which, on his return, Porphyry distributed to the poor and to various monasteries, supporting himself by his manual labour. About his fortieth year he was reluctantly ordained presbyter by John, bishop of Jerusalem, who committed to his guardianship the sacred relic of the True Cross. After a presbyterate of three years, in the year 395, on the death of Aeneas, he was with still greater reluctance ordained bishop of Gaza, by John of Caesarea, who had sent for him on the pretext of consulting him on some scriptural difficulty.* The

* On the asserted irregularity of the ordination of a presbyter to the episcopate by the metropolitan without obtaining the sanction of his diocesan, see Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xv. 201. Blondé doubts the authenticity of the account (*de la primauté en l'Eglise*, p. 552, Genev. 1641.

population of Gaza was at that time almost entirely pagan, and the position of a zealous Christian bishop was one of no small difficulty and even danger. The cessation of a severe drought at the beginning of the second year of his episcopate, January 326, which was attributed to his prayers and those of the Christians, was the cause of the conversion of a number of the heathen inhabitants. This was succeeded by other conversions, arousing great exasperation among the heathen population, which vented itself in a severe persecution. Porphyry endured the ill-treatment to which he was subjected with the utmost meekness, which was not without its effect on the minds of his persecutors. At the same time he despatched his deacon, Mark, and his minister, Borocas (a young man whom he had saved from a miserable death in the streets and who displayed the warmth of his gratitude, sometimes even too zealously) to Constantinople to obtain the protection of the emperor, and his sanction for the demolition of the idol temples. Through the powerful advocacy of Chrysostom an order was obtained to destroy the idols and close the temples, which was carried into execution by an imperial commissioner, who however it was asserted was bribed, to spare the principal idol, named Marnas, and to wink at the entrance of the worshippers into the temple by a secret passage. To these events Jerome refers in a letter to Laeta (Hieron. *Ep.* vii. p. 54). The power of the idolaters however was by no means broken. They still remained the dominant section of the inhabitants, and were able to shut out Christians from all lucrative offices and to molest them in the enjoyment of their property. Porphyry took this so much to heart that he exhorted his metropolitan, John of Caesarea, to allow him to resign his see rather than witness evils he was unable to remedy. John consoled him, and promised to be his companion on a personal visit to Constantinople to obtain an order for the demolition not of the idols alone, as before, but of the temples themselves. After having visited a famous anchorite, named Procopius, at Rhodes, on their voyage, the two bishops arrived at Constantinople Jan. 7, 401. Chrysostom was then high in the empress Eudoxia's favour, and by his influence with her their suit was successful. In addition to the wished for orders for the destruction of the heathen shrines wrung by her from Arcadius, not without much difficulty, on the day of the baptism of their infant son (the future emperor Theodosius II.), an endowment and other privileges were secured for the Christians of Gaza and of Caesarea, and a large sum of money was granted for the erection of a church, and a hospice for strangers in the former city. The bishops reached Majuma, the port of Gaza, on May 1st, and were followed ten days afterwards by a commissioner named Cynegius, accompanied by the governor and a general officer with a large body of troops, by whom the imperial orders for the destruction of the temples was put into execution. In ten days the whole were pillaged and burnt, with the exception of the temple of Marnas. The stateliness of its architecture led to some hesitation whether it might not be desirable to spare it, and convert it into a Christian church. A solemn fast was ordered by Porphyrius, with the view

of discovering their duty in this matter. The sudden exclamation of a child of seven years, that it should be burnt to the ground was regarded as indicating the Divine will. The magnificent edifice was utterly destroyed, and on the ground it occupied the foundations of a cruciform church were laid according to a plan furnished by Eudoxia, who also according to her promise supplied the funds for its erection. The church was five years in building, and was dedicated by Porphyry, on Easter Day, 405 or 406, and called "Eudoxiana" after its foundress. Jerome refers to its erection (Hieron. in *Isaiam*, xvii. l. vii. tom. v. p. 86). The heathen population of Gaza, who were largely the majority, irritated at the high-handed destruction of their sacred buildings and at the spread of Christianity in the city, took occasion of some dispute between a leading pagan, Sampsychus by name, and the "oeconomus" of the church, to raise a tumult, in which several Christians were killed, and Porphyry himself barely escaped with his life. The episcopal palace was pillaged, and he had to take refuge in the house of an old woman, who, with her granddaughter, though still heathen, sheltered the bishop till the danger had passed. This kindness Porphyry repaid by converting them both, and admitting them to the church by baptism, the younger, named Salaphtha, becoming a deaconess, subsequently famous for her asceticism. Porphyry lived several years after the outbreak. We may certainly identify him with one of the two bishops of this name who attended the anti-Pelagian synod at Diospolis in 415. (August. in *Julian*. lib. i. c. 15). He died Feb. 26, 419 or 420, on which day he is commemorated both in the Greek and the Latin church. By his will he directed that a certain sum should be dispensed daily during Lent to the poor of the city, according to his custom during his life, and that in default the whole sum should devolve on the church of Caesarea. Porphyry is said to have been indefatigable in his instruction of the people of Gaza, adopting a simple and popular style, based entirely on Holy Scripture, without any parade of human eloquence. (Galland. *Bibl.* v. 259; Migne, *Patrol.* lxx. pp. 1211, ff.; Ceillier, *Aut. Eccles.* vi. 329; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* x. pp. 703-716.) [E. V.]

PORTIANUS (POURÇAIN), ST., abbat of the monastery which bore his name near Clermont in the first half of the 6th century. According to Gregory of Tours, who includes an account of him in the *Vitae Patrum* (cap. v.), he was originally the slave of a barbarian, i.e. a Frank, and running away many times to the neighbouring monastery, at length was made free and given up to the abbat. He entered the ranks of the clergy, and on the death of the abbat succeeded to his place, and was famous for the ingenuity of the torments he inflicted on himself. When Theoderic invaded and desolated Auvergne in 525, Portianus obtained from him the release of some of the prisoners. On his death, which probably took place about 527, he was buried in his own monastery. In the 10th century his body was raised from the earth. The head and part of the relics were afterwards stolen by Northmen and carried to

l'Aigle in Normandy, where the box containing them, preserved in the church of St. Martin, was opened in 1673. For the history of his monastery, which was reduced to the position of a dependent priory more than eight centuries ago, see *Gall. Christ.* ii. 371. His day is Nov. 24. [S. A. B.]

POSIDONIUS, priest and solitary at Bethlehem in the time of Palladius in the beginning of the 5th century. (Palladius, *Laus. Hist.* c. 38 and 39.) [J. G.]

POSSESSOR (1), African bishop, driven into exile by the Arians, and much esteemed by pope Hormisdas for remaining true to the catholic faith at Constantinople (Baron. *Ann.* A.D. 517, no. 26; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 618). In A.D. 517 (Apr. 5) the pope wrote to him to persevere in the faith (Horm. *Epp.* no. xv. ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 403), and in A.D. 520 (July 18) he wrote to the pope respecting a book by Faustus of Riez upon the doctrines of freewill and divine grace (*Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 481). To this Hormisdas replied (Aug. 13) with extreme caution concerning the doctrines in dispute, but with much feeling respecting the Scythian monks (Horm. *Epp.* no. xxx. ap. *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 490; Fleury, *H. E.* xxxi. cc. 50, 53; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 618, 631) [HORMISDAS MAXENTIUS (4)]. [J. G.]

POSSESSOR (2), bishop of Tarentaise, sent by Charlemagne A.D. 775, and, along with two other bishops, commissioned by pope Adrian I. to enquire and report upon the orders, etc., of Lullus of Mayence [LULLUS]. The pope complained to the emperor of an apparent slight from Possessor and the other envoys (Adrian, *Epp.* 41, 54; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 1212-5, xcvi. 297-9). But an explanation must have followed, for in A.D. 784, Possessor was archbishop, possibly of Embrun, and sat as royal commissioner with pope Adrian for enquiring into the dispute between the abbat Potho and his monks at Vulturum (Adrian, *Ep.* 20, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 1206, xcvi. 360-5; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 702). [J. G.]

POSSIDIUS, bishop of Calama, a town of Numidia, to the south-west of Hippo, between it and Cirta, but nearer to the former place (Aug. c. *Petil.* ii. 99; *Kalma*, Shaw, *Trav.* p. 64). He appears from his own account to have been a convert from paganism, and on his conversion to have become an inmate of the monastery at Hippo, probably about A.D. 390. From that time he lived in intimate friendship with St. Augustine until his death in 430. (Possid. *Vita Aug. praej.* and caps. 12, 31.) About A.D. 400 he became bishop of Calama, succeeding though, after an interval of time, and perhaps with an intermediate successor, Megalium, the ordainer of Augustine. He seems to have established a monastery there, and probably in the early days of his episcopate consulted Augustine on the subjects, (a) of ornaments to be used by men and women, and especially ear-rings worn as amulets; (b) of ordination of some one who had received Donatist baptism. To the first point Augustine replied without hesitation, condemning unequivocally the use of ornaments and especially paint in

persons unmarried and not intending to marry, but as to others dissuading haste and recommending discretion in treatment; but as to the second suspending his judgment, for, said he, "it is one thing to do a thing when you are obliged to do it, but another to recommend its being done." (Aug. *Epp.* 104, 4; & 245.) In 401 or 402 a council was held at Carthage, at which Possidius was present, and challenged Crispinus, Donatist bishop of Calama, but in vain, to discuss publicly the points at issue between the two parties. It was after this abortive meeting that Possidius, though he modestly conceals his own name, while on his way to visit a place in his diocese called Figulina, was attacked by Crispinus, a presbyter, and narrowly escaped with his life. An account of these transactions will be found above. [CRISPINUS (2), Vol. I. pp. 713, 714; see also Aug. *Ep.* 103; and Possid. *Vit.* 12.] In 407 he was one of a committee of seven appointed by Xanthippus, primate of Numidia, at the request of Maurentius, bishop of Tubursica, to consider and decide a question, of whose nature we are not informed, but which was at issue between himself and the seniors of Nova Germania. (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 34; Hardouin, *Conc.* ii. 922; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 185.) In 408 Possidius was again in trouble and personal danger, in consequence of the disturbances at Calama described above. [NECTARIUS (5).] In the following year, 409, on June 14, a council was held at Carthage, and a deputation of four bishops, Florentinus, Possidius, Praesidius, and Benenatus, was appointed to request the protection of the Emperor against the Donatists. We know that on this occasion Possidius was the bearer of a letter from Augustine to Paulinus of Nola, but nothing more is known as to the journey of the deputation or their interview, if any, with the Emperor, who was then at Ravenna. It is certain, however, that in 410, an edict was issued by Honorius on the same day, or nearly so, as that on which Rome was taken by Alaric, viz. Aug. 26, to Heraclian, Count of Africa, to restrain by penalties all enemies of the Christian faith, and another of a similar nature on Oct. 14 in the same year to Marcellinus, the same, no doubt, as the president of the conference in 411. (Aug. *Ep.* 95, i. 105, i; *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 51; and ii. 3; Baronius, 410, 48, 49.) At the conference Possidius was one of the seven Catholic managers, and in the discussion, though not taking a very prominent part, he showed wisdom, moderation, and a judicious desire to prevent unnecessary delay. (*Coll. Carth. ap. Mon. Vet. Don.* liii. 1; ii. 29; iii. 29, 148, 168, ed. Oberthür.) He was with Augustine at Hippo in 412 (Aug. *Ep.* 137, 20), and in 416 was present at the Council of Mileum and signed the letter sent on that occasion to pope Innocent concerning the Pelagian heresy. (Aug. *Ep.* 176.) He also joined with Augustine, Aurelius, Alypius and Evodius in a letter to the same on the same subject, in which mention is made of the two councils held in that year at Carthage and at Mileum. Replies to this letter and to the one from the Council of Mileum were made by Innocent in the same year. (Aug. *Ep.* 181, 182, 183.) In 418 he was present at the meeting or council of bishops held at Caesarea on Sept. 29, at which Emeritus was also present.

[EMERITUS (1) Vol. II. p. 107.] He is mentioned by St. Augustine as having brought to Calama, and placed in a memorial building there, some relics of St. Stephen by which many cures of disease were effected. This was about 425. (*Civ. D.* xii. 8, 12, 20.) When the Vandals invaded Africa he took refuge in Hippo with other bishops, and there attended on St. Augustine in his last illness until his death A.D. 430, in the third month of the siege. He has left a biographical sketch of the life of the illustrious bishop, whose unbroken friendship he enjoyed for forty years, his faithful ally and devoted admirer, and from which we derive many particulars of great interest as to his mode of life, and a description, simple and from its simplicity deeply pathetic and impressive, of his last days and death. Possidius does not appear to have been remarkable for superior ability, and he had more than once to deal with matters of great difficulty, and requiring unusual discretion, and in them he certainly showed great ferbearance and moderation; but it is plain that his chief function in life, so far as posterity can judge, was to be the friend of Augustine, always valued and trusted by him, and loyal to him to the end. Though there have been few men whose lives are written in their own works more fully than that of Augustine has been by himself, yet history and the Church would have lost much if we did not also possess the simple, modest, and trustworthy narrative gathered in great measure from Augustine himself, which Possidius has left behind him. It appears to have been published, not immediately after the death of Augustine, but before 439, as he speaks of Carthage and Cirta, as still exempt from capture by the barbarians, and it was in October of that year that Carthage was taken by Genseric. (Poss. c. 28; Clinton, *F. R.*) Besides the biographical memoir Possidius has also left a list of the works of Augustine which, though very full and compiled with great care, does not pretend to be complete, and of which some have not yet been discovered. It is given in the last volume of Migne's edition of the works of St. Augustine. Prosper relates in his Chronicle that Possidius, together with Novatus, Severianus, and other bishops of less note, resisted the attempts of Genseric to establish Arian doctrine in Africa, and was driven with them from his see A.D. 437. It has been believed, but on no noted authority, that he retired to Italy. The date of his death is unknown, but his memory is observed in some churches on May 17. (Baronius, 437, i; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 140; Ceillier, ix. 564; Tillemont, vol. xiii. 354; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, May 17.) [H. W. P.]

POSSIDONIUS (1), physician, in the reign of Valens and Valentinian I., was son of Philostorgius a physician, and obtained great fame at Alexandria. He attributed more effect to the human evil than to demoniac influences (Philostorgius, *E. H. B.* viii. p. 524, Camb. ed. 1720; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 509.) [J. G.]

POSSIDONIUS (2), a messenger employed by St. Cyril to carry letters to Caelestine of Rome (Cyrilli *Ep.* xl. ad fin.) A.D. 430; and again, when presbyter, by Dioscorus in 445, to carry a letter to Leo the Great. (Leonis *Ep.* ix. cap. 2, see Quesnel's note.) [C. G.]

POSTHUMIANUS (1), prefect of the praetorium at Constantinople, a Christian, and a friend of Gregory Nazianzen. Gregory wrote to him in 383, shortly after leaving Constantinople, on the occasion of the summoning of another council, entreating him to use his authority. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 71, p. 828.) Posthumianus is styled ὁ πρῶτος Ρωμαίων, by Libanius (*Ep.* 929). His name appears in several laws and ordinances of the year 383. (*Cod. Theod.* Gothofred, vi. p. 378.) [E. V.]

POSTHUMIANUS (2), a friend of Sulpicius Severus and Paulinus of Nola, was a native of Aquitania, and made at least two journeys to the East. After the first, when he made the acquaintance of Jerome at Bethlehem, he appears to have visited Campania in order to see Paulinus, and was the bearer of a letter from him to Jovius (S. Paulini *Epp.* 16 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 227). He then became acquainted with Sulpicius Severus, and after a second visit to Paulinus, bringing a letter from Severus (*Ep.* 27, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 306), sailed from Narbonne in A.D. 401 or 402 on a second voyage to the East. At Narbonne he met with Victor, the friend and messenger of Paulinus, on his way to him from Severus, but to whom he desired him to return before accomplishing his errand to Paulinus (*Paul. Ep.* 28, 3). Of this journey a full and interesting account is given in the first book of the Dialogues of Sulpicius Severus (*Patr. Lat.* xx. 183), in which Postumianus with Severus and Gallus are the speakers. In five days he reached Carthage, where he visited the tomb of St. Cyprian. Detained on the coast between Africa and Cyrene by stress of weather, he landed to explore the country, which was inhabited by a very primitive tribe, who however were Christians, and was hospitably entertained by a priest. Alexandria was then convulsed by the quarrel between the patriarch Theophilus and the monks about the writings of Origen, and Postumianus went on by land to Bethlehem, where he spent six months with Jerome, whom he praises highly both for his virtues and his learning. Postumianus then returned to Alexandria, and thence went to the Thebaid, and spent a year and seven months visiting the monasteries and hermitages in the deserts, where he heard a number of extraordinary stories about the monks and anchorites. He also penetrated into the Sinaitic peninsula, saw the Red Sea, and ascended Mount Sinai, whose top he was informed was inaccessible. After an absence of three years he returned, taking thirty days for the voyage from Alexandria to Marseilles. At the time the Dialogues were written he contemplated another journey to the East, and Severus exhorts him to visit Paulinus on the way, and convey to him a copy of the Dialogues that he may be informed of the virtues and miracles of St. Martin (*Dialog.* iii. 17). We have no further information about Postumianus, but he may have been the priest of that name, who was present at the death of Paulinus (Uranus, *Epist. in Patr. Lat.* liii. 861.) [F. D.]

POSTHUMIANUS (3), senator at Rome. A ship, belonging to Secundinianus, had been impressed to carry corn from Sardinia to the public granaries of Rome, and in consequence of a scarcity

was obliged to sail before the summer. A storm coming on, the sailors put off in a boat either to escape or to lay out additional anchors, the boat was capsized, and the whole of the crew lost, except one Valgius, who had been below, and was consequently left behind. Paulinus relates how the ship with Valgius alone on board was miraculously preserved, and having been driven first within sight of the lighthouse of the port of Rome, and then across to Africa, after twenty-three days approached the coast of Lucania, and was towed to land by two fishing-boats. Some incidents strangely resemble Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, especially the angelic host who worked the ship, and were seen departing by the fishermen as they approached her. The ship was seized by the procurator of Postumianus, the owner of the land where she came ashore, and the cargo carried off. Secundinianus vainly sought redress before the local tribunal, as the procurator at first resisted, and then fled to Rome whither Secundinianus and Valgius, who had since been baptized by the name of Victor, were following him, when Paulinus saw them. He sent by them the letter from which we learn the story to Macarius [MACARIUS (23)], asking him to use his influence with Postumianus to obtain redress. (S. Paulini *Epp.* 49 in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 407.) [F. D.]

POTAMIAENA (June 28), one of the most celebrated of the martyrs at Alexandria in the persecution of Severus, being a virgin distinguished alike for her beauty, her chastity and her courage. Eusebius, who tells her story (*H. E.* vi. 5), relates that she was cruelly tortured, and that death was finally inflicted by burning pitch poured slowly about her from feet to head. The version of her story given by Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* 3) is that, the judge having ordered her to be cast naked into a caldron of boiling pitch, she begged to retain her clothes, on condition of submitting to the prolonged torment of being let down gradually. Her mother Marcella suffered with her. Basilides, the officer who led her to death, treated her with humanity, and checked the crowds who would have insulted her. She thanked him, and promised him that when she had departed, she would ask her Lord to give him a fitting reward. Shortly after being called on for some reason to take an oath, he refused, declaring himself to be a Christian. But when some of the brethren came to see him and enquired the cause of this sudden and singular resolve, he is said to have declared that Potamiaena for three days after her martyrdom, standing before him at night, placed a crown upon his head, and said she had entreated the Lord on his account, and she had obtained her prayer, and that ere long she would take him with her. On this the brethren gave him the seal in the Lord; and he, bearing a distinguished testimony to the Lord, was beheaded. [G. T. S.]

POTAMIUS (1), Priscillianist. [JOANNES (555).]

POTAMIUS (2), bishop of Braga, was present at the eighth council of Toledo in November A.D. 653. At the tenth council of Toledo in December, A.D. 656, a document signed by him was presented, in which he accused

himself in confused language of having committed immorality with a woman. The bishops considered the letter in secret session, and summoned him before them. He declared the statements in the letter were true and had not been made under compulsion, and added that he had for the last nine months laid aside his office, and had done penance in a cave. The bishops in consideration of his penitence and voluntary confession allowed him to retain the rank of bishop, but deposed him from his see, and appointed FRUCTUOSUS (10) in his stead, and ordered him to do penance the rest of his life. (*Esp. Sag.* xv. 136; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 385, 418; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Sp.* ii. (2), 132.) [F. D.]

POTAMIUS (3), first known bishop of Ulyssipona (Lisbon). According to the *Libellus Precum*, c. 9 (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 89), whose statements however must be received with great caution, he had been formerly a prominent defender of orthodoxy, but had been induced by a present of an estate from the emperor Constantius to embrace Arianism, and was accordingly excluded from communion as a heretic by HOSIUS, and it was in consequence of his complaints that Hosius was summoned to Sirmium in A.D. 356. In any case he and Hosius were there together, and according to Hilary (*De Syn.* 11, in *Patr. Lat.* x. 487) drew up the second "Formula of Sirmium." This statement, as far as regards Hosius, is generally discredited, and Gams (*Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (1), 237) argues with much probability, from the silence of Phoebadius (*C. Arianos*), and the extreme unlikeness in style to the known writings of Potamius, that it is also untrue as regards Potamius. It seems undoubted however that he subscribed the Formula and took an active part in its circulation (Phoebadius, c. 5). An obscure passage in the letter of pope LIBERIUS preserved by Hilary (*Op. Hist. Frag.* 4), represents Potamius as opposing the pope at the council of Ariminum, but whether he did so, as an Arian, or as a Catholic on the ground that Liberius had fallen into heresy, is uncertain. From the way in which he is there coupled with the well-known Arian bishop EPICETUS (6), the former seems most probable. At any rate he appears after the council of Ariminum to have returned, or professed to return, to orthodoxy, and sent to Athanasius a letter written in the most stilted and pompous style. According to the *Libellus Precum* (c. 11) Potamius died on the way to take possession of the estate given him by Constantius, but it has already been remarked that its statements are of very doubtful authority, and here the death of Potamius is coupled with the alleged miraculous deaths of HOSIUS and FLORENTIUS (8), as an instance of divine judgment. Besides the letter to Athanasius two sermons by Potamius are extant, on the raising of Lazarus and the martyrdom of the prophet Isaiah (*Patr. Lat.* viii. 1110), both full of hideous descriptions, and written in a pompous and almost unintelligible jargon. (Tillemont, *M. E.* vi. 417; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Sp.* ii. (1), 224, 315; *Esp. Sag.* xiv. 178.) [F. D.]

POTAMO (1) (Ποτάμων), bishop of Heraclea in Egypt, and confessor. He became bishop there about A.D. 311, and in the persecution

under Maximin lost an eye (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 581). He proved a steady friend of Athanasius, and upholder of orthodoxy against the Arians. He took part in the council at Nice A.D. 325, but is best known as having attended, along with the other Egyptian bishops, at the council of Tyre to support Athanasius (*supra*, i. 185 B). Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxxviii. 8) tells how he there reproached Eusebius of Caesarea: "Do you sit there as a judge of the innocent Athanasius? When you and I were imprisoned together and I was maimed in our Lord's cause, how could you have escaped without betraying it?" When Gregory the Cappadocian was intruded upon Alexandria in the place of Athanasius, and was making a visitation of his province, he proceeded with great violence at Heraclea, and the aged Potamo died in the hands of his soldiery, A.D. 345 (Hardouin, i. 314, 315, 544; Tillem. *H. E.* vi. 273, vii. 19, viii. 18, 37, 278, ed. 1732.) [J. G.]

POTAMO (2), legate from Cyril's council at Alexandria, A.D. 430, to pope Celestine [DANIEL (4)], and in the following year addressed by St. Cyril. (Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 430, c. 50.) [J. G.]

POTENTIANUS, second bishop of Sens. [POTENTINUS.]

POTENTINUS (1) (POTENTIANUS), second bishop of Sens, is counted among the preachers that were sent into Gaul from Rome in the second half of the third century with St. Dionysius of Paris. Usuard (*Mart.* Dec. 31) gives Sens as the place of his preaching and martyrdom, but does not call him bishop; the *Acts of Savinianus*, however (Mabillon, *A. S. B.* VI. i. 254-6, and *Ann. Ben.* xxxiii. 58; Surlus, *Vitae SS.* xii. 384), relate how the company of preachers, headed by Savinianus, came from Rome, turned many from idolatry at Chartres and Sens, and were at last put to death, but not until Savinianus had been made bishop of Sens and Potentinus his successor. [SAVINIANUS.] In the ninth and again in the eleventh century the remains of the martyrs of Sens were elevated and re-enshrined. His feast is Dec. 31 (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 98; vi. 227-8; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 200; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 4.) [J. G.]

POTENTINUS (2), a friend addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris (*lib. v. ep. 11*; Tillem. xvi. 209). [C. H.]

POTENTINUS (3), probably a Romanized Briton with St. Columbanus at Luxeuil and in his banishment. He settled at Coutances in Normandy, where he had a monastery in the beginning of the 7th century (Jonas, *Vit. S. Col.* c. 20). Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 537-8) calls him a Scot, and says he wrote *Ad monachos collectos* and *Epistolae ad Columbanum*. [J. G.]

POTENTIUS, bishop in Mauritania Caesariensis, was sent by pope Leo I. c. A.D. 446, to inquire into the irregular ordinations said to have taken place in his province in connection with the Vandal incursions, to report upon and remedy them (Leo, *Ep.* xii.; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. liv. 645, 653; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 198-9). [J. G.]

POTHINUS (PHOTINUS, Greg. Tur. FOTINUS), martyr, first bishop of Lyons in the second century. Who consecrated him, and in what year is unknown, though a desire to find an apostolic commencement for the bishops of this see has suggested to different writers the names of St. Peter, St. John and St. Polycarp as authors of Pothinus's mission. His name makes it probable that he was a Greek. Of his episcopate we have no record beyond the account of his martyrdom, with forty-seven others, at the hands of pagans, contained in the letter of the Christians of Lyons and Vienne to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, which Eusebius preserves. Oppressed with the infirmities of more than ninety years, he was dragged by soldiers before the Tribunal, where he comforted himself with dignity. To the question of the President what the Christians' God might be, he replied, "If thou wert worthy, thou shouldst know." The blows and ill-usage of the crowd as he was carried thence to prison caused his death two days later. His successor in the see was St. Irenaeus. (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 1; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* i. 27; *Mirac. lib. i. de Glor. Mart.* 49, 50 seqq. *Gall. Christ.* iv. 4.) [S. A. B.]

POTITUS, a Marcionite teacher, mentioned by Rhodo (*ap. Euseb. H. E.* v. 13). See the article MARCION, Vol. III. 819a. [G. S.]

POTO, abbat of St. Vincent ad Vulturnum. All that is known about him is derived from two letters of pope Hadrian to Charles the Great in May or June 781. (*Cod. Car.* 68, 69, in Jaffé, *Mon. Car.* 212.) There had been quarrels in the monastery, and apparently a double election of Autpert and Poto as abbat. Charles had referred the dispute to Hadrian, who summoned the rivals and the monks to appear before him. Autpert died suddenly on the way. Before Hadrian a new charge of treason was brought against Poto by the monk Rodicausus, who said that he had left the church and refused to join in singing Psalm 53 (54 in A. V.), and that he had spoken disrespectfully of Charles and the Franks. Three monks of Autpert's party also accused Poto of imprisoning them to prevent their going to the king. After a three days' trial, the pope considered Poto was not guilty, and called on him to swear that he had never uttered such words, or had been, or ever would be unfaithful to Charles. Ten of the monks, five being Lombards and five Franks, were also called on to swear that they had never heard him say anything treasonable. They all, however, requested leave to go to Charles himself, which was granted. In a second letter the pope mentions that all the monks had requested him to intercede with Charles for Poto, which he accordingly does, and asks for his restoration to his abbacy. Here our information breaks off. If the *Chronicon Vulturdense* (in Muratori, i. 2, 365) is to be trusted, Poto was not immediately pardoned, as Hainrad is there given as Autpert's successor. He died before March 787, as Paulus was then abbat (Sickel. *Acta Kar.* ii. 48.) [F. D.]

PRAECORDIUS, priest at Corbie, near Soissons, in the department of Aisne in France. Colgan (*Acta SS.* 230-2) gives *De Praecordii* CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

translatione ex supplemento Belfortii, and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. i. 196) *De S. Praecordio presbytero Corbeiae et Valliaci in Gallia* follow Colgan. The *Auctaria* of Usuard also notice him at Feb. 1, calling him presbyter, martyr, confessor, and "in Vastiaco" (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 721-2). Praecordius was a Scot and flourished in the 5th or 6th century, but his history is unknown. The translation of his relics, real or supposed, into a gold and silver shrine in the church of St. Peter, Corbie, took place in the time of abbat Berengarius, before A.D. 943. His natale is Feb. 1, and *translatio* June 5. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* ii. 244-5.)

[J. G.]

PRAEDESTINATUS. The writer known under this name is the author of an anonymous work, first published in 1643 from a MS. in the Cathedral Library of Rheims, by Sirmond, who somewhat inappropriately gave the book its title from those against whom the work was directed. The book has been several times printed since, as for instance in the Lyons *Bibl. Max. Pat.* vol. xxvii., by Galland (*Bibl. Lat.* vol. x.), by Migne (*Pat. Lat.* liii.), and the first book by Oehler in his *Corpus Haeresiologicum*. Oehler enumerates four extant MSS. of the work beside the one used by Sirmond.

The work consists of three books preceded by an introduction, in which the author complains that men were passing themselves off as fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of faith, who really were most treacherous enemies of the church. These men taught that certain were by God's foreknowledge so predestinated to death that neither Christ's passion nor baptism, nor faith, nor hope, nor charity could help them. They might fast, pray, and give alms, but nothing could avail them, because they had not been predestinated to life. On the other hand, those who had received this predestination might neglect and despise all righteousness, yet the gate of life would be opened to them without knocking, while against others who knocked, nay shouted for admission, it would remain firmly closed. A work by one of these heretics had lately fallen into the writer's hands. This work was a whited sepulchre, within full of all uncleanness, but bearing on the outside a false ascription to Augustine, an orthodox doctor, who had ever been not a patron but an opponent of heresy. The book had been brought to the knowledge of pope Caeclestine of most blessed memory, who held it in execration, and condemned it to perpetual silence. But since then the book, though forbidden to be read publicly, had been handed about privately, and that almost as if it were a creed to be implicitly received, rather than a treatise admitting of controversial discussion. Thus it had become necessary to drag it to light and give it a complete refutation. This accordingly is done in the present treatise, consisting of three books. In the first the author clears himself of all suspicion of sympathy with heresy of any kind by enumerating and reprobating the ninety heresies by which up to his time Christ's truth had been perverted, the last and worst of these being that of the Predestinarians. And here it is useful to mention, because it determines limits to the date of the book that in this list the last

but one is the Nestorian heresy. From the mention of Nestorianism, and the silence about Eutychianism, we may infer that the book with which we are concerned was written between the years 431 and 449; and this was just the period when the semi-Pelagian controversy was most actively going on. The second book contains the pseudo-Augustinian treatise already mentioned, which is refuted in detail in the third book. The author professes that the heretical catalogue of his first book has been epitomised from the treatises of Hyginus,* Polycrates, Africanus, Hesiodus, Epiphanius, and Philaster who, he tells us, wrote against different heresies in this chronological order. Now it is remarkable that the first four of these confutations of heresy which the author claims to have used, are not mentioned by anyone else, but still more remarkable that the writer is quite silent as to his obligations to the tract on heresies which Augustine addressed to Quodvultdeus, although his list of ninety heresies agrees, article by article, with Augustine's list of eighty-eight, only with the addition of the two later heresies, Nestorianism and Predestinarianism, and although the substance of each article is manifestly taken from Augustine. The unfavourable suspicions of the writer's literary morality thus excited at the outset are confirmed as we proceed. When a writer makes a number of false statements, which form part of a system, and for which no authority can be produced, we are justified in setting them down as his own wilful invention. Now in this book it is the author's plan to mention in connexion with each heresy the name of the orthodox writer by whom it is refuted. We are in this way told of a number of personages of whom mention is made by no one else, Diodorus of Crete, who refuted the Secundians, Philo who refuted the Alogi, Theodotus of Pergamus, who refuted the Colorbasians, Crato, a Syrian bishop, who refuted the Theodotians, Tranquillus, who refuted the Noetians, Euphranon of Rhodes, who refuted the Severians, and a host of others of whom we might have expected to hear elsewhere if they had been more than imaginary personages. And when Praedestinatus ascribes the confutation of heretics to real persons his assertions are usually chronologically impossible. Thus he makes the apostle Thomas confute Saturninus, the apostle Barnabas in Cyprus confute the Carpocratians; he makes Alexander, who was bishop of Rome at the very beginning of the 2nd century, write a book against Heracleon, who lived in the latter half of the century; the Tertullianists are condemned by Soter, who must have been dead thirty years before Tertullian separated from the church; the imaginary heresiologist, Hesiod of Corinth, is made to be the bishop who first raised opposition to Arius, and in answer to whose prayers that heretic died. It is impossible to study the statements of Praedestinatus without being soon made to feel that we have before us, not inaccurate history but unscrupulous and unskillful invention. And it can only be from want of acquaintance with the charac-

* In consequence of this mention of Hyginus at the beginning of our work, Hincmar, of Rheims, who cites it (probably from the very copy used by Sirmund), ascribes the authorship to Hyginus.

ter of this writer that he is ever cited as a historical authority.

A knowledge of the writer's mode of proceeding in the first book is especially necessary for judging of the character of the second. The statement that the treatise therein contained had been condemned by pope Caelestine has been questioned by many critics, not only on the ground that no one else mentions this condemnation, but also because it does not harmonise with the tone of Caelestine's authentic utterance on this controversy, viz., his letter to the Gallic bishops when consulted by Prosper and Hilary (Benedictine Augustine, x. 131, Ap.). But when we further take into consideration that the first book contains seven other alleged condemnations of heresy by popes, some of which are chronologically impossible, and none confirmed by any other authority, we find ourselves unable to give the least credence to what is told of Caelestine. But this raises another question. It is a common artifice with forgers of documents of alleged antiquity to anticipate the objection, why should these things be heard of now for the first time, by the statement that for some reason their circulation had been kept secret. And in the present case there is good ground to believe that the story, that the treatise of the second book had been kept private on account of its condemnation by Caelestine, is no more than an excuse, made in order that an invention of the author's own might be accepted as an approved statement of the views of the asserters of predestination. The following specimens of the work ought to leave no doubt as to its character. "Those whom God has once destined to life, even though they are neglectful, though they sin, though they do not will, shall yet against their will be conducted to life; but those whom He has predestined to death, although they run, although they hasten, yet labour in vain. Judas daily heard the word of life, he daily lived in the society of our Lord, he daily heard His admonitions, daily witnessed His miracles, but because he was predetermined to death, he was suddenly overthrown by a single blow. Saul, on the other hand, who daily stoned the Christians, and laid waste their churches, was suddenly made a vessel of election, because he had been predestined to life. Why fearest thou then, thou who continuest in sin? If God vouchsafes it thou shalt be holy. Or why art thou who livest a holy life overburthened with concern, as if thy concern could preserve thee? If God does not will it, thou shalt not fall. Wilt thou who art holy, and takest pains that thou mayest not fall, who busiest thyself day and night with prayer, fasting, reading of Scripture, and all manner of holy discipline, wilt thou be saved by these efforts of thine? Wilt thou be holier than Judas? Cease, O man, cease to be careful for thy virtue, and securely rely on the will of God." The reader can judge whether this is the language of one desirous to commend the doctrine of predestination or of an opponent of that doctrine, anxious to represent that it must lead to a relaxation of all morality. And when the document is presented to us by one who has already shewn himself to be quite devoid of literary honesty, it is an excess of charity to acquit him on this occasion, as Neander does

(iv. 411), of all attempt at imposture. Very little need be said on the question, which after all is a verbal one, whether the sect of Predestinarian heretics (Praedestinati), against which this book was directed, ever existed. In the 5th century disputes concerning the Divine decrees, the extreme on both sides branded their opponents as heretics; but however faulty the views of either might be, they neither desired to separate from the church, nor did they incur excommunication from it. Our author no doubt had been stigmatised by his adversaries, not as a half but a whole Pelagian, for the name semi-Pelagian is of later invention. In the first book he vindicates his orthodoxy by anathematising not only the Pelagian but all other heresies; and when he retorts on his opponents by a charge of heresy, although he is too respectful to include St. Augustine in his accusation, yet if Predestinarianism be a heresy, he cannot consistently acquit that saint of it. (See SEMI-PELAGIANISM.)

One MS. of the work with which we are concerned assigns to the author the name Primasius. This appears to be merely an annotator's mistake, arising out of the fact, that Isidore of Seville (*De Script. Eccl.* ix.) had stated that Primasius had written a treatise against heresies in three books. But the description given by Isidore of the contents of the three books does not answer to the present books; the work of Primasius was addressed to a bishop Fortunatus, of whom there is no mention in Praedestinatus; besides which, as we have already remarked, Praedestinatus wrote before the appearance of Eutychianism, and Primasius about a century later. The true clue to the authorship of our treatise was furnished by Sirmond, who gave a long list of coincidences, to which it would be possible to add several more, between this work and the Commentary on the Psalms by the writer known as ARNOBIUS JUNIOR. The doctrinal position of the two writers is the same. Both are inspired by the same hatred of the Predestinarians, and they refute them by the same arguments and from the same texts of Scripture. Thus both prove that God wishes all men to be saved, from Ps. xlix. 1; both argue that it is not God who puts men away from Him, but men who put themselves away from Him, from the words, "qui se longe faciunt a te peribunt," Ps. lxxiii. 27; both prove that it does not follow that because fornication is a sin, sexual passion is in itself an evil thing, by the argument that it is a good thing to receive the Lord's Body, but wrong if one does so who has not been baptized; a good thing to offer priestly sacrifice, but bad if he who offers usurps a power not granted to him; so in all cases a thing in itself good becomes evil if done out of order by one not properly authorised. In this last case especially the coincidence seems to me more than casual. Both also employ the formula, "Nota tibi Praedestinate." No account of these coincidences is so simple as that the two works belong to the same author. Concerning Arnobius Junior, see the article, Vol. I. p. 170. It may be added to what is there stated that Mai has published (*Spicileg. Rom.* v. 101) a letter of Cyril of Alexandria against the Nestorians, which purports to have been translated by this Arnobius. [G. S.]

PRAEJECTUS (1) (PROJECTUS), bishop of Aquae Tibilitanae, Thibilis, or Tibilis, a place in Numidia, south-west of Hippo, near the river Abus (*Seibus*) *Hammam*, Shaw, p. 64. He is mentioned as having brought to that place some relics of St. Stephen, through which a blind woman was restored to sight. (*Aug. Civ. D.* xxii. 8, 10; Morelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 79.) [H. W. P.]

PRAEJECTUS (2), bishop of Narnia. Gregory the Great on the occasion of a pestilence there in A.D. 591 exhorted him to use his utmost efforts for the conversion of the people there, whether Lombards or Romans (*Epp.* ii. 2). He died before A.D. 595, as his successor attended the synod of Rome in that year. (*App. ad S. Greg. Epp.* 5.) [F. D.]

PRAEJECTUS (3) (PRIE, PRIEST, PRIX, PROJECTUS), Jan. 25, elected c. 665 bishop of Clermont, son of Gondolenus and Helidia, belonging to a noble family in Auvergne. Upon the see of Clermont falling vacant, there was a general desire that Genesisius, count of Auvergne, a man highly esteemed for his virtues, should succeed; but this nobleman declined, on the ground of the canons forbidding the elevation of laymen to bishoprics, and strongly recommended Praejectus, who was accordingly appointed, and proved a most zealous and munificent prelate. By his counsels count Genesisius, who was wealthy and childless, founded a monastery in the suburbs of Clermont, while he himself built another on land given for the purpose, besides a hospital on his own domain. An unprincipled nobleman, Hector count of Marseille, sought to divert some of the funds given by a lady named Claudia to these foundations, but was baffled by law, and on a charge of conspiracy against the king suffered death. Hector's relations, being determined to revenge themselves on Praejectus, hired assassins, who slew him at a place called Volovicus, in his own diocese, c. A.D. 674. He was buried in the place of his martyrdom, and Rusticus succeeded in the see. The next bishop, Avitus, built a church and monastery at the tomb, and the name of the saint is famous throughout France. Two anonymous lives are given by Mabillon, *A. S. B.* ii. 640 sq.; Surius, *Vit. SS.* i. 418 sq.; Boll. *A. SS.* Jan. iii. 244. The Lives seem to be early, and embody the general tradition. (Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 670-3; Vincentius Bellov. *Spec. Hist.* xxiv. 119; Fleury, *H. E.* xxxix. cc. 49, 50; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 597.) To Praejectus when a deacon, or to a deacon of the same name, there are attributed the Lives of Austremonius, first bishop of Clermont, and of the martyrs Cassius, Victorinus, Anatolianus, Liminianus and others, but they are not extant, and those under these names belong probably to the ninth century. (Boll. *A. SS.* Mai. iii. 453; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 93, 196-7; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 615-17; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 779, generally accepting them as the work of the bishop.) [J. G.]

PRAESIDIUS, as a deacon, bearer of a letter from St. Jerome to St. Augustine, A.D. 403, afterwards, as a priest, requested by Augustine to deliver a letter to St. Jerome, and endeavour

to appease his displeasure towards him. (Hieron. *Ep.* 103, 1; Aug. *Ep.* 74.) The same name appears among the bishops attending the Council of Mileum, A.D. 416. (Aug. *Ep.* 176.)

[H. W. P.]

PRAETEXTATA, wife of Hymettius. [HYMETTIUS; EUSTOCHIUM.] [W. H. F.]

PRAETEXTATUS (1), Donatist bishop of Assuris or Assurae, a municipal town of proconsular Africa, thirty miles from Musti, and twelve from Terebentina (Ant. *Itin.* 49, 4), the same as Absuris or Azuris of Pliny (H. N. 5, 4, 29), perhaps Ἀσσυρος of Ptolemy, iv. 3, 30, perhaps *Kisser*, Shaw, p. 115. His history, as one of the ordainers of Maximian, and in the subsequent transactions, is so closely connected with that of Felicianus, that the reader may be referred almost entirely to that article. He died about 409, and was succeeded by Rogatus. (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 39, 45; *c. Petil.* i. 10, 11; *Ep.* 108, 5; *Ep. c. Don.* 18, 46; *de Gest. cum Emer.* 9. FELICIANUS (4), vol. ii. p. 475.) [H. W. P.]

PRAETEXTATUS (2), eighth bishop of Apt, can scarcely be the Praetextus to whom, among other bishops, the presbyter Placidus addressed his letter after the council of Arles, A.D. 475 (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1044). He was present at the councils of Epaon, A.D. 517 (*Ib.* iv. 1582), Arles, A.D. 524 (*Ib.* iv. 1623), Orange, A.D. 529 (*Ib.* iv. 1673), and Arles, A.D. 541 (*Ib.* v. 388). Baronius (*Ann.* A.D. 545, c. 7) is of opinion that it was on the conduct of this Praetextatus for some irregularity in ordinations that Pope Vigilius (*Ib.* v. 321; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxix. 29) issued his commission to Auxanius and others to make enquiries (*Gall. Christ.* i. 351; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 114, 146). [J. G.]

PRAETEXTATUS (3), ST., seventeenth bishop of Rouen between Flavius and Melantius, circ. A.D. 549-589, is rather a prominent personage in the pages of Gregory of Tours. He was strongly suspected and accused of assisting Chilperic's son, Meroveus, whom he had received from the font in infancy, in his plots against his father's crown. It is certain that in defiance of the canons he married him to queen Brunehilde, the widow of his uncle, a proceeding which gained him the implacable hatred of Chilperic and Fredegund. In A.D. 577 he was summoned by Chilperic before a council of forty-five bishops at Paris to answer these charges. The narrative of the proceedings forms one of the most graphic recitals in early French history (*Hist. Franc.* v. 19). Gregory alone ventured to defend his cause, but could not save him from banishment. It is a question whether he was formally deposed, though Melantius was consecrated to the diocese. In A.D. 584, however, after the king's death he returned to his see amid the acclamations of the people. But the enmity of Fredegund, whom he rebuked for her crimes, was unappeased, and on a Sunday, variously given as the 23rd and 24th of February and 14th of April, 586, he was stabbed in his church during service, and soon after expired. Melantius, who was accused of privy to the murder, resumed his episcopate, circ. A.D. 589. Praetextatus was present at the third Council of Paris in A.D. 554, the second of

Tours in A.D. 566, and the second of Mâcon in A.D. 585. As one who perished by violence, he was for long honoured as a martyr in the church of Rouen. His day is Feb. 24. Gregory mentions some prayers he composed during his exile, and read to the bishops assembled at the second council of Mâcon, but they did not meet with general approval. (Greg. *Tur. Hist. Franc.* v. 19; vii. 16; viii. 20, 31, 41; ix. 20; Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 464-8; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 10, 11; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 351, 352; Ceillier, xi. 322.)

[S. A. B.]

PRAGMATIUS (1), a bishop in Gaul in the latter half of the 5th century, addressed in a letter by Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* vi. 2). Some have identified him with Pragmatius the 11th bishop of Autun who subscribed the council of Épaune in 517, but probably incorrectly (see *Gall. Christ.* iv. 341); while Ceillier says Bourges is believed to have been his see, but it is not apparent on what grounds (x. 390). He must be distinguished from PRAGMATIUS (2).

[S. A. B.]

PRAGMATIUS (2), an orator and man of letters in Gaul, who flourished in the latter half of the 5th century, seemingly at or near Vienne. He was a friend of Sapaudus and of Sidonius Apollinaris. According to the latter, who eulogizes him in the highest terms (*Epist.* v. 10), his eloquence induced Priscus Valerianus, the prefect of Gaul, to accept him as a son-in-law, and associate him in his official labours. Nothing remains of his works (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 580-1; 499).

[S. A. B.]

PRAPIDAS, a solitary of Cappadocia, a chorepiscopus, who at an advanced age presided over the hospital for the poor founded by Basil at Caesarea (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 34).

[E. V.]

PRAXEAS is a somewhat mysterious heretic, about whom various theories have been held. He was a Monarchian and Patripassian. Tertullian wrote a treatise against him and places his scene of activity first of all at Rome, but never mentions Noetus, Epigonus, Cleomenes, Sabelius or Callistus. While on the other hand Hippolytus, who denounces these in his controversial works for the very same tenets, never once mentions Praxeas as teaching at Rome or anywhere else. Some have regarded the word Praxeas as simply a nick-name. Thus De Rossi (*Bullet.* 1866, p. 70) identifies him with Epigonus, Hagemann (*Gesch. der Röm. Kirche.* s. 2:4) with Callistus. Döllinger however (*Hippol. u. Kallist.* s. 198) and Lipsius (*Chronolog. der Röm. Bisch.* s. 175) maintain that Praxeas was a real person who first of all started the Monarchian and Patripassian heresy in Rome, but so long before the age of Hippolytus that his name and memory had faded in that city. They fix his period of activity in Rome during the earliest years of Victor, A.D. 189-198, or even the later years of his predecessor Eleutherus. This explanation, however, seems to ignore the fact, that Hippolytus must have been a full-grown man all through Victor's episcopate, as he expressly asserts (*Refut.* ix. 6) that he and Callistus were about the same age. Praxeas remained but a short time in Rome, and the shortness of his stay offers a better explanation of Hippolytus' silence.

He then proceeded to Carthage, where he disseminated his views. Tertullian in his treatise (*adver. Prax.*) attacks the heresy under the name of Praxeas, the local teacher, but was really attacking Zephyrinus and Callistus. The facts of his life we gather from Tertullian's notices of him in cap. i. of the treatise just named. He was a confessor from Asia Minor, where he had been imprisoned for the faith. Asia Minor was then the seed-plot of the Monarchian views. He came to Rome when the Montanist party had just gained over the pope to their side. Praxeas converted the pope, back to his own opinion, which was hostile to the Montanists. The latest critics are indeed all agreed that the pope so converted by Praxeas was Eleutherus, cf. Bonwetsch's *Montanismus*, s. 174; Hilgenfeld's *Ketzergeschichte*, p. 569. Dr. Salmon, on the other hand, maintains that Zephyrinus was the pope whom Praxeas converted to his views. [MONTANUS, t. iii. p. 940.] By this, says Tertullian, Praxeas did a twofold service for the devil at Rome, "he drove away prophecy and he introduced heresy. He put to flight the Paraclete and he crucified the Father." He then went to Carthage, where he induced some to adopt his opinions. Tertullian opposed him prior to A.D. 202, according to Hilgenfeld, l. c. p. 618, and converted Praxeas himself, who acknowledged his error in a document extant among the Catholic party when Tertullian wrote his treatise. Praxeas then seems to have disappeared from Carthage, while Tertullian himself joined the Montanists. The controversy some years later broke out afresh, spreading itself doubtless from Rome, and then Tertullian wrote his treatise, which he nominally addressed against Praxeas as the best known expositor of these views at Carthage, but really directed against the Patripassian system in general. Hilgenfeld, l. c. p. 619, dates this work about the year A.D. 206; Harnack, about A.D. 210, i.e. about twenty-five years after the first arrival of Praxeas in Rome, while Dr. Salmon in the place just cited dates it after the death of Callistus in A.D. 222; so great is the uncertainty about the chronology of the movement. Harnack's article on *Monarchianismus* in t. x. of the new edition of Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie* contains a good exposition of the relation of Praxeas to the Patripassian movement; cf. Lipsius *Tertullian's Schrift wider Praxeas in Jahrb. für deutsche Theolog.* t. xiii. (1869) s. 701-724. Among patristic writers the only ones who mention Praxeas are pseudo-Tertullian; August. *de Haer.* 41; Praedestin. 41, and Gennad. *de Eccles. dog.* 4. [G. T. S.]

PRAXEDIS, ST. Her cult, like that of her alleged sister, Pudentiana, was exceedingly ancient at Rome, her church being one of importance before the end of the 4th century (LAURENTIUS (10), Vol. III. 629). Unfortunately, the only information about her is contained in Acta purporting to be written by the priest Pastor, the brother of pope Pius I., which, however, were plainly composed at a much later date, and are full of anachronisms and mistakes (Tillemont, *M. E.* ii. 615). Whether there is any, and if so, what basis of fact underlying the Acta it seems impossible to decide. St. Praxedis is commemorated on July 21st, and with her sister on May

19th. (*Acta SS. Mai.* iv. 296, Jul. v. 130; *Bull. di Arch. Crist.* 1867, 49.) [F. D.]

PRAYLIUS (PRAYLLUS), bishop of Jerusalem 416-425, 43rd in succession, succeeded John after December 415 (Clinton, *F. R.*). According to Theodoret (*H. E.* v. 38) he was distinguished by great mildness of disposition, in keeping with the supposed derivation of his name from *πραΰς*, *ἀνὴρ τῷ ὄντι φερώνυμος*. Praylius is only known to us in connection with the Pelagian controversy. When, after the indecisive synod at Jerusalem under the presidency of his predecessor John, A.D. 415, by which the decision as to Pelagius's orthodoxy was remitted to Rome, and that of Lydda and Diospolis at the close of the same year under Eulogius of Caesarea, which acknowledged Pelagius and Caelestius as members of the Catholic church, Caelestius visited Rome in 417, he brought with him, together with Pelagius's confession of faith, a letter from Praylius, who had in the meanwhile succeeded John as bishop of Jerusalem, testifying to the soundness of Pelagius's doctrine. These documents addressed to Innocent were delivered to his successor Zosimus, and by him communicated to Aurelius of Carthage and the other African bishops Sept. 21, 417, in a letter declaring Pelagius's orthodoxy, and referring to the testimony of Praylius: "qui causae enixius astipulator intervenit." (Zosim. *Epist.* i.; Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 1561.) Before long both Zosimus and Praylius saw how they had been deceived by Pelagius, and reversing their former policy, Zosimus sent a circular letter to the bishops condemning his heresy, in compliance with which Praylius banished him from the holy city, and from all the sacred sites (Mar. Mercator. *Communitor.* c. iii. p. 19, ed. Garnier, 1673). Theodoret mentions Praylius having ordained Dominus, a "digamus" as bishop of Caesarea after Eulogius (Theod. *Epist.* 110). [E. V.]

PREDESTINATION. Of this difficult subject, made doubly difficult by what has been written on it, and its opposite, reprobation, with which it has often been mixed up in name, no more than a general survey can be attempted, including, so far as it presupposes, or is presupposed by them, reprobation, foreknowledge, redemption, original sin, vocation, justification, election, free will, grace. Practically, St. Paul supplies us with our text, and St. Augustine with its exposition. No writer of the Old or New Testament has so much as named it but St. Paul; no father had discussed it in a special work before St. Augustine and his followers, St. Prosper and St. Fulgentius. St. Paul himself has not done this. He had been led to refer to it in discussing justification by faith, on which it bore. Consequently, we must interpret what he has said of it as having been said relatively to that subject, and therefore qualified by his argument on that subject in some measure. Similarly, St. Augustine, though he devotes a special treatise to its elucidation, was led to do so by his controversy with Pelagius on original sin and grace. From neither, therefore, can we expect either logical completeness or absolute treatment of it in an abstract form.

The *locus classicus* relating to it in the Epistle to the Romans is familiar to all; yet it should be taken out of its context for our purpose.

"We know," says St. Paul, "that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate them He also called, and whom He called them He also justified; and whom He justified them He also glorified" (c. viii. 28-30). Here we have the different stages through which each individual has to pass, from the starting-point, or *terminus a quo*, to the *terminus ad quem*, or eternal salvation, broadly traced, which would have been unreal and a mere play upon words, had each at his birth unalterably belonged to one of two classes, giving him no option of choosing between them.

In addition to this let it be noted, with regard to—

1. REPROBATION.

That predestination is here not only confined to a good sense, but to a Christian sense throughout. It is limited to those whom Christ has redeemed, whom God will, accordingly, conform to His image. It may be added that it is never used by St. Paul elsewhere but in this sense. We are thus precluded from considering the term in any sense but this.

2. FOREKNOWLEDGE.

That it is based on foreknowledge, though not by any means co-extensive with it. Divine foreknowledge covers a much wider range. "God foreknows all that happens in the world," as St. John Damascene says, "but God is far from predestinating all that happens." Again, "He foreknows all things that have been placed in our power, but predestinates not all even of these. For He neither wills that wickedness should be generated, nor that virtue should be forced." Thus predestination is the result of a Divine sentence, based on foreknowledge (*De Orth. Fide*, ii. 30). To the same effect, St. Augustine, "God foreknows all that is done by others, as well as by Himself . . . every sin, for instance, that is committed . . . Accordingly there may be foreknowledge without predestination; but predestination there cannot be without foreknowledge" (*De Praedest. Sanct.* c. 10). Again, Peter Lombard says, "Praedestinatio de bonis salutaribus est, et de hominibus salvandis" (*Sent.* i. dist. 4, §§ 1 and 4), quoting another passage from St. Augustine, who there defines it to be "Praeparatio gratiae." Reprobation is considered three sections on; but he refrains pointedly from calling it "predestination."

So far, then, all are agreed in the interpretation of this text. It relates to the good alone, who are predestined to be saved through grace purchased for them by Christ, and, taking effect in each of them, as they are successively called, justified, conformed to the image of Him who redeemed them, and glorified. "Christians," says Dr. Mozley, *On the Augustinian Doctrine of Pred.* c. 2, pp. 43-5, "are addressed in the New Testament upon this supposition" . . . "Each of them is addressed as one predestined to eternal glory. He is encouraged to regard himself as a favourite of heaven, singled out from the world, and stamped from the very commencement of his course with the token of

future triumph . . . His life in this world is described as a passage, laborious and painful indeed, but still conducting him by a sure succession of steps to this end . . . Life is to him a purgatorial rather than a trial state; purifying him by affliction, and exercising him by conflicts, through all of which, however, he passes onward steadily with the seal of God upon him, marking him infallibly from the very beginning as His own. Nor is this position confined to a few eminent saints; but it is supposed to be the position of all Christians, who, whatever be the differences among themselves, are all saints, in comparison with the world around them . . . The conviction that he is marked out for a heavenly crown, elevates and inspires each in the pursuit of it. This is the *godly consideration of predestination*," he adds, "recommended in the 17th article of our church."

St. Paul, it cannot be repeated too often, only discusses predestination in any part of his epistles in this sense: and now, even in this sense, relatively to the subject he was expounding to the Romans, namely, justification by faith, in contradistinction to the works of the Law. Hitherto the Law of Moses had been the special boast of the Jew. Having cut away this support from beneath his feet, the apostle felt bound to furnish him with another, incomparably more secure. He unfolds to him, therefore, what God had determined from all eternity to do for those whom He has predestinated in His Son. He states their case absolutely, to give greater effect to the argument with which it supplied him then; and in so doing, he merely followed a course which is normal in Scripture. Scripture constantly lays down broad principles, leaving us to apply them. Scripture lays down one duty without qualification in one place, and another duty without qualification in another place, leaving us to strike the balance between them, when they conflict or cross each other. Or, to put the matter in a terser form, Scripture, Dr. Mozley tells us, abounds with "half-truths" . . . truths which are "truths in tendency, not absolute, not complete" . . . truths that admit of being enforced separately, and stated forcibly for influencing practice; but yet have bounds set to them by other truths belonging to the same class of subjects, and all of equal importance, which, without actually barring their path, run on for ever side by side with them in parallel lines, each throwing light upon the other, yet unable to unite. Thus Scripture is, in appearance, "two-sided" on the great subject of justification. One set of passages, taken in their natural meaning, speaks of faith, while another speaks of works as its main ingredient; and we seem left to strike the balance between them ourselves. Again, this epistle to the Romans represents the whole human race in a state of moral ruin in consequence of the transgression of the first man; incapable of doing anything pleasing and acceptable to God, or of performing any really good act; in other words it represents mankind as having lost free will in all that concerns virtue. Yet in this same letter, at its close, St. Paul commences a long and fervid appeal to his correspondents to "present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God" (Rom. xii. 1), and this he calls "their *reasonable service*."

Further, the Bible throughout, speaking to mankind in general, and addressing them on their duties and responsibilities, certainly speaks as if all had the power to do their duty, or to abstain from doing it, as being a matter in which they might please themselves; nor could any plain man infer anything from this language, other than that each moral being had a will of his own, and in spite of all temptations to the contrary, was so far free that he might be punished as a malefactor with justice, whenever he wilfully failed in his duty. Human laws, let alone divine, presuppose this, and act upon it too. Similarly, we must not invest what St. Paul says about predestination with any such meaning as will contradict, or will be found incompatible with what we read in other passages, either of reprobation which is its opposite, or of Divine foreknowledge, redemption, original sin, grace, free will, vocation, justification, sanctification, election, all bearing on the present or future condition of mankind, with which it is mixed up or has to do. In short to understand it aright we should run through broadly the limitations imposed on it in advance by what is laid down in other parts of Scripture respecting each of these. First, then—to take them in the order in which they stand—*reprobation* is a term that never occurs in Scripture, the nearest approach to it being what St. Paul writes of the Gentile world, anterior to Christ, outside the Law. "Even as they were not *mind*ed to retain God in *knowledge*"—such as He had given them of Himself—"God gave them over to a *reprobate mind* (*ἔδοκίμασαν . . . ἐν ἐπιγνώσει . . . ἀδόκιμον νοῦν*, Rom. i. 28), I give the Greek of the italicised words. The play between the first and last has been universally noticed, and could not have been unintentional. To supply the pronoun "their" before "knowledge" with the Revised and Authorised Versions is misleading. To render *ἐπιγνώσις*, with most lexicons and commentators, "*full or complete knowledge*," is misleading also. For when our Lord says, "Nobody knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth anybody the Father save the Son" (St. Matt. xi. 27)—using the same compound in both cases—He as good as tells us, surely, that, except by special revelation, no man was ever possessed of *such* knowledge as this in respect of God? Then, again, have not Christians a considerably fuller knowledge of Him than those Gentiles had, yet the same term is ever afterwards used to designate the knowledge vouchsafed to them; and, lastly, the pronoun "*their*" nowhere precedes it even in their case. Thus, this single passage must be held to settle the question of reprobation in a manner that cannot possibly be explained away. It is a key-passage to the whole subject. It explains all that we are told about Pharaoh, on whom the miracles of Moses were thrown away, and about the Jews, whom the miracles of our Lord failed to convert, in the same breath. No heart was ever hardened, no eyes ever blinded, nor any mind given over to become reprobate, from the day on which Adam was expelled Paradise until now, before the knowledge, vouchsafed by God of Himself to the individual possessing them, had been deliberately scorned and flung aside. Consequently, nothing that we read in any part of Scripture bearing upon predestina-

tion, can be pressed to an extent incompatible with this unequivocal declaration of the law ruling its opposite. "God," says Dr. Thomas Jackson, "did not from eternity decree to harden Pharaoh by His irresistible will, is true of Pharaoh in his infancy or youth, but false of Pharaoh after his wilful contempt of God's summons by signs and wonders" (book x. c. 41, § 20, ed. 1673). 2. Divine foreknowledge has been already touched upon. It only remains to be pointed out that its subject-matter is in this case limited exclusively to what Aristotle calls the contingent or indeterminate future (*De Interp.* c. 9). For there are "two classes of secondary causes, one necessary, the other contingent," as Dr. Mozley quotes approvingly from St. Thomas Aquinas (p. 256). Of these the first operates in the material world around us, below and above; the second in creatures possessed of a will. We ourselves can forecast what our contemporaries, under circumstances known to us in advance, will elect to do; but our success in forecasting it unknown to them, cannot have conduced in the slightest degree to their choice. Each such resolve was not only foreknown but taken into full account by God, long before this world began; for no human being is ever born into this world but by His permission. "Thine eye did see my substance, yet being imperfect; and in Thy book were all my members written," as the Psalmist says (Ps. cxxxix. 16), and as Dr. Mozley puts it in a few words (p. 7), "No one, who believes properly in a God at all, can suppose that He does anything on a sudden, and which He has not thought of before."

3. REDEMPTION.

It is extraordinary that in a work on predestination of such grasp and excellence, Dr. Mozley should have passed over this fundamental topic in comparative silence—without any special treatment, or adequate recognition. For, if one thing is expressed in plainer terms or more constantly than another about Christ in Scripture, it is, that He "came into the world that the world through Him might be saved" (St. John iii. 17)—that He "wishes all men to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4)—"came to save sinners" (ib. i. 15)—"is come to seek and to save that which was lost" (St. Luke xix. 10)—"gave Himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. ii. 6)—"died for the ungodly" (Rom. v. 6)—"died for all" (2 Cor. v. 14, 15)—was "lifted up from the earth (in His death, purposely) to draw all men unto Him" (St. John xii. 32)—"was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil" (1 St. John iii. 8). Hence the conclusion drawn by St. Paul himself, "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life" (Rom. v. 18). In other words, a full and perfect atonement was accomplished by Christ upon the cross, retrospective as well as prospective for the whole race descended from Adam; in which it was His intention and wish all men should participate to the full, by accepting the terms on which it was offered to each individual in turn; though it was no secret to Him in effecting it, on what numbers it would be thrown away, and only work for condemnation. "Marvel not at this," as He said Himself, "for the hour

is coming, in the which *all* that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." In the judgment scene, portrayed by Him in Holy Week, which St. Matthew records (c. xxv. 31-46), He ranges them Himself, the blessed and the cursed ones, over against each other "as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats;" representing, to their mutual surprise, the good deeds of the one to be works of mercy done to Himself, and the evil deeds of the other as works of mercy denied Him; and making them the ground in one case for everlasting reward, in the other case for everlasting woe. Could any principle be more broadly or more authoritatively laid down, than what is here laid down by the Judge Himself for the judgment day, namely, that all will have their doom fixed according to the works done by themselves; that is to say, works done by them with full intent, and of their own free choice? To suppose that one will be rewarded, for complying with what they could not resist, or the other punished for doing what they never had the option of avoiding, would be to make judgment a solemn mockery, and probation a complete farce. Again, take that tenderest of invitations addressed to *all* burdened consciences on this side of the grave, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Would it not be sacrilege to suppose that *any such* could ever be found on earth, as would never have the option of accepting it?

4. ORIGINAL SIN.

By which is meant, not so much the actual sin committed by Adam, as its effects on his posterity. But a few words on his own sin first. It was of course foreseen and permitted, but not decreed. The Supralapsarians of modern times outwent Calvin himself on this head. What *were* decreed were the consequences attaching to it. God leaves the antecedents to us, in matters where we are allowed freedom of choice. The consequents, viz. the good or evil that shall befall us on our better or worse choice, He determines Himself, and commonly without appeal. Death—in other words the decay and ultimate dissolution of the body, called in the last book of the Bible the first death—was the first consequence decreed against Adam for his sin, and it has passed on all descended from him, with only two noted exceptions. It was not—it would seem *it could not be*—reversed even by the second Adam; though, by submitting to it in His own person, He purchased exemption from the second death, or death of the soul, for all who would accept salvation at His hands, and on His terms. The second consequence decreed against Adam for his sin and transmitted to all descended from him by carnal generation, is the lifelong struggle that goes on within them occasioned by the emancipation of their lower nature from control of their higher, which all instinctively would hide from view, yet cannot help betraying, whenever it is active, by a conscious blush. By some this has been represented as a mere physical taint, by others, as a withdrawal of original righteousness, or the grace given to Adam at his birth. But, unless

St. Paul is to be discarded as an authority, it is much more than the mere withdrawal of a supernatural quality. For, according to him, it is an active principle that works, without exception, in all descended from Adam. Indeed, he gives utterance to the universal conscience, in describing it as a law inherent in the natural man as now constituted, impelling and often forcing him to do wrong, even when his wish is to do right. Again, the rite of circumcision points, with all the clearness of a finger-post, equally to the stronghold of its dominion and to the never-failing instrument of its transmission. So far St. Augustine is in as full accordance with St. Paul as St. Paul with fact. Still, even on this head there is another set of passages, equally prominent in St. Paul, but almost left out of sight not merely by St. Augustine, but by most writers on original sin, ancient and modern; namely, those who dwell on the unseen agency that assails man from without, being just as much due to original sin as lust itself. "For we wrestle not," says the apostle, "against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places" (Eph. vi. 12; comp. *ib.* v. 11; Eph. iv. 27; St. James iv. 7; 1 St. Peter v. 8-9; 1 St. John iii. 8). In the rite of circumcision there was no reference to these, but in the offices for Christian baptism renunciation of the devil always came first (Bingham, *Ant.* xi. 7), and who can tell how often lust is set in motion by him unknown to ourselves? Hence the effect of leaving his action out of sight in discussing this question, must be to blacken unduly the taint inherent in man; in other words, to make lust and original sin nearly convertible terms. Accordingly St. Augustine pressed those words of St. Paul, "I know that in me—that is, in my flesh—dwelleth no good thing," to their extreme limit, in estimating the internal condition of man after the Fall. "For it is a rule in morals," says Dr. Mozley, "that the morality of the man must precede the morality of the action . . . before any particular act can be pronounced good in him. This morality of the man—the fulfilment of this general condition—is the foundation. One type, then, of a faulty character is that of a character good at the foundation and only failing in degree; the other is that of a character bad at the foundation. . . . Now, St. Augustine does not admit the power of nature to supply such a foundation in any degree whatever . . . He therefore regards heathen morality as bad at the foundation; and therefore as a hollow, false, and only seeming morality itself. Nor does he admit the existence of a good heathen: though he admits that the heathen did actions which in Christians would be good ones." Applying his argument to the condition of the world before and since Christ, his first position was generally, that hell was the proper place for all whose original sin had not been cancelled in this life; his second that circumcision under the Law, and baptism under the Gospel, were the sole means ordained hitherto for cancelling it; and then, driving this argument home more particularly for his own times, he laid down that hell in various degrees awaited all, adults or infants, heathens, Jews or Christians, who died unbaptized. See

the quotations from his works in b. ii. dist. xxx.—xxxiii. of the sentences of Peter Lombard; only the most extreme are given, art. AUGUSTINUS, Vol. I. 220–21 of this work. Yet it was part of his teaching, no less, as it was of Scripture, too, that Christ died for all, and that the entire guilt of the sin of the first Adam was cancelled on the cross by the second Adam. "Tenet ergo diabolus, liberat Christus; tenet deceptor Evae, liberat Filius Mariae; tenet qui per conjugem venit ad virum, liberat qui de conjugate natus est, quae non pertulit virum; tenet qui causam libidinis intulit feminae, liberat qui sine libidine est conceptus in femina . . ." as he puts it, in a way that leaves nothing unsaid (*De Pec. Orig.* § 45, ed. Ben.). It is his second position which narrows his ground, yet even here we can follow him till we come to its application. That the merits of Christ must in some way be applied to each individual separately, for each individual to have the option of profiting by them, is a point about which there can be no dispute. The whole tenor of Scripture testifies to it. Again, circumcision under the Law, and baptism under the Gospel were both of them appointed means for bringing men back into covenant with God, prospectively or retrospectively, through Christ, in other words for applying His merits to man. Of course they were; but were either of them means appointed in an exclusive sense? To those placed within reach of either, and deliberately refusing to avail themselves of either, few would think it reasonable that other means should be supplied. From all excluded from either, through no fault of their own, surely some provision must have been made by Him, from whose prescience their case could not have been hid. From whatever benefits were derived from circumcision all women were designedly shut out by His ordinance; from whatever benefits either circumcision or baptism conferred, all infants were shut out, though born within reach of them, whom He called away too soon to be recipients of either. And to whose fault has it been due that so many countless millions, under the law and the Gospel alike, have gone to their graves in utter, but not therefore wilful, ignorance of both? Can any portion of those for whom Christ died equally with ourselves, be considered out of covenant with God, condemned never to have the option of avoiding the second death, though redeemed in point of fact by His blood? Principles of reason and common sense, which have been accepted in other cases, cannot be refused extension to this. "God has not tied His power to the sacraments," in other words, God has bound Himself to confer grace through the sacraments, but has not bound Himself never to confer grace without them, says Peter Lombard more than once (*Sent.* iv. dist. 1 d, and 4 e), quoting from St. Augustine, who found that "not only death endured for confessing Christ may supply lack of baptism, but that faith and conversion of heart also may, where adverse circumstances make the celebration of baptism impossible . . . where it is not contempt of religion, but necessity, that excludes the sacrament." Elsewhere St. Augustine says, "Invisible sanctification has been conferred before now, and received with profit by some, without the visible sacraments of their time"

(*Quaest. in Levit.* iii. 9, 84). It is agreed on all hands that no positive grace was conferred by circumcision; and that down to Christian times, all who were justified, were justified by their faith alone (*Estius in Sent.* iv. dist. 1, §§ 27–30). Reason brought out the meaning of Scripture, by being in general agreement with it upon this point. "The wind bloweth where it listeth," said our Lord to Nicodemus (St. John iii. 8), in interpreting all that He had previously laid down about being "born again," and paralleling the action of the Spirit in it by that of the wind, hence called *baptismus Fluminis*, in contradistinction to the *baptismi fluminis* aut *sanguinis* (St. Thom. *Sum. Theol.* iii. quaest. 66, art. 11). St. Paul, too, writes in his first dogmatic epistle on justification by faith, "We say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in *uncircumcision*" (Rom. iv. 9, 10). Agreeably with this, he gives, in his third and last epistle on the same subject, an indiscriminate list of all the saints beginning with Abel, who lived before Christ, and were justified solely by faith; having defined the believer at starting to be simply, the man who "believes that God is, and that He is a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him" (Heb. xi. 6). Millions might be sincere believers in this sense who had never heard of the Law or the Gospel either; the Spirit, "who bloweth where He listeth," having scattered, as He passed unseen, the seeds of faith in their hearts. Whence St. Peter, in the opening sentence of his address to the household of the first Gentile convert to Christ, is inspired to say, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him" (Acts x. 34–5). *Working righteousness* may be predicated in all strictness of all who have been justified by faith—no matter to what race they belonged; no matter where, when, or how long or short a time they may have lived. But this, again, was only what St. Peter had been taught on the best authority to anticipate years before. For, in reply to another centurion, but in words intended more particularly for the bystanding Jews, our Lord had Himself said, "Verily I have not found so great faith, no! not in Israel. And I say unto you that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." After such explicit language from Christ Himself, and recorded in a gospel addressed especially to the Jews, how can we doubt that all through the ages of the Christian church the same gentle Spirit has been incessantly blowing "where He listeth," and working for good among the countless multitudes, that, for no fault of their own, are strangers to the Gospel still; inspiring each soul responding to His overtures with saving faith, in proportion to its needs, and effacing in it by that invisible baptism, for applying to all the merits of Him who died for all, the guilt of the taint inherited by all from their parents (comp. Bp. Full, *Apol. pro Harm.* § 111). To assert this is neither Solifidianism, nor Universalism. On the same principle, those who were to be removed soonest

from this life would be soonest visited by Him. No infant of a single hour in any part of the world would be passed over. The good seed sown here would be matured under more favourable conditions elsewhere without fail. Visible sacraments, where they cannot be had, are plainly not indispensable for the removal of original sin through Christ. But for the controversy raised by Pelagius, St. Augustine would never have asserted they were.

5. GRACE.

Nothing need be added here to what has been already said on this head (Vol. II. 719, art. GRACE) except relatively to

6. FREE-WILL.

Now, free-will and grace being both recognised factors in the scheme for the salvation of man set forth in Holy Scripture, we should consider ourselves barred from representing the action of either to the prejudice, and still more to the exclusion of the other. That is to say, no view of either should be permitted, that would impair their harmonious co-existence. That these bounds have been overpassed in modern times is no secret, and Dr. Mozley charges even St. Augustine with making grace irresistible—*thereby destroying free-will*. In other words, he construes a subtle distinction of his in that sense (pp. 160-8). But, surely, St. Augustine should be allowed, in preference, to explain himself. Three years before his death, A.D. 427, he wrote thus (*De Correp. et G. c. 1*): "Ac per hoc et desiderare auxilium gratiae, initium gratiae est. Liberum itaque arbitrium, et ad malum et ad bonum faciendum, confitendum est nos habere: sed in malo faciendo, liber est quisque justitiae servusque peccati: in bono autem liber esse nullus potest, nisi fuerit liberatus ab eo, qui dixit: 'Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc vere liberi eritis.' Nec ita, ut cum quisque fuerit a peccati dominatione liberatus, jam non indigeat sui Liberatoris auxilio: sed ita potius, ut ab illo audiens—'Sine me nihil potestis facere'—dicat ei et ipse: 'Adjutor meus esto, ne derelinquas me.'" What can be plainer in language, or more Christian in tone? The first act, whereby the assistance of grace is desired, is an act of free-will on the part of man; by the next, which is an act of God, grace is bestowed, whereby the will is set free; by the third more grace is petitioned for on the part of man, to co-operate with each act of the will now free to do right. Practically, no doubt, the influences of Divine grace instil themselves into the heart willing to receive them with so much tenderness and persuasiveness, as to exercise resistless power over the will; yet it is only resistless, as not being irresistible. For the will having asserted its own freedom in assenting to them, goes along with them rejoicing at each step, and surrendering itself more completely to them, as it becomes conscious of their increase. But such is not the case with all hearts by any means. Innate propensities, resulting from heterogeneous causes, peculiar to each case, differentiate widely between man and man. Some will readily sacrifice everything in this world and the next to the gratification of a single unlawful appetite, that takes such possession of them as absolutely to deprive them of free-will

for some time at least. For them heaven possesses no attractions, nor hell any cause for alarm. They have inflicted judicial blindness upon themselves by a series of long-continued acts, disapproved by their conscience. Others abhorring the promptings of their lower nature from childhood, pant thirstily for the faintest whisper of the Spirit to their inner man, and are raised out of themselves at every fresh sound of His voice. To live to Him is a privilege for which they can never be thankful enough, and would gladly pay any price to get secured to them and enlarged. Thus the intention on the part of God in bestowing grace is everywhere the same; but its effects on different minds are so widely dissimilar, that we are perplexed to reconcile them. In some cases it seems as though it could never have been really bestowed; in others, as though it had been irresistible, and never could fail. The simple truth is that the grace purchased for man by Christ will have been offered to all in some form before this world ends, on the same terms. It has neither been withheld from any, nor has it ever been forced upon any; but it has systematically been increased or diminished, according to its acceptance or non-acceptance by the individual in each case. "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance" (St. Matt. xxv. 29), but "whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have" (St. Luke viii. 18). Now this is a principle which is not in any sense peculiar to grace; but one which is thought just, and acted upon in all lands, and in all affairs of the world. There remains some little to be said about free-will in man. Dr. Mozley asserts (p. 30) "that alone to be a genuine doctrine of free-will, which maintains such a free-will in man, as is inconsistent with our idea of Divine power." Genuine or not, this doctrine cannot be said to be founded on fact. St. Augustine came much nearer the truth when he said that the will of the Omnipotent invariably triumphed, whatever happened, and whichever side human wills took (*Enchirid. c. 100-2*). "Illa enim voluntas," says the Master of the Sentences in epitomising him, "semper impletur aut de nobis, aut a nobis—*De nobis impletur—licet non implemus eam—quando peccamus*" (lib. i. dist. 47). His will is equally fulfilled in punishing the sinner and rewarding the just, though it is no part of His will that any should commit sin. But St. Augustine pushed his case too far when he represented it as incompatible with omnipotence that any should have the power of resisting grace. For God in creating man ordained that his will should be free; and Christ in redeeming man provided for his recovering that freedom, which he had partially lost, entire, through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. His free-will therefore could not well have been restored, to be over-riden in the same breath. Sin it was which had caused him that partial shipwreck of the freedom of his will, which Christ became man to restore. But sin is no creation of God; it is not a substance, it is incapable of being classed under any species in the world of nature (comp. Mozley, pp. 171, 232-3, 271, and seq.). It is, in every conceivable case, the creation of a perverse will, of a will disobedient to some

general or special law of the Power who made the world. This is how sin entered into the world; how it has been perpetuated in the world ever since; how it continues in the world still. It began in the self-determining will of a creature. It will only cease when the self-determining will of every creature shall have been brought into complete harmony with Divine law again. For sin carries with it its own punishment in every case, by making the will a slave to it, whose creation it is. Thus the will that has committed sin is no longer free to that extent. Its disobedience recoils upon itself. The consequences of original and actual sin, too, though widely differing in extent, are congener in kind. Though unnatural themselves, they are the natural effects of disobedience to law. "Peccatum est factum, vel dictum, vel concupitum contra legem aeternam. Lex vero aeterna est ratio Divina, vel voluntas Dei: ordinem naturae conservari jubens; perturbari vetans." (St. Aug. c. *Faust.* xxii. 27; on which see St. Thom. Aq. 1^{ma}-2^{da}, q. lxxi., art. 6 ad 2^{am}.)

Human free-will must be considered in strictness as we find it in man, and in man it never was, or was intended to be beyond that of a creature formed as man is. His own constitution, therefore, dictated limits to his free-will, in many ways from the first. His conscience should have been always supreme in him as regards duty, and his reason as regards knowledge. By a wanton act of disobedience he burst away from both at the Fall, and has inherited in each successive generation the consequences of that rebellion ever since. Those consequences Christ purchased for him—but only purchased for him by discharging them in His own person—the means of extirpating gradually through grace. Should he neglect to avail himself of the opportunity thus afforded him, the bondage to which he subjected himself by rebelling against the laws of his constitution must, with all its consequences, remain his for ever. He knows (1) that his free-will is confined strictly to things within his power, and is, even in these, constantly swayed by mixed motive, and deterred by circumstances from choosing what it would have preferred, had it felt itself perfectly free, but is powerless to alter the laws without him, as well moral as physical, in any respect with impunity. He knows (2) that he cannot exchange, for others that he might prefer, the general qualifications of his own mind or body with which he was born. He knows (3) that his own free-will is limited in action to what concerns himself, that he cannot attempt anything in opposition to the free-wills of his fellow-men without counting the cost, and that men are just as likely to resent interference with their laws as God with His. His own reason and conscience, therefore, between them should teach him that perfect freedom of the will in a creature can only consist with perfect obedience to the known laws of his Creator, and that for every creature destined for a probationary state, like himself, no condition could be conceived more natural or more fair than his own, namely, that with reason and conscience given him for guides at his birth, he should be left perfectly free to decide for himself both what he should do and what he will do; and this is precisely the condition in which every man may, if he

will, occupy through Christ by grace. As Christ Himself told the Jews, "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (St. John viii. 36), and as His apostle told the Gentiles, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. iii. 17).

7. VOCATION.

On this point, "we shall have no difficulty," says Calvin (*Inst.* iii. 24, 8), "in understanding those words of our Lord about the *many called* and the *few chosen*, if we will only bear in mind that *vocation* is twofold: (1) universal, whereby God invites all by a call addressed to their outward ears, namely, through the preaching of His word by man; and (2) special, in which He speaks to them by His Spirit in their hearts." According to the first of these—which the Jesuit Cornelius à Lapide praises Calvin (*ad loc.*) for connecting with Rom. xi. 29, and of which, in spite of the multitudes on whom it is thrown away in each case, the apostle there says pointedly, that it is "*without repentance*" on the part of God—the Jews were called under the Law, and the Gentiles under the Gospel. In this sense vocation includes both bad and good, and as often, probably, fails as succeeds in its purpose, and therefore contrasts rather than corresponds with election, being only the first step to it in a limited number. For thousands of Jews under the Law, and millions of Christians under the Gospel, have proclaimed their doom openly to the world beforehand by their ungodly lives. Of such St. Peter has said, "It had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness" (2 Pet. ii. 21); of such St. Paul despairs, "seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame" (Heb. vi. 6).

Calvin, too, shrinks, as the logic of facts compelled him, from taking any more sanguine view of the effects of the vocation which he calls "special," though "hidden" would have been a more correct name for it; as, to whatever extent he may have limited it in his own mind, it includes all plainly both before and since Christ, that have lived and died in ignorance, not caused by themselves, of any visible dispensation for applying His merits to man. Each individual of this world-coeval, world-coextensive class, was born with the same reason and conscience, and had the same witness of God in the visible world, that the Gentiles had, of whom St. Paul writes in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans; on each heart of this multitude, the Spirit "who bloweth where He listeth," as our Lord gave Nicodemus to understand, has in all ages been free to act; each must have, therefore, had it in his power, by opening his heart to that action at some period of his life, to have died in faith—such faith as is defined in Hebrews xi. 6. What numbers responded to that action with alacrity, we may not even guess now; but if "*compulsion*" was ever employed "*to fill*" heaven "*with guests*," we may well infer it was charity that dictated it, on behalf of those who lived on acorns "in the highways and hedges" (St. Luke xiv. 23), but who will finally "come from the east and the west in thrones, to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (St. Matt. viii. 11), and occupy the vacant places

of the children of the same that have been "cast out." To these two classes a third, so far as words go, might have been joined, namely, those designated "the called according to His purpose (*κατὰ πρόθεσιν*)" by St. Paul, did not the context and the outcome of his argument in the next chapter shew that "the elect" are there meant, of whom presently.

8. JUSTIFICATION.

Which, owing to the controversies raised about it in modern times requires going into with extra fullness. First as to the word—anglicised from the Latin "justificatio"—which may have been coined by Tertullian, as he often employs its cognates. Speaking of the passages in the Epistle to the Romans left untouched by Marcion, he says, "Monet justificatos ex fide Christi, non ex lege pacem habere" (*c. Marc. v. 13*); quoting the parable of the Publican and Pharisee, he says, "alterum reprobatum, alterum justificatum descendisse" (*ib. iv. 36*). By comparing two more passages (*ib. ii. 19*, with *ad Ux. 8*), we find he makes "justificare = justè facere," shewing it was the forensic sense that he attached to them, of "doing justice" to a person, either by condemning or acquitting, agreeably with the Greek verb *δικαίωω*, so often used by St. Paul, which was also the sense given to it in numerous charters and constitutions of the middle ages (*v. Du Cange, s. v.*). Similarly, St. Augustine, referring to the versions of the Old Testament, current in his time previously to the Vulgate says, "Justificationes sane Latini interpretes eas esse dixerunt, quae Graeci *δικαιώματα* appellant" (*Quest. in Exod. ii. 95*). And no doubt his own frequent employment of this word in the singular number was suggested to him by finding it in the Latin versions of the New Testament, also then current, from which he quotes. But, on the other hand, when he asks, "Quid est justificare?" and then replies, "Justum facere" (*Serm. cxcii. § 6*), and again "quid est aliud justificati, quam justi facti?" (*De Spir. et Lit. § 45*) taking *facere* not in the sense of doing, but of "making," he was adventuring a bold gloss of his own, determined entirely by the mere form of the Latin word, without reference to the Greek for which it stood, but which settled at once and for ever the theological meaning of that Latin verb and its cognates for the Western church. Thus Becan, one of the ablest Jesuit controversialists of the 17th century, says, without hesitation, as if admitted by all, "Justificatio nihil aliud est, quam mutatio, quâ quis ex impio seu peccatore fit justus" (*Manual. i. 16*). Nor was it till the middle of the same century that attention was first called by our own bishop Bull to the astounding fact, that the Greek verb *δικαιοῦν* and its cognates, which had long been classical before they became theological, had a different meaning almost invariably throughout the New Testament from what had been assigned *uno ore*, from the 5th century downwards, to their received Latin equivalents; in short that Rev. xxii. 11—assuming the received reading to be the correct one—was a solitary case where *δικαιοῦσθαι = justum fieri*, and not *justum censerì*, which it meant everywhere else (*Harm. Apost. i. 6*). So far, then, on the origin and the meaning attached to the Latin term, to which the little discussion there

was of the subject in patristic times was confined, not by any means that there was no generally received doctrine respecting it in the collective church. Perhaps the clearest statements of it are to be found in the earliest fathers—St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius, and St. Irenaeus—already quoted under another head. [FAITH.]

It may be summed up in a few words. Justification was, according to them, an act of grace on the part of God; Who justifies man—that is, accounts him righteous, and purged from sin, not for any deserts of his own, but solely for the merits of Christ, Who died for him, on condition of his accepting salvation through Christ, and ever after abiding in Christ. In default of the first it would not issue, in default of the second it might be cancelled at any moment. But on his assenting, his regeneration was accomplished for him by the Holy Ghost in due course, subject only to his power of saying "no" to it at each stage. Faith was the first of inward gifts, and baptism the first of outward ordinances for effecting his new birth and union with Christ in the same breath. Other virtues and other means of grace followed, in proportion to his willingness to receive them, and turn them to the best account he could, Christ making up for the rest. Thus it was all done, in every case where it was done, by God, for the sake of His Son, and by gift of His Spirit. The whole Trinity was a party to it in conferring it; man was a party to it only by accepting it, and co-operating with it sincerely to the best of his power. The faith by which he believed in Christ was his only by gift; the good works that were the fruits of his faith were the fruits of the Spirit in the first instance, which, in answer to prayer, he got strength from above to perform; in the sacrament of baptism it was not man who gave, but men who received the Holy Ghost; "In nullo gloriandum, quodd nostrum nihil sit," and the correlative to it: "In Deum solum fidendum, et in Ipso gloriandum," as St. Cyprian says (*Test. iii. 4 and 10*). Holding this principle warmly and thoroughly, the fathers were comparatively not careful how they expressed it themselves, nor again jealous of any merely verbal inconsistencies about it in others; least of all, copious in distinguishing between instrumental and efficient, meritorious and formal, causes in this joint but disparate work of God and man. Yet any false doctrine connected with the action of either would have been discovered and disowned by them in a trice, with as much recoil as St. Augustine professes, on first becoming acquainted with the notions of Pelagius on original sin. "I was perusing," he says, "a few days ago, certain writings of Pelagius, a holy man as I am told, and a Christian of no moderate standard, containing some short comments on the epistles of St. Paul, and among them I found *à propos* to Rom. v. 12, the argument of those persons stated, who deny the existence in infants of original sin, an argument which I confess not to have refuted as yet in any of my voluminous works, simply from never having dreamt that anybody could have entertained or given vent to it" (*De Pecc. Mor. et Rem. iii. i.*). Further on, he adds: "When this first began to be disputed I know not, but this I do know, viz. that even St. Jerome, who still lives, devoted to ecclesiastical studies, and in

high repute for the learning and labour he brings to bear on them, unhesitatingly takes this doctrine for his standpoint in deciding various questions which he has to solve. For instance, when he comes to that passage of the prophet Jonah (iii. 5), in which even children are stated to have been forced to fast. 'It was to begin,' he says, 'from the eldest, and go down to the youngest. For there is nobody without sin, be he but one day old, or numbers of years. For if the stars are not clean in the sight of God, how much more are not the worm, and corruption, and they to whom the sin of Adam has descended by inheritance.' Could we, without difficulty, put the question to this most learned man, how many commentators on the holy Scriptures in either tongue, how many writers on Christian controversies, would he produce, who never held a different doctrine since the Christian church began, never received a different doctrine from their predecessors, never handed down a different doctrine for generations unborn?" (*Ib.* c. 6). Both St. Augustine and St. Jerome must have said precisely the same thing of "justification," had it been assailed in their time. Yet they so far differed in their own incidental allusions to it, that St. Jerome in arguing against the Pelagians, adhered strictly to the teaching of the earliest fathers, with whose language he was critically acquainted. St. Augustine innovated upon them in some respects from not understanding their language.

Their doctrine shall now be given in their own words. St. Clement of Rome, to whom reference has been already made, requires a little elucidation, partly from having been mistranslated by his standard editor, and partly from having expressed himself at times so as to need harmonising. This is his fullest statement: "We, then, having been called through His good purpose in Christ Jesus, are justified, not through ourselves, nor through our own wisdom . . . nor work done by us in uprightness of heart, but through faith: through which Almighty God justified all that ever were (justified) since the world began" (*Ep.* i. 32). Cotelier makes him say here: "Non per nos ipsos *justi efficiuntur* . . . sed per fidem, per quam cunctos qui unquam *justi fuerunt*, justificavit Deus omnipotens." This, we repeat, is not rendering but glossing upon the Greek verb, as St. Chrysostom says on Rom. viii. 33: "He wrote not, 'God that remits sins,' but 'God that justifieth;' which was far greater. For when the *sentence of the judge*—and such a judge too—*declares one righteous*, what count is made of the accuser? . . . For God both chose and justified us—yea, marvel of marvels!—justified through the slaying of His Son . . ." And Theodoret (*ib.*):—"God that justified—in other words, that declared them righteous." And St. Basil, on Rom. vi. 7; "that is, discharged, freed, purged from all sin" (*de Bapt.* i. 2, 15). Again, the prominence which is here given to faith must be construed side by side with two strong expressions elsewhere: "justified by works and not by words" (*ib.* 30); and "charity covereth a multitude of sins" (*ib.* 49). It is perfectly consistent with both. The faith here contemplated is proved by the context to be *not* our own, but a divine gift; and works

that are the fruit of it; and charity, planted in us by the same Hand as faith—"charity" which he describes as being "in Christ" (*ib.*)—are naturally sharers in its prerogatives. One more passage completes his meaning. On Ps. cxviii. 19, "Open me the gates of righteousness, that I may go into them, and give thanks unto the Lord," he says: "Many gates having been opened, that in righteousness and that in Christ, is the same: into which all the blessed having entered and made straight their path, perform all things in holiness and righteousness without fear . . ." (*ib.* 48). Union with Christ alone secures permanence for their faith and love: neither are safe, neither avail for our justification, except so far and as long as we are one with Him. As St. Chrysostom observes (on Phil. iii. 9), "It is well said, 'not having my own righteousness;' not that which I acquired through toil and labour, but that which I found from grace . . . and what is this? that which is from the faith of God; in other words, which has also been given from God; at once the righteousness of God, and a gift whole and complete. For the gifts of God far exceed in measure the poorness of our best achievements." And Theodoret, on Rom. iv. 4: "The righteousness which is of faith is a gift of the God of all things." and St. Cyril of Alexandria, first, on 2 Cor. v. 21: "Him who never sinned He made to suffer all the penalties of the most determined sinner, that He might declare righteous us who have accepted faith in Him . . . For we have been justified from before God and the Father, not by works in righteousness that we have done ourselves, but according to the greatness of His mercy, through faith which is in Christ;" second, on Is. xviii. 22: "What are the things thus consummated and concise? The preaching of the Gospel, the grace which is through faith, justification which is in Christ, sanctification which is through the Spirit . . ." third, *ib.* on v. 26-9: "As it was not possible for man to be justified in law, the only begotten Word of God appeared with a consummated and concise thing in His hands for our acceptance—viz. the justification which is in faith . . ." Finally, St. Chrysostom on St. John xv. 1: "He saith not that the root enjoys the care of the husbandman, but the branches; and the root is introduced for no other purpose than that they may learn that they can work nothing without His power; and that they ought to be united with Him by faith, as the branch with the vine . . . the abiding in the root is that which makes the branches to be fruit-bearing:" or, as St. Augustine interprets the same passage for the West: "Ita quippe in vite palmites, ut viti non conferant, sed inde accipiant, unde vivant: ita vero vitis est in palmitibus, ut vitale alimentum subministret iis, non sumat ab iis. Ac per hoc et manentem in se habere Christum, et manere in Christo, discipulis prodest utrumque, non Christo. Nam praeciso palmitate, potest de vivâ radice alius pullulare: qui autem praecisus est, sine radice non potest vivere" (*in Joh. Ev. Tr.* lxxxi., repeated by Prosper, *Sent.* 368, and Conc. Arausic. ii. can. 24).

Three more sets of passages remain to complete their teaching. 1. Where they speak of baptism in almost as strong terms as faith; but these passages are by comparison few and far

between, though at the same time they would be repudiated by none. St. Clement has nothing explicit, for instance, to this effect, though he refers to the sanctification that follows on baptism in his salutation; nor St. Basil either, though he composed a tract on baptism. But when we come to commentators, we find St. Chrysostom explaining Rom. viii. 30: "justified through the laver of regeneration;" and Theodoret (*ib.*)—"justified through baptism;" and Primasius (*ib.*) speaking for the Latin church—"justificatur per baptismum;" Theodoret, again, on Rom. iv. 25: "Through His resurrection we get the starting-point of our justification, and by being buried with Him in baptism we receive the remission of our sins." And St. Chrysostom on Rom. vi. 3: "What the cross and tomb were to Christ, that baptism is to us." And St. Cyril of Jerusalem to his catechumens, in the same spirit: "You went down into the water dead in sins, you ascend quickened in righteousness" (*Cat.* iv. 12). Only two chapters earlier he had said: "If any receive not baptism, he attains not to salvation: the martyrs alone excepted, who without that water receive the kingdom." From these two passages it might be inferred St. Cyril placed baptism a long way before faith. But in a still earlier chapter he says, speaking of Cornelius: "Peter came to him, and the Holy Ghost fell on them that believed, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. Then, after they had received this grace, the Scripture goes on to say, that Peter commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; that the soul having been regenerated through the faith, the body might be a sharer of the grace through the water" (*ib.* § 4). And in his fifth lecture, which is on faith, he says of Abraham: "He was not justified by works alone, but by faith too. For though he did many things well, he was never called the friend of God till such time as he believed, and every work of his had been made perfect according to faith . . . as he therefore was justified, do you be justified also" (§ 5). The Fathers knew very well that justification by faith was a doctrine that originated, *not* with St. Paul, but with Christ Himself, whose comforting farewell to those cured by Him was habitually: "Go thy way, thy faith hath saved or hath made thee whole"—that faith, indeed, which His Spirit instilled, but which they, by accepting, had made their own—that faith which His Spirit offers to all men in all ages of the world as a means—having no other means within their reach—of justifying, or making all sharers of His merits by whom it is accepted.

2. Where good works are described as indispensable consequents on justification. For instance, St. Chrysostom on Rom. viii. 4: "For that which was the righteousness of the law . . . Christ has accomplished this for thee. Be not a betrayer, then, of so great a gift, but constant in preserving this goodly treasure. For here he shews thee that the font is not enough to insure salvation to us, unless after the font we shew a life worthy of the gift we get there . . ." And, again, on Rom. iii. 31: "But inasmuch as after this grace, by which we were justified, there is also need of a life suited to it, let us exhibit a zeal worthy of the gift . . ." And Theodoret (*ib.*) on the last verse of chap. iv. :

"Having shewn how Abraham became possessed of the righteousness of faith, lest careless livers should deem themselves dispensed from the practice of virtue on that account, as though faith sufficed for their justification, he appends some necessary remarks on morals, and says . . . Faith indeed gave you remission of sins, and declared you blameless and righteous through the laver of regeneration, still it behoves you to keep the peace which you have made with God." And St. Basil (*de Bapt.* ii. 2): "He that has been truly baptized into the death of Christ, as the apostle says . . . has engaged in a covenant of the strictest kind to follow the Lord in all things: in other words, to live wholly for God . . ."

3. Where the righteousness even of the baptized and faithful is admitted to be, *per se*, but imperfect and incomplete. Perhaps Origen, who has not been quoted hitherto, because not extant in Greek, is fullest on this point, and therefore beyond mistranslation. "Et hic ergo quod dixit: 'Non justificabitur in conspectu Tuo omnis vivens.' Non hoc sentiri voluit, quod non justificabitur omnis vivens: sed in conspectu Tuo, hoc est, Dei, non justificabitur. Quantumvis enim quis justus, quantumvis sanctus sit, non solum inter homines, sed et in supernis atque eminentioribus creaturis, ad comparationem Dei certum est eum justificari non posse . . . Nullus inventus est nisi solus Agnus de tribu Juda, qui justificatus est in conspectu Dei . . . Omnis autem creatura ex comparatione inferiorum justificatur . . ." (*In Rom.* lib. iii. 2). He adds further on: "Potest adhuc et alio modo explanari quod dixit—'non est justus quisquam'—vel quod ait, 'Non justificabitur in conspectu Tuo omnis vivens,' quia donec quis vivit in corpore, justificari non potest, nec pronunciarum justus: sed cum exierit de corpore . . ." It is a magnificent remark of St. Augustine, squaring with this last interpretation, that the whole church militant makes a daily confession of sins in the Lord's Prayer (*De Civ. Dei*, xix. 27), and it may be added that in point of fact no saint in her calendar was ever canonised while alive; and this was always his own doctrine. "Justus et justificans non est nisi Deus," as he writes to Boniface: "Absit ut quisquam nostrum ita se justum dicat, ut aut suam justitiam velit constituere: id est, quasi a seipso sibi datam . . . aut sine peccato se esse jactare audeat in hac vita" (*Ep.* cixxxv. 37). And still more strongly, that of his more learned contemporary St. Jerome, whose words may well pass for a landmark, as they were penned against the Pelagians: "*Tunc ergo justii sumus, quando nos peccatores fatemur: et justitia nostra non ex proprio merito, sed ex Dei consistit misericordia . . . et haec hominis summa est justitia, quidquid potuerit habere virtutis, non suum putare esse, sed Domini qui largitus est*" (*Cont. Pelag.* i. 13). This is, in a few words, the whole patristic doctrine on justification finely resumed.

It was this doctrine, substantially, that was upheld also by St. Augustine, though amid some peculiarities which deserve notice. First, that owing to his slender acquaintance with Greek, he made *δικαιοῦν* practically synonymous with *ἀγιάζειν*. This misconception of his was the parent of endless confusion in the Latin church. In him it was made plausible by the

circumstances of his controversy with Pelagius. For Pelagius having denied original sin, almost the first point on which they joined issue was the necessity for baptism. And in baptism, both the death unto sin, and the new birth unto righteousness, far from being merely declaratory, expressed radical changes in each case. From this point of view, then, he may be said to have confused justification with regeneration. "Justus ex Deo, non ex homine, nascitur: quoniam renascendo, non nascendo, fit justus," as he maintained against Julian (*Op. Imp.* iii. 51).

Next, in one of his earliest treatises against Pelagianism, addressed A.D. 412 to Marcellinus, he allows himself to say, "Justificatio ex fide impetratur" (*de Spir. et Lit.* c. xxix.), which, as he still leans to the opinion that this faith was in part our own, hardly fell short of giving Pelagius right. He calls it himself "errorem meum" in his latest work, A.D. 429 (*de Praed.* c. iii.). But his own latest conclusion on this point is: "Tutores igitur vivimus, si totum Deo damus: non autem nos Illi ex parte, et nobis ex parte committimus" (*de Persev.* c. vi.): on the part assigned to faith in justification by St. Paul: "Ex fide ideo dicit justificari hominem, non ex operibus; quia ipsa prima datur, ex qua impetrentur cetera, quae proprie opera nuncupantur, in quibus justè vivitur" (*De Praed.* c. vii.); on good works done by justified man, and their reward: "Dona sua coronat Deus, non merita tua (*De Grat. et Lib. Arb.* c. vi.); and "Debetur, inquam, bona merces operibus hominum bonis; sed non debetur gratia, quae homines bonos operatur ex malis" (*Op. Imp.* c. Jul. i. 133) or, as Prosper alters it: "quae praecedat, ut fiant" (*opera bona, Sent.* 299).

Several of these passages, and others to the same effect, were collected from St. Augustine by Prosper for his *Sentences*, and by Gennadius for his *Ecclesiastical Dogmas*, besides inspiring the canons of the councils of Milevis, A.D. 416, and Orange, A.D. 529 (*Mansi*, iv. 325; and viii. 711), and hence the confusion in the Western mind, already noticed, respecting justification to this day. The council of Milevis, for instance, at which St. Augustine was present, says in its third canon, which is the twenty-eighth dogma with Gennadius: "Item placuit, ut quicumque dixerit gratiam Dei, in qua justificamur per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, ad solam remissionem peccatorum valere, quae jam commissa sunt, non etiam ad adiutorium ut non committantur, anathema sit"; where it is the grace received in baptism, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is really meant; described further in the fourth and fifth canons, and called expressly "gratia justificationis" in the fifth. In this state the subject remained dormant till the 13th century, neither St. John Damascene nor Peter Lombard inviting attention to it in their respective works, till it was taken in hand by St. Thomas, who, following St. Augustine in distinguishing between operating and co-operating grace, made justification an effect of the first (*Sun.* II. i. quaest. 111 and 113).

But this is to confound negative with positive grace: cause with effect; justification with regeneration; the judicial act of the Father consequent on the death of Christ, with the descent of the Holy Ghost consequent on His ascension. Justification in the view of the

fathers, so far as they have expressed themselves, precedes not merely co-operating but operating, grace; and is the *sine qua non* to both, but equally conditional with both throughout on their acceptance by man. Hence the secret of its connexion with faith, baptism, and good works, in patristic literature, is, that they are the means employed, internal and external, by the Holy Ghost for giving effect to it in individuals. Justification is accordingly stated in the fathers to be through faith at one time, through baptism at another, through good works at another, though most frequently, by a good deal, through faith. And for this plain reason, namely, that where baptism is out of the question, faith alone will suffice; while baptism, on the contrary, by whomsoever administered, will never suffice for adults without faith. In the same way, there are numerous cases where faith will suffice without works; but no case where the best of works will suffice for salvation where faith is extinct. Yet neither in works, faith, nor baptism is the part played by man more than subordinate; the vitality (*τὸ ζωοποιόν*) belonging to them all is the gift of the Holy Ghost; union with Christ compensates for all imperfections in their reception by men; the sole contribution to them for which any credit can be taken for man is his consent. We cannot be reminded too frequently, that a gift is one thing and the application of a gift another. Christ purchased justification for us all, but the Holy Ghost applies it to each of us, and not to all of us in the same way. "Life," says Hooker, "as all other gifts and benefits, groweth originally from the Father: and cometh not unto us but by the Son: nor, by the Son, to any of us in particular, but through the Spirit" (*E. P.* v. 66, 7). He has here simply translated St. Cyril of Alexandria, whose constant refrain it is. All the benefits flowing from the promise made to the woman were merited by Christ, but are supplied to us by the Holy Ghost, to whose action within us, be what it may, co-operation on our part is a *sine qua non*. Our justification, our sanctification, and our union with Christ, not one of these was purchased for man by the Holy Ghost, yet not one of them is supplied to us by Christ Himself. Christ merited them all, but it is the Holy Ghost who is charged in each case with their bestowal, and man is free to reject them all on their being offered to his acceptance; or, having accepted them, to trample them under foot in after life, and "account the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing," though the consequences of his act are portrayed in the same page (*Heb.* x. 26 et sq.). "Save yourselves" (*σώθητε*, the passive form in a middle sense, as both our Revised and Authorised Versions correctly render) "from this untoward generation," exclaimed St. Peter to his countrymen on the day of Pentecost, as is stated in Acts ii. 40. And agreeably with his exhortations, we are told in the last verse of the same chapter, "The Lord added daily to the church such as were saving themselves" (*τοὺς σωζομένους*); which both versions alike fail to express.

9. SANCTIFICATION.

Which the council of Trent probably would not have confounded in its lengthy decree with

justification (Lep. vi. ed. Waterworth), had Greek been as well known to its picked theologians as it is to most university men now. Yet it is just possible that a deeper cause underlies and influences Roman theology now, as then: namely, the breach established long since between it and primitive teaching on the special prerogatives of the Sanctifier. For it was the teaching of the universal church, for at least eight centuries, that the Holy Ghost came down from heaven to be the dispenser of all the benefits of the Incarnation to be had in the church at large: and to apply them, through the sacraments, to each individual soul desiring them; first, by regenerating the soul of each catechumen in baptism, and secondly, by incorporating each regenerate soul with Christ in the Eucharist. The ancient church made no secret of her teaching on this vital point, in her public offices that have come down to us. For there was a special prayer, called *Ἐπίκλησις*, for invoking His presence and inviting His action, that was inseparable from her administration of baptism, confirmation, penance, the Holy Eucharist, the consecration of bishops, priests, and deacons, the anointing of the sick, the dedication of altars and churches, to say nothing of all those subjective gifts and graces enumerated by St. Paul, and attributed expressly to the Holy Ghost in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, which the church constantly prayed might be vouchsafed to her children. Professor Hoppe deserves all praise for his candid admissions (*Die Epiklesis*: Schaffhausen, 1864, 8vo.), but even his statements fall short of his subject. He, too, perhaps, had not observed that sanctification was never so much as considered, nor even named, except *obiter*, in the council of Trent, and that in its thirty-three canons on justification, the Holy Ghost is only twice named: first in acknowledgment of "His prevent inspiration before baptism," and next of "the charity" which St. Paul says is "shed abroad in our hearts" by Him (Rom. v. 5); while in the sixteen long chapters preceding them, He is again only named in connexion with the two subjective gifts ascribed to Him in the canons, and with baptism and penance amongst ordinances. Contrariwise the apostle writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. vi. 11), "But ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and in the Spirit of our God," evidently distinguishing between justification and sanctification, and ascribing one to the Son, and the other to the Holy Ghost. And this, again, is his summing up in writing to the Romans (viii. 1 and 14), "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit . . . For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." Christ redeemed us, justified us, on the cross. We are sanctified by the Holy Ghost in our hearts. In other words, though the whole Trinity planned the salvation of man, part of the scheme for effecting it was assigned to the Son, and part to the Holy Ghost. Nor must Their parts be reversed, any more than Their names, by man. St. Augustine (*Serm.* viii. 13, ed. Ben.), speaking for the West, says: "Sanctificatio nulla divina et vera est, nisi ab Spiritu Sancto." St. Cyril of Jerusalem, speaking for the East (*Cat.* xxii. 7), says, "Everything which

that Holy Spirit touches is hallowed and transformed."

10. ELECTION.

But, in reality, the elect are neither more nor less than the predestinate, consisting of all those who, having been called in Christ, and justified freely through Him, have neither refused to come, nor been afterwards wanting in diligence to make their calling and election sure. All men might have belonged to this class, had they pleased, to whatever race they belonged, and in whatever age they were born—whether aggregated to the Jewish or to the Christian churches or not, in life, so that they never had the option of belonging to either. As election was never in any case founded on personal merits, so neither was non-election ever decreed against any, but such as had personally rejected, or proved unfaithful to the offer made to them by the Holy Ghost of all the benefits purchased by Christ for all in whatever form that offer may have been conveyed to each. For the mission of the Holy Ghost being to apply, without limit or stint, all those benefits to the redeemed of all ages in succession, His application of them to the millions outside the Jewish and Christian churches, would widely differ from His application of them to the individuals composing those bodies; again, even they would be differentiated from each other on the same principle that would differentiate them from those outside their pale, namely, that "unto whom much is given of him should much be required: and to whom men have committed much, of him would they ask the more" (St. Luke xii. 48), and again, "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful in much too" (*ib.* xvi. 10). Yet further, even "the unrighteous mammon" may prove the means of receiving numbers, using it aright, "into everlasting habitations" (*ib.* x. 9).

11. TEMPORAL MISSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.

Turning back at this precise point, therefore, for a final survey of the entire subject of predestination, by the light thrown on it from what has been advanced on other subjects affecting the present and future condition of man, we find the remark forced on us, that this temporal mission of the Holy Ghost is the very point which has hitherto received least attention from predestinarians, though they would probably be the last to question its relevancy. For the admitted end and object of His mission having been to apply the full benefits of the Redemption to all willing to profit by it, to say that its application must be co-extensive with its intention, is almost to waste words. To allow that Christ died for all, and yet maintain in the same breath that the Holy Ghost passes over any for whom Christ died, or, again, applies His merits unfairly, by not giving each the same option of profiting by them as his next neighbour or his deadliest foe, would surely be treason to those pointed assurances, "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever." It is an *alter ego*, surely, that is here promised; so that if One "came into the world to save sinners," it is out of the question that any, being sinners, should be overlooked by the other. Only those who rejected His advances would be denied anything that He had to give; their

exclusion would be purely their own act in each and every case. Now, by the confession of all, it is He who washes away sin of every kind, actual as well as original, in the sacrament of baptism; He who washes away post-baptismal sin afterwards in penitential tears; He who, before baptism by water was instituted, or wherever it cannot be had still, has never ceased to baptize, by breathing into the heart repentance and faith. Yet both the outward and inward baptism may be offered only to be refused, or, having been accepted, to have their effects marred and effaced ultimately by the workings of a perverse will. Again, "the unclean spirit" having been driven out of a man, may return, and finding the house from which he had been expelled empty, may resume possession of it with seven others more wicked than himself, making his abode there permanent (St. Matt. xii. 43-45). Judicial blindness is the penalty which is here symbolised, for it is added, "Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation." St. John identifies them for us (xii. 37 and 39). "Though He had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on Him . . . Therefore they could not believe . . ." St. Stephen, himself full of the Holy Ghost, assures us later, that overtures had been made by the Holy Ghost even to his persecutors, but resisted—"Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye" (Acts vii. 51). And St. Paul, in a strong appeal to those since converted, like himself, "Wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, 'To-day, if ye will hear His voice, *harden not your hearts*' . . ." (Heb. iii. 7). Meanwhile the same blessed Spirit, repelled habitually by the Jew, was hard at work in hearts of the man of Ethiopia, treasurer to queen Candace (Acts viii. 27), and of the Italian centurion at Caesarea (ib. x. 1), with their good will, and therefore working with effect. The same grace that became by its acceptance, the saving of the Gentile, entailed by its non-acceptance, the condemnation of the Jew. In other words, it was the unconstrained act of the individual in each case that decided his future. Putting the Scriptures out of sight, it is beyond us to conceive probation accomplished in any beings endowed with reason, unless the will is left free; while the scriptural dissuasives against resisting, tempting, grieving and quenching the Holy Spirit, taken in their obvious and natural sense, go far to prove that the Holy Ghost, in offering salvation through Christ to the individual, not merely presupposes, but upholds, and invests with enhanced solemnity, those fundamental laws of his present existence, which hold him accountable for his acts on earth, by making it an additional item in his probation, and the consequences of its rejection infinitely more momentous than any with which he had ever been threatened before. Taking Scripture, then, for our guide we may be bold to say, that the Holy Ghost has been engaged, ever since the promise made to the seed of the woman, up and down the world, making overtures to all for whom Christ would in due course die; inspiring all breasts responding to His benign influence with saving faith, and gradually fitting them by a hidden process, to sit down with Abraham, Isaac,

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven, while discovering and eliminating all the corrupt and counterfeit members of the Jewish and Christian churches, whose defilements should exclude them from fellowship with the elect of those bodies in the church triumphant. For it belongs *ex officio* to Him, in the application of His spiritual tests, to search out of what stuff each heart is made, and thus to see that not only none should be excluded from heaven who would fain get in thither if they could, but that none should get in under false pretences. Here, then, we seem to be brought face to face with the only sin pronounced by the Saviour Himself to be beyond forgiveness, and characterised as sin against the Holy Ghost (St. Matt. xii. 32), probably what St. John calls with bated breath, "a sin unto death," and past praying for (1 John v. 16). Of this sin, again, we seem to have several degrees assigned, "Resisting the Holy Ghost," with which St. Stephen charges his persecutors and their forefathers (Acts vii. 51), would be the first of course; "quenching Him," against which St. Paul warns the Thessalonians (1 Thess. v. 19), another: wilful apostasy, described in two well-known passages of the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 4-8 and x. 26-31), the worst of all. For such, it must be plain to everybody, "no more sacrifice for sin," could be with any reason expected, nor any plea for mercy, consistently with immutable justice, sustained.

Thus the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, estimated at its full proportions, at once and for ever negatives the doctrines of unconditional or absolute predestination, and of unconditional or absolute reprobation, in the same breath. For it precedes both, and determines both by its success or failure. Its foreseen success dictated the one, and its foreseen failure the other, before time began, in the counsels of the Most High. Consequently, predestination viewed side by side with the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost, and interpreted by it, assumes a complexion that may be scanned without any misgivings, as it is seen to include no more than its foreseen results, grounded on the report in due time to be supplied by Him of the souls that have accepted or rejected His offer made to each of them of all the benefits purchased for man by Christ under each dispensation, and outside them both, a report to be definitively comprised in two separate books—not to be opened before the judgment day—each commencing with time, and each receiving accessions to the end of time, and neither containing a single name that was not foreknown and predetermined. Hence, both the names in both, and the number of the names in both, cannot but be fixed and unalterable, not that the course which human affairs would take was brought about in the least by its being infallibly foreknown, nor again that the destinies of a single moral agent were not the effect of his own personal act in accepting or rejecting salvation through Christ, because predetermined. For if it would be impious to deny that the Son of God died for all men, and earnestly desired the salvation of all for whom He died, or that by His death adequate satisfaction was made for the sins, actual and original, of the whole race descended from Adam, it would surely be just as impious to

assert that any should have been predestined to everlasting exclusion from heaven, to whom the Holy Ghost, in the application of His merits to individuals, had not offered actual participation in them to each soul, on terms appreciable by it, and been refused. Faith, equally without the sacraments of the Christian church and the culture of modern times, appears thus once more the polar star of all the souls under the Law, and before the Law, enumerated in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose sixth verse, defining it, supplies a test by which no human being either now, or at any previous time, could refuse to be tried. And reason alone would suggest that more should be required from those who have received more, were Scripture silent on this point, which it is not. Again, "he that hath, to him shall be given and he shall have abundance . . ." but, "whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have . . ." whether intended or not to supply the rule, traces exactly the course observed by the Holy Ghost in bestowing grace. Predestination is but another word for election, based on this principle, and carried out in instalments on earth, but registered in the archives of heaven in advance, where its results have been always foreknown.

To enumerate, or even to classify, the different views taken of the subject of predestination from St. Augustine downwards, would be nugatory, because neither St. Augustine, nor those who followed him are consistent at all times with themselves. Dr. Mozley (note 19 to p. 139) credits Hooker alone with three different views, founded upon St. Augustine, which he illustrates by quotations. Then, in his next note, reviewing the controversy raised by Goteschalchus, he says "a good deal of arbitrary adoption and arbitrary rejection of language on both sides, a good deal of reliance on distinctions without a difference, that is to say, on words." And, in his next, "I see no substantial difference between the Augustinian and Thomist, and the Calvinist doctrine of predestination." Once more, further on in the same note, we are told that "the same argument by which Pascal proves that the Thomists of the Sorbonne agreed in doctrine with the Jansenists, proves equally that the Jansenist or Augustinian agreed with the Calvinist." It is needless to say that all these positions are maintained with consummate skill, and illustrated with abundant extracts from the writings of each school, and accompanied, in another part of his work, by strictures on archbishop Laurence for not understanding them better (c. x. p. 280 et sq.). But the truth is, the Bampton Lecturer for A.D. 1865 only concerned himself with the opinions of the Reformers in relation to Articles 9-18 of the Church of England, and in general his quotations from the schoolmen are derived from their writings, on which his remarks and learned notes may be studied with great profit. Chapters 37-42 of the tenth book of the great work of Dr. Thomas Jackson traverse the same ground, with keen insight avoiding its pitfalls. Post-reformation opinions on the continent may be read summarised in Hagenbach's *Hist. of Doctrines*, §§ 244-52; or, again, in Blunt's *Theol. Dict.*, articles Calvinism, Sublapsarians, Sciti-

dianism. Article Election brings out the doctrine of the Church of England on that head. A fuller insight into the "Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants" on these subjects will be found in the first four chapters of Moehler's *Symb.*, Robertson's tr. Going back to St. Augustine, the views maintained by him found a warm defender in St. Prosper of Aquitaine, whose answers to the various objections made to them by his countrymen may be read in vol. li. of the *Patrol. Lat.* of Abbé Migne. A tract of St. Fulgentius on predestination follows in vol. lxxv. of the same series. Another in the appendix to the works of Alcuin, vol. ci. Another by Amalul, vol. cxvi. Another by Florus, vol. cxix. Another by Ratramm, vol. cxxi., followed by the confession of Goteschalchus, and the three works of Remigius, bishop of Lyons, favourable to him in the same vol. For the strictures on him by archbishop Hincmar of Rheims we have to go to vol. ccxv. A tract of St. Anselm may be read in vol. clviii. p. 507, et sq. This is a golden treatise, that might be studied with the utmost profit even now. All the intervening pieces between it and that of St. Fulgentius are merely collections of passages from the fathers dovetailed. This is argued out on the grounds of Scripture and common sense, without reference to a single father. The four books of the *Sentences* by Peter Lombard are reprinted in vol. ccxii. of the same series, and book i. dist. 35, of this work furnished a text on predestination for the schoolmen, who followed him, to work out. Part i. 9, 23, of the *Summa Theol.* of St. Thomas Aquinas, reprinted at the end of the same series, supplied them with a further text. A learned digest of their opinions may be seen in Estius, *ad Sent.* lib. i., dist. 40-48. Calvin rekindled, and stirred up fresh controversy by the views expressed in book iii. of his *Instns.* published A.D. 1536, on predestination and reprobation, making both unconditional and absolute—views which he defended afterwards in a separate tract. The council of Trent left the subject untouched. Cornelius Jansen, bishop of Ypres, accordingly, by his work published in the next century, called *Augustinus or the Doctrine of St. Augustine*, nearly precipitated a schism between the Gallican and Roman churches, on the merits of which Dr. Mozley has been already cited, while the Calvinistic proclivities of Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, which led to his deposition, were condemned afterwards in two synods of Constantinople, A.D. 1642-3, under the then patriarch Parthenius, and at Jerusalem, A.D. 1672, under Dositheus. (Kimmel's *Lib. Symb. Eccl. Orient. Proleg.* § 10; also *Conf. Orthod.* P. i. 9, 22-31; and *Synod. Hier.* c. i., contra iii.; with *Dosith. Conf. Dec.* iii.)

On justification more particularly, see Maréchal's *Concord. SS. Pat.* supplemented by Schramm's *Analysis*, Fessler's *Inst. Patrol.*, Huebner's *Hist. Ant. Doym.*, Bull's *Harm. Apost.*, Waterland's *Summary View*, Faber's *Primitive View*, Newman's *Lectures*, Moehler's *Symb.* c. iii., Robertson's tr., Waterworth's *Council of Trent*, introd. xciii-cx. and p. 21-49, bp. Harold Browne on Art. X.; Blunt's *Theol. Dict.* sub v.; Kimmel, *Dosith. Conf. Dec.* XIII. *Sylloge Confm.* Oxon e Typ. Clar. 1827, under the heads given to it in each. [E. S. Fl.]

PREPON, a disciple of Marcion, whose name has been preserved for us by Hippolytus (*Ref.* vii. 31). Hippolytus states that he was his own contemporary, that he was an Assyrian, and that he wrote a book in defence of his heresy inscribed to "Bardesianes the Armenian" (see Vol. I. p. 251). [G. S.]

PRILIDAN, one of the three children martyred with BABYLAS (1). [EPOLONUS.] (Tillem. iii. 404.) [C. H.]

PRIMA, one of the martyrs with DATURUS (3) and SATURNINUS, A.D. 304. She is by some called Primaeva, her name being joined to that of the next woman on the list, Eva. Cf. *Kalend. Carthag.* iii. Kal. Sep. in *Ruinartii Acta Sinc.* p. 694; cf. the acts on p. 410, l. c. [G. T. S.]

PRIMAERIUS, bishop of Nocera, to whom with other bishops Gregory the Great wrote in A.D. 598, requesting him to give the ex-prefect Gregorius the relics of certain saints for a basilica he was founding. (*Epp.* ix. 25.) [F. D.]

PRIMASIVS, bishop of Adrumetum, or Justinianopolis, in the Byzacene province of North Africa. He flourished in the middle of the 6th century, and exercised considerable influence on the literary activity of the celebrated theological lawyer Junilius [JUNILIUS, t. iii. p. 534], who dedicated to him his *Institutes*, which spread the views of Theodore of Mopsuestia in the west. Primasius first comes before us as sitting in a synod of his province in 541, the decrees of which are lost, and are now known only through Justinian's decrees confirming them, as given in Baronius, *Ann.* 541, n. 10-12. He was sent to Constantinople in connexion with the controversy about the Three Chapters, about the year 551. He took part in the synod which pope Vigilius held against Theodore Ascidas, and was still in Constantinople during the session of the fifth general council, but took no part in its meetings, notwithstanding repeated solicitations (Mansi, ix. 199 sq.). He was one of the sixteen bishops who signed the Constitutum of pope Vigilius, May 14, 553. When, however, Vigilius accepted the decrees of the fifth council, Primasius signed them also. According to the *Chronicon Victor. Episc. Tunv.* Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxviii. col. 959, other motives conspired to bring about this change. He was at first exiled to a convent, and then the death of Boethius, primate of the Byzacene province, aroused his ambition to be his successor. He gained his point, but on his return home found his suffragans so hostile that they denounced him as guilty of sacrilege and robbery. He died soon afterwards. His writings are contained in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxviii. p. 407-936. They embrace commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles and Apocalypse, and likewise a treatise (now lost) in three books, *De Haeresibus*, dedicated to bishop Fortunatus, touching on some points of that subject which Augustine did not live to treat with sufficient fulness (Isidor. *Hispal. Vir. Ill.* xxii., in *Pat. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1095; Cave, i. 525; Tillem. xiii. 927, xvi. 21). On the impossibility of this treatise having been that now extant under the name of PRAEDESTINATUS, see that article. Our Primasius is sometimes con-

founded with another Primasius who succeeded Reparatus in the see of Carthage. The best account of Primasius of Adrumetum will be found in Kihn's *Theodor von Mopsuestia*, pp. 248-254, where a critical estimate is formed of the sources of his exegetical works. [CHILIASTS.] [G. T. S.]

PRIMIANUS, Donatist bishop of Carthage, successor to Parmenian, A.D. 392. A general account of his quarrel with Maximian, and its consequences, will be found above. (DONATISM, Vol. I. 887; MAXIMIANUS (2), Vol. III. 869.) The following additions, however, may be made: 1. as to Maximian, that in one place it is said that he was ordained by twelve bishops, and in another that 100 were present, viz. at Cabarsussis (*Aug. de Gest. cum Emer.* 9; *c. Cresc.* iv. 6, 7), a discrepancy easily reconciled if we suppose, as Ribbek suggests, that though 100 were present, only twelve joined in the act of ordination. (Ribbek, *Aug. und Don.* p. 216.) 2. Respecting Primian, that among the many charges brought against him by the Maximianists were the following, that he admitted the Claudianists to communion, and when some of the seniors remonstrated with him for so doing, he encouraged, if he did not even originate, a riotous attack upon them in a church, in which some of them lost their lives. Further, that he was guilty of various acts of an arbitrary and violent kind, superseding bishops, excommunicating and condemning clergymen without sufficient cause, closing his church doors against both the people and the imperial officers when summoned to appear, and taking possession of buildings to which he had no right. (*Aug. En. in Ps.* 36, 20; *c. Cresc.* iv. 6, 7; and 7, 9; also 48, 58, and 50, 60; *Mon. Vet. Don.* xxxv. ed. Oberthür. CLAUDIANISTS, Vol. I. 549. Fortunatus (4), Vol. II. 555. SALVIUS.) At the proceedings before the civil magistrate, probably Herodes, or Seranus, arising out of the decision of the Council of Bagaia, Primian is said to have taunted his opponents with relying on imperial edicts, while his own party brought with them the Gospels only. (*Aug. Post Coll.* xxxi. § 53; HERODES (2) Vol. III. 5.) When the conference was proposed he resisted it, remarking with scornful arrogance that "it was not fit that the sons of martyrs should confer with the brood of traitors." (*Carth. Coll.* iii. 116; *Aug. Brevic. Coll.* iii. 4, 4.) As one of the seven managers at the conference, A.D. 411, on the Donatist side, he appears to have done what he could to delay the opening of the proceedings, and to obstruct them during their progress, but to have shown no faculty of debate. (*Brevic. Coll.* ii. 30; *Carth. Coll.* i. 104.) The only other act of his with which we are specially acquainted is a just sentence of condemnation passed by him on Cyprian, Donatist bishop of Thubursica, for an act of scandalous immorality. (*Aug. c. Petil.* iii. 34, 40.) [H. W. P.]

PRIMITIVUS (1) "compresbyter," bishop or presbyter of Carthage, sent to convey the letter and give personal explanations from Conc. 1. Carth. to Cornelius (Cyp., *Ep.* 44): brought back the reply from Cornelius (*Ep.* 48).

[E. W. B.]

PRIMITIVUS (2). [SYMPHOROSA.]
2 H 2

PRIMOGENIUS, patriarch of Aquileia. From the time of Candianus the succession of the patriarchs of Aquileia had been twofold, a schismatic line being established at Cormons, Cividale, or Udine, with jurisdiction over the continental part of the province which were under the Lombard dominion, while a line in communion with Rome went on at Grado with jurisdiction over Istria and the islands which obeyed the emperor, though each line claimed jurisdiction over the whole of the ancient province. On the flight of Fortunatus after stripping the churches [FORTUNATUS (23)], Pope Honorius informed of these facts by the bishops of Venetia and Istria in A.D. 628, sent Primogenius a subdeacon of the Roman church to be consecrated in the place of Fortunatus, and granted him the pall. (Honorii *Epp.* ii. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 469; Jaffé, *Reg.* 157.) Honorius also wrote to the king of the Lombards, demanding the extradition of Fortunatus and the restoration of the abstracted property. Primogenius is said to have sent a mission to the emperor, who gave him more than Fortunatus had carried off, and also the chair of St. Mark which he had brought from Alexandria. He was bishop for twenty years. (*Chron. Patr. Grad.* in *Scrip. Rer. Lang.* i. 395.) [F. D.]

PRIMOLUS, confessor at Carthage, A.D. 259. He died in prison, but unbaptized, and his confession was held equivalent to baptism (Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 275, ed. 1859). [J. G.]

PRIMOSUS (1), Catholic bishop of Lemella in Mauritania, attended the Donatist council of Theveste, A.D. 362, and complained in vain of the violence of the party (Optatus, *De Schism. Don.* ii. c. 17). [J. G.]

PRIMOSUS (2), bishop of the civitas Tigabitana in Mauretania Caesariensis, complained of by the citizens to the emperor, and by the latter ordered to appear before a general council of Africa. When this council met at Carthage in 407 (the eleventh under Aurelius), Primosus failed to appear, and when sought for could not be found. A report of the circumstance was sent to Innocentius, the primate of Mauretania Caesariensis. (*Cod. Can. Afr. Eccl.* num. 95, *Hard.* i. 922; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 321; Tillem. xiii. 454, 1036.) [C. H.]

PRIMULUS, Donatist bishop of Vaga, who in 411 had embraced catholic unity with all his people, both in town and country. (*Gest. Collat. Carth.* cognit. i. §§ 176, 215.) [C. H.]

PRIMUS (1), 4th bishop of Alexandria, succeeded Cerdon in the eleventh year of Trajan (Euseb. *Chron. H. E.* iv. 1), i.e. in A.D. 108-9. His name was afterwards corrupted into Abri-mius, Obrimius, or Barnius (e.g. Eutyech. *Annal.* i. 347). Le Quien (*Oriens Christ.* ii. 389) says that later writers also call him Ephraim; but Renaudot (*Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 19) does not agree with Papebroch in thinking that "Primus" was altered into "Ephraim" and "Syrian" into "Egyptian" in the Coptic calendar, for the 3rd of Mesori = 27th July. It would not, he says, have been natural for the Copts to place Primus in their Calendar, which contains few names of the earliest ages, except those of mar-

tyrs. He cites Severus of Aschumin as saying that Primus was "one of the orthodox people," i.e. a layman, when elected, and adds, "Thus even the Coptic tradition refutes the story of Eutyechius about St. Mark's decree that the bishop of Alexandria should be elected solely out of the college of twelve presbyters which he had instituted." He considers that Eutyechius was referring to the election, not consecration, of early Alexandrian bishops; but that even so, he is refuted by the statements of Severus, a far more "accurate" writer on Alexandrian affairs. The chief event in the episcopate of Primus must have been the sanguinary insurrection of the Jews of Egypt, avenged in Alexandria itself by the massacre of the Jewish residents (Eusebius, iv. 2; compare Milman, *Hist. Jews.* ii. 420; Merivale, *Hist. Rom.* viii. 167). Primus sat twelve years, and died in the third year of Hadrian (A.D. 119-120) according to the ordinary recension of Eusebius's *Chronicle*; the Armenian form dates his death in the fourth year, and Renaudot postpones it till the fifth, and fixes it on Sunday, the 3rd of Mesori, or July 27, A.D. 122. [W. B.]

PRIMUS (2), bishop of Corinth in the middle of the second century, when Hegesippus visited the city on his way to Rome. [HEGESIPPUS.] Hegesippus was kindly received by him, and commends him for continuance in the true faith (Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. c. 22; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* 158). [DIONYSIUS (3).] [J. G.]

PRIMUS (3) Cyp. *Ep.* 50. Novatianist. [NICOSTRATUS.] [E. W. B.]

PRIMUS (4), bishop of Misgirpa (Migirpa, Migirpa), which was in Prov. Afr. Proc. according to the Notitia, but is unmentioned by the geographers, Morcelli. Mommsen also has no inscriptions which illustrate it. But its bishops appear in three more African councils before A.D. 485. The high place of Primus on the list of speakers, who comes from so insignificant a place perhaps illustrates the African rank of bishops by seniority. *Sentt. Episcoporum.* 2. in *Syn. Carth. de Bap.* 3. [E. W. B.]

PRIMUS (5) the same). In Aug. he is called Primus Felix, whence Fell supposes the true name to be Felix, and Primus a note to distinguish him from the other Felices, but the word alius is not added to the next Felix, but the one after. He previously appears as 2nd bishop in the list of Syn. 4 Carth. de Basilide, A.D. 254 (Cyp. *Ep.* 67, and in the 4th place in that of Syn. v., A.D. 255. De Bap. 1. *Ep.* 70). [E. W. B.]

PRIMUS (6), June 9. A Roman citizen and martyr with Felicianus in the Diocletian persecution. They were accused by a pagan priest, and suffered under Promotus a president. Le Blant quotes their acts p. 254 and 225 as genuine illustrations of antiquity. Baronius in *Rom. Mart.* June 9 and Ceillier iii. 100 are doubtful of them. Ado gives a long extract from them, and tells us of exposure of the martyrs to lions who refused to touch them. Their bodies were stolen by the faithful, and buried "Ad arcus Numentanos intra arenarium" at the 14th milestone from Rome. [G. T. S.]

PRIMUS (7), sub-deacon, a Spaniard by birth, removed from the clerical office for irregular conduct and disobedience in respect of social intercourse with nuns. Having gone over in resentment to the Donatists, he was received by them and baptized, and was followed by two of the nuns, who also received baptism, and joined the Circumcellions in their riotous extravagances. (Aug. *Ep.* 35, 2.) [H. W. P.]

PRINCIPIA, a Roman lady who lived in virginity; the friend of Marcella (*q.v.*), and well known to Jerome. When Jerome and Paula left Rome, Principia went to live with Marcella, and remained with her in the closest intimacy till her death. (Jerome, *Ep.* cxvii, 8, ed. Vall.) She had, like Marcella, a great delight in scriptural studies. Jerome, in answer to her request, wrote for her a commentary on the 45th Psalm (*Ep.* lxx.), in the close of which he says that she will hereafter understand not only that Psalm, but the whole of the Song of Songs. This appears to have led to a request from her that he would write a commentary on the Song. (Pref. to Comm. on Matt., end.) But whether he ever did this is uncertain. The year following (398), when Eusebius of Cremona was starting for Italy, and had persuaded Jerome to write for him the commentary on St. Matthew, Jerome in the prefatory letter to Eusebius bids him specially take a copy to Principia. She continued to live with Marcella till the siege of Rome, from the effects of which Marcella died. She then wrote to Jerome begging him to compose an epitaphion or memoir of Marcella, which however he was unable to do for about two years. At length in 412 he did so. It forms *Ep.* 127 in Vallarsi's edition of his works, and is addressed to Principia, who was her heir—the heir, as Jerome explains, of her poverty rather than her wealth, or rather the trustee of her legacy to the poor. [W. H. F.]

PRINCIPIUS (PRINCE), ST., 12th bishop of Soissons, was a brother of St. Remigius of Rheims, the apostle of the Franks [REMIGIUS (2)] and father or uncle, as is said, of his own successor St. Lupus. He was the recipient of two letters from Sidonius Apollinarius (viii. 14; ix. 8). The earlier, written between 472 and 482, is highly eulogistic of Principius himself, his father, and his more famous brother. At his death, which probably occurred in the last decade of the 5th century, he was buried by St. Remigius in the little chapel of St. Thecla without the walls, whence his remains were afterwards translated to the cathedral. They were burnt by the Calvinists in the 16th century, but an arm was preserved at Douay, in the collegiate church of St. Amé. His day is Sept. 25, but his cult is not very ancient (Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. vii. 60-2; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 335). A homily on him, ascribed to Milo, a monk of St. Amand in the 9th century, was published by Surius (see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 414). [S. A. B.]

PRISCA (1) the Montanist Prophetess (Cyp. *Ep.* 75, Firmiliani). [E. W. B.]

PRISCA (2), Jan. 18. Virg. and Mart. at Rome; date unknown, but *Roman Mart.* places her under Claudius: perhaps the second of that name, A.D. 268, as the first Claudius is out of

the question. (*Mart. Vet. Rom.*, Usuard., Adon., *Kalend. Fronton.*; Gregor. *Sacramentar.*)

[G. T. S.]

PRISCA (3), wife of the emperor DIOCLETIAN, *q.v.* Vol. I. 836.

PRISCIANUS (1), a bishop, sent with two others, Eusebius and Cyriacus, by the council of Constantinople in 381 to carry its synodical letter to the council of Rome (Theod. *H. E.* v. 9). He was probably the bishop of Sebaste in Palestine, who subscribed at the former council (Hard. i. 813; Tillem. x. 150). [C. H.]

PRISCIANUS (2) CAESARIENSIS. Of the life of this celebrated grammarian and its details very little is known. He appears to have been a native of the Mauretanian Caesarea, and to have taught and written in the early years of the 6th century. From the dedication of one of his minor works (to Symmachus), it has been inferred that he had lived at Rome, while Cassiodorus (*de Orthogr.* 12) speaks of him as a contemporary teaching at Constantinople. He was the pupil of Theoctistus, whom he calls "omnis eloquentiae decus, cui quidquid in me sit doctrinae post Deum imputo." The date at which he wrote is to some extent fixed by the panegyric on Anastasius (491-518). His principal work was probably published some years before 526, as it appears to have been in the years 526-7 that his pupil Theodorus was engaged on the revision of the work from which all the existing MSS. are descended. This great work is the "Institutiones Grammaticae," in 18 books; a treatise very widely read in the middle ages (as the large number of MSS. sufficiently shews), printed several times before 1500, and still largely influencing grammatical terminology. In the dedication (addressed to Julianus, consul and patrician, who cannot be certainly identified), Priscianus explains the plan and character of his work. He admits that it is based on the works of Apollonius and Herodianus, in the same way that earlier works of the kind had been based upon the writings of the earlier Greek grammarians; and he claims for himself a higher credit than was due to his Latin predecessors, because, while they imitated "the very errors" of their Greek authorities, he has been the first to follow a more excellent model. At the same time he complains that he has been forced to publish his book more hurriedly than he desired, on account of those "qui alienis laboribus insidiantes, furtimeque et quasi per latrocinia scripta ab aliis surripientes, unius nominis ad titulum pertinentis infanda mutatione, totius operis gloriam in se transferre conantur." This complaint would have something of absurdity if he had regarded his work as a mere reproduction of the treatises of older writers. Yet in substance it would appear that such was the case. In arrangement he seems to have followed his Greek authorities, in details and quotations the earlier Latin grammarians. But he makes a special claim to the merit of brevity by way of apology, declaring that his books are compendious in comparison with the "pelagus scriptorum" of Herodianus, and the "spaciosa volumina" of Apollonius; and it was possibly this combination of brevity with superior

arrangement which obtained for his work the great influence it undoubtedly possessed. The subject is divided by him as follows:—Book i. contains his treatises on sound and on letters; book ii. treats of the syllable, of the word (dictio), the sentence, and the noun; book iii., of comparatives, superlatives, and diminutives; book iv., of denominatives, verbals, participials, and adverbials; book v., of the distinction of genders by terminations, of numerals and figures, and of cases in general; book vi. deals with the terminations of the nominative, and with the ultimate and penultimate syllables of the genitive case; book vii., with the remaining oblique cases; book viii. is concerned with the verb; for which book ix. gives the general rules of all conjugations, and especially those concerning the perfect of the first and second; while book x. is devoted to the formation of the perfect in the third and fourth conjugations; book xi. treats of the participle; books xii.–xiii. of the pronouns, and of the reasons for excluding from this class certain forms previously treated as pronominal; book xiv. is allotted to the preposition; book xv. to the adverb and interjection, and book xvi. to the conjunction. The two remaining books (for which Priscianus was not able so freely to avail himself of earlier writings) treat of “construction” or syntax. These books furnish fewer quotations by way of illustration, and are less valuable in substance than those which are less original.

Of the minor writings of Priscianus, three are dedicated to Symmachus (perhaps the sole consul of 485; the same name occurs as that of a consul in 522). These are entitled “de figuris numerorum,” “de Terentii metris,” and “de praeexercitamentis rhetoricis.” These are all borrowed in greater or less degree from Greek authors, the last being a translation of a work of Hermogenes. The work sometimes called “de delineationibus” is most likely an abridgment intended for school use. The treatise on the initial lines of the 12 books of the Aeneid is interesting as an illustration of the scholastic exercises of the author’s day.

For the treatise “de accentibus,” and a metrical treatise on weights and measures, which are sometimes attributed to Priscianus, he is probably not in any way responsible. He wrote, however, in metre, a translation (in hexameters) of the Periegesis of Dionysius, a work which is of more merit as a translation than as a specimen of poetry; and also an original panegyric on the emperor Anastasius, of no conspicuous excellence.

This last work was edited by Endlicher (Vienna, 1828). The translation of the Periegesis is to be found in Wernsdorf (*Poet. Lat. Min.*), and is also printed with the original poem (as in the Oxford editions of 1697 and 1710). The grammatical works, published very early and often, are to be found in Keil (*Gram. Lat.*), as well as in the earlier and less accurate work of Putsche (*Gram. Vet. Lat.*).

[H. A. W.]

PRISCILLA. [MONTANUS (1) Vol. III. p. 936.] Epiphanius uses the name PRISCILLIANI as equivalent to PEPUZIANI, which see [G. S.]

PRISCILLIANUS (1), governor of Bithynia in the persecution of Diocletian. He succeeded HEROCLES (1), and under both of them Donatus,

the beloved friend of Lactantius, suffered many cruelties (Lact. *De Mort. Persec.* c. 16). Tillemont (v. 89) gives A.D. 307 as the date of his appointment. St. Antonina also is related to have suffered under him (Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Mart. i. 26). [C. H.]

PRISCILLIANUS (2), PRISCILLIANISTS, PRISCILLIANISM. The Priscillianists holding a system of doctrines, Manichaean and Gnostic in character, were organised as a sect by their founder Priscillian. The area and limits of the heresy were not wide either in time or space. The sect sprang up and flourished in Spain during the last third of the 4th century in the reigns of the emperors Gratian and Maximus. After the synod of Saragossa, 381, it ramified into Aquitaine. But it never took deep root beyond the Pyrenees. Where the heresy first appeared in Spain is unrecorded. There it spread through most provinces, especially in cities. The agitation at Cordova, Merida, Avila, Astorga, Saragossa, Toledo, Braga, are sufficient to indicate the prevalence and popularity of the sect. The council of Bordeaux, 384, followed by the violent measures of Maximus, had rather the effect of intensifying for a while the enthusiasm of Priscillian’s adherents. But this was not lasting. In 390, at the synod of Toledo, many leading Priscillianists recanted, and were admitted to church communion. The sect continued to diminish in number. Pope Leo I. exerted himself vigorously to repress it. It languished and lingered still in Spain till the middle of the 5th century. After the council of Toledo, 447, and the council at Braga in Galicia, 448, especially held against the Priscillianists, they disappear from history. Priscillianism became a remembrance and a suspicion.*

A sad and romantic interest attaches to the annals of the sect from the martyrdom of its founder.

The death of Priscillian is an epoch in the dark history of the rise and progress of intolerance and superstition in the church. At this time the theory of persecution was being rapidly developed in the East. Theodosius published fifteen severe edicts against heretics in the fifteen years of his reign, 380–395. Already the punishment of death had been denounced against heretical leaders, at least as a threat and last resource (*Codex Theodos.* Gothfredi, xvi. tit. v. lex. 9). The extreme violence of the heretical sects, the Arians and Donatists and others, becoming rebellious political factions in Africa and the East, murdering antagonists, demolishing houses, committing all sorts of havoc, had led to this. It was reserved to Maximus to carry out the baneful theory in practice. By a singular prophetic fatality, these early persecuting edicts of Theodosius the Spaniard in the Eastern were contemporary with the first judicial shedding of blood for religious opinions under Maximus, also

* Neander has an interesting note (*Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 507). The general dread, in the 5th century, of infection of the Priscillianist heresy is illustrated by reference to Bacchiarus, a Spanish monk driven out of Spain by civil troubles. He is compelled to justify his orthodoxy by his two treatises, *De fide* and *De reparatione lapsi*. They are published in Muratori (*Anecdota*) and Galland (*Bibl. Patrol.* ix. Cf. Mosheim *Ecl. Hist.* cent. iv. pt. ii. ch. v. 22, note p.)

a Spaniard, in the Western empire. Thus the Genius of Persecution had its habitation in Spain. The first legislator, the first executioner, the first victims of the relentless principle that made heresy a capital crime are traceable to Spain, where the fires of the Holy Inquisition in the middle ages were kindled with such remorseless severity. All the more influential dignitaries of the Western church disclaimed at the time this violence against the Priscillianists as unjust and antichristian (Ambrose, *Ep.* 24, *ad Valentinianum*, *Ep.* 26, *ad Irenaeum*, Concil. Turin, can. vi.; Jerome, *de Script. Eccl. Liber*; Sulpic. Sever. *Hist. Sacr.* lib. ii. and *Dialog.* iii. cap. xi.). Yet it was but a perverse inference from arguments generally advanced. Truth and salvation, Augustin, Leo, Chrysostom argued, were well purchased for the souls of men, and need to be secured for them, even though at the cost of bodily pains and penalties to the heretic.

There is an importance also attaching to Priscillianism in connexion with the settlement of the canon of holy Scripture. As the early ages of Christianity receded farther and farther into the remote and distant past, what were its primary records became a question of great moment. How were the true Scriptures to be detected and separated from the false? Who were to be the guardians of the integrity of the Scriptures? At the end of the 4th century this subject was anxiously occupying the minds of Augustin and Jerome. Spain at this time is an example of the need there was for such inquiry, and for some practical form of solution of the difficulty. A vast multitude of apocryphal writings, introduced by the Priscillianists into common use, usurped the place of the Scriptures. To collect and destroy these was one of the chief cares of the orthodox bishops. The laxity of the Priscillianists on the subject of the "divine Scriptures" and the appeals of the Spanish bishops to the churches of Africa and Rome were an important element in the settlement and reception of the canon as still now received (Aug. *Liber de Haeresibus*, 70; *Common. of Orosius to Aug.* Op. vol. viii. 934-5; Aug. *Ep.* 237, *ad Ceretium*).

Regarded from a political point of view in the general history of the times, Priscillianism occupies a meagre space. It was for a while strong in popular favour, modern language would say, as a "revival" movement. It was warmly supported by the middle class. It attracted the sympathy of the lower orders. It enlisted public enthusiasm as a protest against the worldliness and secularity of the churches and their clergy. But even without movement of the tremendous machinery of the civil power, Priscillianism could only have been what we now find it in church history, an ephemeral sect of the later age of the Western empire. The intrinsic strength of the united church would have been sufficient to combat it. Its history embodies no great names. Its vitality depended on the traditions of its founder. The succession was never maintained. Priscillianism was one more new and vain attempt to recast Christianity, a new form of alloy of the pure gold of the faith, a fresh intermingling with it of other metals, a different fusing in new proportions of the current doctrines of the Scriptures with the baser Manichaean and Gnostic materials.

The rise and progress of Priscillianism suggest

some interesting questions. Through all the Trinitarian controversy, in the early half of the 4th century, Spain was firm in its adherence to Athanasian doctrine. A century later, afflicted by the Arianism of Vandal and Gothic conquerors (as later still by the Mohammedanism of the Moors), Spanish orthodoxy became still more tenacious. In the intermediate half-century Priscillianism is outpoured over the peninsula; a sudden tidal wave of Oriental mysticism, the rise, flow, and ebb of a flood of Manichaean and Gnostic opinions. How was it that these Oriental doctrines had such influence in Spain? How came it about that their influence was so widely felt and for so long, while it was so limited to the peninsula? From the speculative nature of the tenets, Priscillianism never could rise in the practical West to the height of a great passionate controversy like Pelagianism. Would persecution, as searching as the Albigensian crusades in the days of Innocent III., have rendered Priscillianism, in the time of Leo I., as inveterate and difficult to eradicate as the Manichaeism of Languedoc?

We now proceed to the general history of the sect.

The Mediterranean sea, long become a Roman lake and the highway of Roman commerce, had early brought upon its waters the first messengers of the gospel. By the same channel were brought in the 4th century the Gnostic and Manichaean heresies. Marcus, a native of Memphis in Egypt, was the means of introducing them. There is nothing known of his life and history. What brought him from the banks of the Nile—why he left behind him the solitude of the Pyramids with the desert and the mirage hovering over them—what were his antecedents at Memphis—how he became imbued with Orientalism, through what Alexandrian books or teachers—what led him to the Spanish peninsula—where he landed—how long he remained—what was his condition of life—is unrecorded. The only facts mentioned are his name, his Egyptian origin, his coming to Spain, his teaching. Two of his followers were Agape a Spanish lady, and Helpidius a rhetorician. Neander considers them to have been husband and wife, but this is uncertain and unlikely (*Ch. Hist.* vol. iv. section iv. Appendix, p. 501). Their convert was the layman Priscillian. The place of his birth or residence is unknown. He was a man of good family, wealthy, and well educated. He became at once an ardent proselyte; an apostle of the Oriental doctrines. His character is described to us by the contemporary historian, Sulpicius Severus, in his *Sacred History* (ii. 46). To advantages of birth and fortune Priscillian added the accomplishments of eloquence and learning. With these was united a remarkable and original native character. Pious and sincere, austere, ardent, and zealous, Priscillian was well fitted to be the apostle and founder of a sect. From youth, eager and curious, with a love and thirst for knowledge, the ignorance of the times charged him with addiction to magical arts and practices. He is described in mature years as keen and ready in debate, intellectual, and fond of argument, acute, restless, and subtle. Frugal and moderate and self-disciplined in his way of living, liberal-handed in use of his riches, endowed with great physical power, high-minded, ambitious, persistent, he

easily acquired a commanding influence over others. Once having become acquainted with the Oriental doctrines, modifying and framing them into a system of his own, he soon became their able exponent and advocate. He attracted a large following. He organised them into a religious society. The influence of the new opinions spread. His efforts were successful both among the higher and lower orders of the people. Many of the wealthy and noble, and a great number of the people, received his teaching. Some bishops, as well as the clergy and laity, became his disciples. The Gnostic mysticism began to take root, and spread rapidly and widely in all Spain.

(1.) Among Priscillian's first and most devoted followers were two bishops, Instantius and Salvianus. This leads us to the south of Spain. Adyginus, bishop of Cordova, took alarm. He was the first to come forward in opposition to the rising sect. Adyginus reported the matter to Idatius, bishop of Emerita (Merida), and took counsel with him. Their conference led to an organised movement against the new errors. From the Guadalquivir to the Guadiana, all southern Spain became agitated by the controversy. Idatius is blamed as too rough and violent in his proceedings. By his intolerant severity he rather promoted than prevented the spread of the sect. Adyginus, dissatisfied with his colleague, turned round rather to be the protector of the Priscillianists, and incurred in consequence much reproach and odium. It was at length agreed that a synod should be held. This was fixed to be at Caesar-Augusta (Saragossa) on the Ebro. The site of the council was sufficiently northern to be distant from the localities where the Priscillianists and the orthodox were in hostility; it was neutral ground. There would be the advantage also of its nearness to Gaul. It was proposed to gather together there the bishops of Spain and Aquitaine. The synod was held in 380. The Priscillianists did not venture to appear. In their absence their opinions were condemned. The four leaders, Instantius and Salvianus the bishops, Helpidius and Priscillian the laymen, were excommunicated. The bishop of Cordova, who had first started the church movement, fell under the lash of the leaders of the synod. He had received into terms of communion some of the heretics. The anathema of the council was declared against all who shared and all who connived at the new errors of faith and practice. The task of promulgating the decrees and carrying out the ecclesiastical sentences was entrusted to Ithacius, bishop of Sossuba. The important and lamentable result of the synod of Saragossa was the assumption by Ithacius of the leadership of the persecuting party.

(2.) A preconcerted counter-movement now began on the part of the Priscillianists. At the hands of Instantius and Salvianus, Priscillian hitherto unordained, received episcopal ordination. His see was Avila (Abila), on the Adaja, a tributary of the Douro, midway between Salamanca and Madrid (Jerome, *lib. de Script. Eccl.*). This measure of defiance shewed the strength of his party. It led to further progress towards persecution. On behalf of the church authorities, Idacius and Ithacius made application to the secular government. Aid was brought against

the heretics. Powers were asked for execution of the decree of the late synod. This succeeded, and in 381 the emperor Gratian granted a rescript, excluding all heretics from the use of the churches, and ordering them to be driven into exile. The Priscillianists were thus, as it were, cut off from civil protection and left at the mercy of their adversaries. Vigorous defensive measures had become necessary for their very existence. An appeal was proposed by them to the two most eminent bishops of the West, pope Damasus at Rome and Ambrose, the bishop of Milan. Their influence, it was hoped, might lead to a rescindment of the imperial decision against them. Instantius, Salvianus, and Priscillian undertook the journey to Rome to clear themselves and their party in the papal court. Their journey was not without incidents. On their way to Italy they penetrated into Interior Aquitaine. Probably they made their journey thither by sea. It is unlikely that they traversed the rugged passes of the Pyrenees. It may have been their desire to try measures of conciliation among the bishops of that province, who had condemned them unseen and unknown at Saragossa. The seeds of the heresy were meanwhile sown by them, where they travelled. Elusa (Eluso) near Eauze, a town on the Gelise, near Auch, is especially mentioned. All the church centres were, however, hostile to them. They were vigorously repulsed from Bordeaux (Burdigala), where all their efforts were foiled in the town by the vigilance of Delphinus, the bishop. Still even there, in the neighbourhood, on the lands of a noble matron Euchrocia, they met with success, and gathered together some adherents (*Sulp. Sev. ii. 48; L. Pac. Drep. in Panegyr. Vet. xii. 29*). Some years later, traces of this journey still remained. We hear of sedition at Bordeaux respecting Priscillianism, a riot of the populace and the stoning to death, in the tumult of a woman named Urbica for persistent adherence to the sect (*Prosper. Chron. ii.*). On their journey onwards to Italy, the Priscillianist leaders were accompanied by a number of those whom they infected with their errors from Gaul. Euchrocia and her daughter Procula, amongst these, ministered of their substance to Priscillian and his colleagues. A promiscuous crowd of others, especially women, are mentioned. In consequence, injurious reports, probably calumnies, were vigorously circulated against Priscillian and his retinue. Procula was said to be living in criminal intercourse with her spiritual adviser. Such charges, and perhaps such excesses, are one of the phenomena that appear to accompany times of such religious excitement. It is strange how constantly such charges are brought, as it were in very defiance of probability against the severest sectaries. Is it that amidst the stronger natures there are the instances of weaker character, examples of reaction against too rigid rule, the very violence and tyranny of asceticism over nature leading to the opposite extreme of self-indulgence and licence? There are found illustrations of this in modern times. Last century, in the first fervour of Methodism in England, it is said to have been so.

(3.) On the arrival of the Priscillianists at Rome, as might be anticipated, they found themselves shut out of court. They were refused audience. They had no opportunity allowed

them of vindicating themselves or explaining their doctrines. During their stay at Rome Salvianus died. Repulsed by pope Damasus, they retraced their steps to Milan, where the power and reputation of Ambrose were at its height. They attempted to gain a favourable hearing at Milan. Would the ear of Ambrose be open to their plea? Would the great upholder of the sacerdotal order listen to them? The liberties of the church might seem in their person to be in danger. The Priscillianists might appear to be upholding the rights of the clergy against secular encroachments. It might be worthy of Ambrose, with his lofty sacerdotal views, to sympathise with the Spanish bishops, disclaiming the right of the civil magistrate, in a question of enforcing obedience in the church. Here again they were necessarily disappointed. At Milan they found Ambrose to be steadily opposed to them. Thus having signally failed at Rome and at Milan, but one resource remained to them. Their adversaries had appealed to the secular power. Their adversaries had condescended to art and intrigue. They would meet them with their own weapons.

(4.) Thus the controversy passed on to another stage of its history. The Priscillianists put on a bold front. They began aggressive measures against their assailants. The wealth of Priscillian, the wealth of his followers was liberally employed. "The silver spears" were now in the hands of the partisans on both sides. At this time Macedonius was the master of the offices (magister officiorum). This imperial functionary, who administered justice in the emperor's household, who exercised control and superintendence over many departments of state, was won over to the interests of Priscillian and his party. Favoured by his powerful influence, the former rescript of Gratian was rescinded. Macedonius obtained a reverse decree, a rescript from Gratian in their favour, protecting them. The Priscillianists were to be reinstated in their former position, and restored to their churches and sees. Relying on this, Instantius and Priscillian returned to Spain, obtained entrance again for themselves and their party to the churches, and regained possession of the sees of which they had been dispossessed. All things now seemed to be turned in their favour. Their star was in the ascendant. They felt as if their hour of opportunity was come. Idacius and Ithacius, though for the moment powerless, had not ceased to make a show of resistance. The Priscillianists charged them with causing divisions and disturbing the peace of the church. They instituted public proceedings against them, and Ithacius was compelled to fly. Treves was at this time the residence of the Caesar who ruled Gaul, Spain, and Britain, according to the fourfold division of the empire by Diocletian. Ithacius escaped from Spain into Gaul to Treves. Gregory, the prefect there, warmly espoused his cause, and exerted himself to bring the complaints of the orthodox bishops again before Gratian. The Priscillianists had, however, secured their interests, their friends at court were powerful enough to ward off the danger. A judicious distribution of bribes, and especially the gift of a large sum of money to Macedonius, effectually thwarted the persevering hostility of their enemies. A judicial inquiry was ordered

to be made, not, however, in Gaul, but in Spain. The cause was taken out of the unfriendly hands of Gregory, the prefect, and transferred to the court of Volventius, the vicar of Spain. Ithacius, no longer as accuser but as the accused, was summoned from Gaul to appear before the vicarial tribunal. Had it not been for Pritannius, the bishop of Treves, with whom he found shelter from the impending storm, Ithacius would have been humbled, and severely handled by the ascendant faction.

(5.) An unlooked for change was now, however, to come over the aspect of affairs. A great political event was about to bring new and unforeseen influences to bear. The overthrow and assassination at Paris of the unpopular Gratian, the usurpation of the purple by Clemens Maximus, his proclamation as emperor by his soldiers in Britain, his triumphant entrance into Gaul, with the consequent official changes brought about, were the destruction of all the bright hopes of the Priscillianists. Their prosperity now began to wane, the fortunes of their adversaries were retrieved. On the arrival of Maximus at Treves in 384, Ithacius placed in his hands a formal accusation with heavy charges against Priscillian and his followers. Maximus, a Spaniard by birth, did not turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Spanish bishops. He proceeded to reverse the vacillating policy of Gratian. He refused to be blindly led by the venal officers of the court. He treated the cause with a high hand, not as a matter of mere ecclesiastical rivalry and dispute, nor as one involving only serious doctrinal differences, but as one directly affecting the general interests of morality and society. In his letter afterwards to Siricius, who succeeded Damasus in 384 in the see of Rome, he expressly dwells upon these points, and glories in the part he had consequently taken against the heresy of Priscillian. The commands of the new emperor were at once ominous of no good to the Priscillianists. Joint letters were issued to the prefect of Gaul and the vicar of Spain respecting them. A synod was fixed to be held at Bordeaux (Burdigala) in 385. Both parties were summoned to appear. There had been a sufficient Priscillianist movement in Aquitaine to render Bordeaux a likely and suitable place to be selected. It had been at the same time the stronghold of orthodoxy under its bishop Delphinus, which Priscillian and his followers had assailed in vain. The commercial importance of the town, and its rank as one of the chief seats of literature and learning in the West, would give a decision and weight to a conference there, which the enemies of the Priscillianists knew well how to estimate. The distance was moderate for the travelling of all parties concerned, and sufficiently remote from the Priscillianist centres to secure the peace of the council. All who were suspected of participating in the spread of the new doctrines were called on to defend themselves. There was now no safety in inaction, and Instantius and Priscillian were the first to appear. The defence of Instantius, as might be expected, was insufficient to satisfy the synod. He was declared to have forfeited his bishopric, and sentence of deposition was decreed against him. What was now to be the attitude and policy of Priscillian? His adherents were full of dismay. They had measured the forces arrayed against them, they

understood the animus of the conference gathered together. Priscillian resolved to embark in a counter-movement. The ecclesiastics at Bordeaux were, as it were, the old Jewish sanhedrim. Priscillian felt himself to be as another St. Paul before them, he resolved to forestall the hostile judgment he might expect, he "was constrained to appeal unto Caesar." In the hurry and excitement of the council, the important religious issues involved were not understood. No protest was made. The bishops, partly from a sense of their own weakness, partly from hostility to Priscillian, consented to the transfer of the cause. The appeal of Priscillian was allowed. A purely spiritual offence was remitted for criminal trial to a secular tribunal. In due course both parties appeared before the new emperor Maximus at Treves.

(6.) In the troubled state of public affairs, after the usurpation of Maximus, it was easy for men of low motives and strong passions, and clever intriguers, to gain their ends. As a mere struggle for victory at Treves, both parties might seem to have equal chance of success, whichever would condescend to use the most unscrupulous means might appear to have the brighter hopes. The exigencies of empire were great, the exchequer of Maximus was low, a rich prospect of bribes or confiscations would be the strongest temptation and inducement to prejudice the cause in the interests of order for or against one of the parties. Amidst the rough controversy of the time, from the midst of "the strife of tongues," it is very interesting to be able to catch the voice and get a glimpse of men, for there were such, actuated by high and noble principle, the tolerant spirits of their day. At Treves there was one at this crisis of the fortunes of the church, whose prophetic insight to a great extent comprehended the real significance of the religious issues at stake. The influence of Martin, bishop of Tours, was then at its height. The vicissitudes of his remarkable career as soldier, hermit, monk, and at last bishop, his skill and energy in establishing monastic centres of religious life, his vehement iconoclasm, his consistent Christian activity and steadfastness, his humane and gentle and apostolic spirit, had won for him in Gaul from popular esteem the reputation of the working of miracles. St. Martin's strong spiritual instinct at once led him to choose for himself a definite line of action in the Priscillianist controversy. All his influence was thrown into the scale on the side of counsels of moderation. In argument with the orthodox bishops he protested on wise grounds against any abandonment of the rights of their order, as they had till then been recognised. What but evil could result from this dangerous and hasty example of the submission of a spiritual cause to the civil arbitration, this appeal amidst the hot passions of controversy, at the instance of the heretical leaders, from the ordained guides, rulers, and guardians of the church to the capricious tribunal of a relentless military dictator? Through St. Martin's mediation between the contending parties, and his influence with the emperor, the trial of Priscillian was for some time delayed, Maximus for a while yielded to his protests. He even consented to promise, at St. Martin's suggestion, that no blood should be shed, no life should be

sacrificed. But at last St. Martin, at the call of other duties, was obliged to withdraw from Treves. The emperor was now surrounded by other influences. Idacius and Ithacius well knew how to seize and use their opportunity. They were ably supported by two bishops of a like stamp of men, Magnus and Rufus. These were powerful at court, and by them Maximus was unremittingly urged on to severe measures. The character of Ithacius is ably drawn for us by Sulpicius Severus (*Hist. Sacr.* ii. 50). Sulpicius, with all his aversion to the sentiments of Priscillian, has no hesitation in saying that the accusers were, in his judgment, equally blameworthy with the accused. For what manner of man, for example, was Ithacius, who undertook to set all people right, who took on himself to purge the temple of the Lord? He was a man who made little account of anything that stood in the way of his own aggrandizement. Of things divine or things human, in his heart he regarded nothing, he esteemed nothing sacred. Audacious, talkative, shameless, he might be, but he was without the least tincture of true piety. Luxurious and worldly-minded, he was abandoned to voluptuousness, and a slave to his belly. Such an one, a mere voluptuary, a man utterly destitute of all sense of spiritual things, was he a fit choice to be the man to whom should be committed the business of seeing that the decrees of church councils were put in execution? He would have accused as heretics, and as protectors and patrons of Priscillian, all who led a strict and serious Christian life, for which he had no respect or liking himself, all who were much given to the study of the Scriptures, or who often fasted. He was for fixing the charge of Priscillianism on any of those whose faculties were consecrated to the pursuit of piety and knowledge, whose lives were distinguished by acts of mortification and abstinence, or even whose ascetic cast of countenance or habit of dress might mark them out for his victims. Thus the bishop of Sossoba comes before us, the model and prototype of a figure too often repeated afterwards in the annals of religious strife and persecutions; we may see in the picture drawn of him at the close of the fourth century, the worthy model and prototype of the popular ideal of the mediaeval Spanish inquisitor.

(7.) Now came the final act of the tragedy. The trial of the Priscillianists once resolved upon was soon brought about. The last scenes follow rapidly upon one another. The Priscillianists were now to become a defenceless prey to their enemies. "The appeal unto Caesar," in their case, was truly to be an appeal to a pitiless Nero. As a stroke of state policy, nothing could be wiser in the eyes of the adherents of Maximus than their destruction. Both pagan and Christian authorities attribute mercenary motives to the emperor, and state that the possessions of the rich Priscillian and of his followers excited his cupidity. (Sulp. Sev. *Dialog.* iii. 9: *Panegyrr. of Lat. Pac. Drep. on Theodosius, Panegyrr. Vet.* xvi. 29.) At the same time there could not be a more brilliant inauguration of the new reign than a vigorous assertion of sovereignty on the side of orthodoxy in religion on the lines of the now famous Theodosian decrees. No harm could follow; the cause of peace and good order seemed to be involved in this. Nothing would

be more likely to strike a responsive chord in popular favour than the high-minded assumption by Maximus of the position of arbiter in ecclesiastical controversy. Past examples shewed what an immense impulse in his favour might follow upon the skilful interposition of his authority in a matter so novel and so deeply moving all the better orders of society far and near, as peace and war in the church.

Maximus entrusted the cause to the praetorian prefect Evodius, a stern and severe judge. Ithacius and his companions undertook the office of accusers. Priscillian and his chief followers were brought before the imperial consistory at Treves, and heard and condemned in two investigations. They were charged not only with heresy and false teaching, but with violation of the laws. They were convicted of magic, impiety, and lewdness. Various gross accusations, partly founded on vague and exaggerated rumours, partly established by the doubtful evidence of torture, were brought in against them. Confessions and admissions of the usual Gnostic abominations and secret mixed assemblies for immorality and obscene practices were extorted by the rack. At length Priscillian and some others were declared guilty by the prefect, remitted to prison, and ordered to be detained there till the emperor's pleasure should be known. On the adverse decision of the prefect being reported in the palace, Maximus gave his consent to infliction of a capital sentence. It was necessary that a final sitting of the court should be held for this purpose. Ithacius as a bishop withdrew from further interference in the cause. Maximus set forward as prosecutor a civil officer of the treasury (*fisci patronus*) named Patricius. In this last investigation and rehearing of the case, Priscillian and his chief associates were condemned to death. Several others, after confiscation of their goods, were banished to the Scilly islands, others to places within Gaul. Priscillian himself is recorded as the first of those who suffered death (*gladio perempti*). With him died two presbyters, lately become disciples, Felicissimus and Armentius. There also suffered at the same time Latronianus, a poet, and Euchrocia, the rich and noble matron of Bordeaux. Instantius, deposed from his bishopric by the synod of Bordeaux, was banished to the desolate Scilly isles. In following processes Asarinus and Aurelius, two deacons, were executed. Tiberianus was banished to the same place of exile as Instantius. Tertullus, Potamius, and Johannes, as meaner followers, were punished by temporary banishment within Gaul. They had turned king's evidence, and thus by the merit of early repentance won the indulgence of a lesser penalty.

The immediate consequences were not reassuring to the persecuting party. At Treves a violent strife arose between the bishops present there on the question of the merits of Priscillian's execution. Theognistes, a bishop, a man of a masculine and independent mind, boldly threw himself forward as the leader of the non-contents. He and his party refused church communion to Ithacius, and the others who had partaken in the judicial guilt of the bloodshed. In Spain the Priscillianist enthusiasm was for a while intensified by the heroic death of their founder. The opinions spread, the number of followers

grew. The bodies of those who had suffered at Treves were brought to Spain, and their obsequies celebrated with great pomp and splendour. Priscillian himself, before revered as a saint, was now, says Sulpicius, worshipped as a martyr. To take oaths by the name of Priscillian became a common form of asseveration in Spain. At the same time signs were not wanting which struck terror into the orthodox, that the Priscillianist society aimed at retreating from open view, assuming more and more a mysterious character, and shrouding themselves under the attractive guise of a secret religious association, ramifying widely, full of power and energy, commanding great influence, yet invisible in its machinery and agencies.^b

Additional severities were proposed. Maximus resolved to send military tribunes to Spain, entrusting the commission with unlimited powers. They were to investigate charges of heresy, examine heretics, take life and property from the guilty. They were men little likely to temper justice with mercy. At this juncture Martin of Tours returned to Treves. As soon as it was rumoured that he was approaching, the bishops who were in opposition to Theognistes, persuaded Maximus to send officers to meet him. They were to forbid Martin's entrance into Treves, unless he promised to keep peace with the bishops. Martin was known to be coming on the errand of imploring the regnant emperor's mercy for those implicated in the recent political struggles, Count Narses, Leucadius, and others. Martin answered the messengers of Maximus with the ambiguous answer that he would come "with the peace of Christ." He entered the city after sundown, and proceeded at once to the basilica for prayer. Next day he went to the palace, and presented himself before the emperor. He stated he had come for two principal objects, both errands of mercy. After interceding for Count Narses and Leucadius, and other adherents of the fallen Gratian, he made it his object to plead for the troubled church in Spain. Were the commissioners sent out, who would be security for the just exercise of their powers? What grounds were there for supposing there would be due discrimination between the guiltless and the guilty? Who would winnow the grain from the chaff, would not the tares and the wheat be uprooted together? Was there not a probability that the faithful and the heretics would be alike harassed, the innocent and the guilty confounded? What could be expected but venality, rapacity, and subtle intrigues through all the provinces, when matters of speculative religious opinion were to be sifted before a tribunal of soldiers? For two or three days the emperor refused to relent. He answered Martin's supplications only by evasive replies. Many thought, says Sulpicius Severus, that the necessities of the imperial treasury were urgent, the emperor's coffers were scantily filled, the prospect of rich confiscations from the estates and goods of wealthy political and ecclesiastical offenders was too powerful a

^b The contemporary *Sacred History of Sulpicius Severus* closes with some fair and moderate reflections on the death of Priscillian. Further particulars are gathered from the *Third Dialogue* and *Life of St. Martin* by the same author.

temptation to be withstood (Sulp. Sev. *Dialog.* iii. 11; Pacat. in *Panegyrr. Vet.* xii. 29). Maximus also, it was strongly suspected by many, had been in the first instance and all along moved to espouse the cause of the persecuting party by opportune advances of money by the bishops, and other such important assistance at the recent crisis of his political fortunes.

Theognistes, on the arrival of Martin, was felt to be supported by a powerful ally. Martin threw the great weight of his influence on the side of Theognistes. Anticipated and feared as this had been before he arrived, it was felt by the bishops as a keen affront on his arrival. It was vehemently resented, and every effort was made at court to inflame the royal prejudice against him. St. Martin was, however, inflexible. No efforts could induce him to be reconciled to the promoters and abettors of the late executions. Neither the persuasion nor the threats of the emperor moved him. He was at length dismissed from the imperial presence in anger. All at once, however, tidings reached Martin that the tribunes had been really sent to Spain. He hurried to the palace, though it was night. He agreed to unite with the bishops in church fellowship. The emperor yielded in turn to his importunity on behalf of the Priscillianists. His firmness and zeal on the side of humanity were rewarded. The tribunes were recalled, and the peninsula was thus spared the horrors of a religious proscription.

Little more is recorded of the final issue of the dispute between the ecclesiastics at Treves. The schism continued some time between the two parties, those that approved and those that condemned the severities against Priscillian. Ithacius was some time afterwards deposed from his episcopal office for the part he had taken in it. For fifteen years the contention was extreme between the disputants, and the merits of the controversy long continued to be canvassed. At the time, as has been already said, all the more influential dignitaries of the Western church were struck with horror and indignation at the violent measures of Maximus, and were moved to pity and compassion for the tragic end of Priscillian.

The heresy was certainly not extinguished by these means. It continued to prevail, and seemed even to take deeper root in Spain. In 400 a council was held at Toledo, where many Priscillianists came over to the Catholic side, and were re-admitted to church communion. Amongst these was Dictinnius, a Priscillianist bishop, author of the book called *The Scales* (*Libra*), where the Priscillianist opinions were expounded and advocated. In 415 a Spanish presbyter, Orosius, wrote to Augustine concerning the sect. A long letter of Augustine also is extant, written to Ceretius, a bishop, respecting the apocryphal Priscillianist Scriptures, especially a hymn attributed to Christ. Forty years later, Turribius, bishop of Astorga, wrote in sorrow and perplexity to pope Leo I., asking his advice in what manner to deal with these insidious and dangerous adversaries. Leo recommended the convocation of a general council of bishops from the four provinces of Tarragona, Carthage, Lusitania, and Galicia. If this general council could not be held, Turribius might appeal to a provincial council from Galicia alone. Two councils pur-

suant were held, one at Toledo in 447, the other at Braga in Galicia, in 448, where Priscillianism was condemned in the usual forms of anathema. A last contemporary mention of the Priscillianists comes in combination with the Arians, in the acts of the council of Braga, in 563.

None of the ancient writers have given an accurate account of the doctrine of the Priscillianists. What knowledge may be gained of this has to be gathered from such sources as the meagre accounts of their adversaries supply, the correspondence of eminent men of the time,^c the acts and canons of councils,^d the church histories,^e and a few verbal allusions in contemporary Pagan writers.^f The Priscillianist system, already sufficiently dark and perplexed, has had new degrees of obscurity added by unstinted misrepresentation and calumny. The general outline may be made out of their opinions, fantastic allegories, daring cosmogonies, astrological fancies, combined with the severest asceticism. It is more possible amidst these to compare the general resemblances of their doctrine to Cabalism, Syrian and Egyptian Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Persian and Indian Orientalism, than to detect and analyse and assign the differences.

There are no authentic records remaining of the Priscillianist writers. We hear of one book widely circulated and long held in estimation amongst the sect, called *The Scales* (*Libra*). This was written by Dictinnius, a Priscillianist bishop. He recanted, and returned to the church at the council of Toledo in the year 400, but his book continued to be circulated, though disowned by its author. A fragment of a letter of Priscillian himself has come down to us in quotation (*Orosii Common. in Aug. Op.*). There are allusions to a multitude of apocryphal scriptures accepted and used by them. In this respect they differed from most heretical sects, accepting alike all apocryphal and canonical books as scripture, explaining and adapting them to their own purpose in a mystical manner.

Beyond this there is no extant literature connected with Priscillian or his followers. Nothing is known to have been preserved.

"The thoughts that breathe and words that burn"

of the arch-heretic himself, or his more influential followers, have all vanished and perished with them. A specimen of the Priscillianist allegorical treatment of the Christian Scriptures on the model of Philo's interpretation of the Old Testament, and also of their wild physical myths, reminding of the philosophical romances of Valentinus and the Egyptian Gnostics, is preserved by Orosius (*Common. ad Aug.*). The clearest account of the Priscillianist tenets must be found in the controversial correspondence slightly later than Priscillian, between Leo the Great and Turribius, bishop of Astorga. The Spanish prelate summed up the doctrines in sixteen articles. Leo replies in a lengthy epistle, comment-

^c Leo I. *Ep.* xv.; August. *Ep.* 237; Ambrose, *Ep.* 24; Maximi *Ep. ad Siricum* in Baron.

^d Braga, Toledo, Turin.

^e Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr. and Dialogues*; Aug. *Haeres.* 70; Orosii *Commonitorium in Aug. Op.*; Aug. *Liber de Mendacio ad Consentium*; Jerome, *de Script. Eccl.*

^f L. Pacatus Drepanius, *Panegyrr. Vet.* xii. 29; Auson. *de Profess. Burdegal.* carm. vi.

ing seriatim on each of the propositions (Leo, *Ep. xv.*).

1. Their wild cosmical speculations were based on the bold Gnostic and Manichean conceptions of a primaevial dualism. The two opposite realms of light and darkness, in eternal antagonism, were the foundation of their tenets. Believing in the canonicity of the Old Testament, they were unable to distinguish literally with the Anti-Jewish Gnostic between an evil demiurge, the Jehovah of the Old Covenant, and the higher God of the Christian Scripture. At the same time they ascribed all matter in every form and in its essence to an origin connected with the kingdom of darkness. Here the emanation theory came in to help them. They supposed a manifold series of emanations from the primeval unity in each realm, emanations in the kingdom of light, various in power and might, partaking the Divine essence, in descending grades, till the souls of men issued forth into existence—a similar gradation in the realm of darkness originated the powers of evil, at the head of which stood Satan. Thus Leo's rude statements of their faith held partly true, that they considered heaven the creation of God, and earth the creation of the devil.

2. Their anti-materialism led them very far wide from the sublime simplicity of Scripture. Perplexed with the insoluble problem of the origin of sin, they threw their teaching into the form of the most fantastic dreams and myths. Souls partaking the Divine essence had gone forth by the Divine mission from the kingdom of light to conflict with the powers of darkness. Animated by angelic exhortation they had sworn to constancy, but descending through the seven heavens, they became subjected to lowering and material influences. From each of the seven heavens, which, like the Ophites, they considered presided over by the seven star spirits, souls appropriated something of a sidereal vehicle. Thus they passed the borderland between the opposite realms, and entered the antagonist kingdom of darkness. Here, in our universe, the powers of evil prevailed against them. They became entangled in matter, and at length by birth enchained in bodies. Priscillianism thus by the idea of an earlier guilt preceding birth, accounted for the inequalities of the present life.

3. The astrological fatalism which they taught, which pope Leo condemned so sternly as subversive of all moral distinctions, was a striking peculiarity of their system (Leo, *Ep. xv. 11-12*). They believed the twelve signs of the Zodiac to have a mysterious supremacy over the members of the body. They assigned, according to Augustine (*Haeres. 70*), the head to the dominion of Aries, the neck to Taurus, the shoulders to Gemini, the breast to Cancer, the feet to Pisces, and so through all the human frame. Thus our earthly members were subject to these sidereal powers, who in some mysterious way were concerned in their creation. Thus astrology, a superstition afterwards so long and widely prevalent in Europe, assumes its first distinct form in the Priscillianist doctrine. Their allegorical treatment of the Old Testament may here be illustrated. The names of the twelve patriarchs were viewed by them in a similar, but here an allegorical manner, with reference to the soul, as the signs of the Zodiac for the body.

Orosius, the Spanish presbyter, writing to Augustine, enumerates Reuben for the head, Judah for the breast, Levi the heart, Benjamin the thighs, and so through the patriarchal family. To these twelve heavenly powers, thus allegorized and under their guidance, Priscillian supposed the souls of men to be related and to stand. It is in reference to this subject that an almost unintelligible sentence remains, the only words of Priscillian that are preserved (Oros. *Comm. in Aug. Op.*). They are words of Priscillian in a letter, "Haec prima sapientia est, in animarum typis divinarum virtutum intelligere naturas et corporis dispositionem, in qua obligatum coelum videtur et terra, omnesque principatus saeculi videntur adstricti sanctorum dispositiones superare. Nam primum Dei circulum et mittendarum in carne animarum divinum chirographum, Angelorum et Dei et omnium animarum consensibus fabricatum Patriarchae tenent, qui contra formalis militiae opus possident."

4. Their Christology is difficult to gather. If they held the doctrine of a Trinity at all, it was but a Trinity of names. Their adversaries accused them of Arrianism and Sabellianism. Leo sharply criticises their application and interpretation of the Scripture attributive of the Redeemer, "the only begotten."* The truth appears to be that confounding the separate ideas of Godhead and Spirit, they started with the principle of the soul being of divine substance as well as origin. The variable and the invariable, the unchanged and the changeable, the Creator and the creature, ideas essentially distinct, they thus attempted to blend. Starting thus, and with their anti-materialism, who and what was the Christ? Solving this question on their principles it was impossible that the human body of Christ could be real. It is not clear whether they held that Christ existed in a prior state (Milman, *Lat. Chr. vol. i. p. 197*). It is not clear what idea they had of the divine and human nature of our Lord. Probably He was to them "the one Divine Light—nature exhibiting itself to the eye of sense under the semblance merely of an object of sense" (Neander, *Ch. Hist. vol. iv. p. 509*). He brought with Him into the world, through a birth entirely different from other men, a body of ethereal mould. In the Priscillianist view of the work of Christ, it is remarkable that he gave particular prominence to the sufferings of Christ. It is consistent with their Docetic views of the person of Christ, that the Priscillianists fasted on Christmas Day and on all Sundays, the days of memorial of our Lord's birth and resurrection, and thus of His first and latest contact with matter. The life and sufferings of Christ he seems to have considered in some sense symbolical. It was by them that the bond was annulled (Col. ii. 14), by which the soul was held imprisoned in the body by the powers of darkness, and was made subject to the sidereal influences. Redemption was a doctrine held by Priscillian in common with all Gnostic sects, but it was a metaphysical redemption by a metaphysical Redeemer.

* The Priscillianists held that all the children of promise were "conceived by the Holy Ghost," though begotten and born of earthly parentage. They attributed the term "Only Begotten" to our Lord only in the sense that He alone was born of a virgin (Leo, *Ep. xv. 3*).

5. The rigid asceticism, which was everywhere insisted on as a part of the Priscillianist teaching, resulted directly from their idea of the innate evil of matter. Marriage was proscribed by them. Austerities of all sorts were required. The dissoluteness of conduct, the orgiastic libertinism, which is so constantly a hostile calumny against the sect, can only have been the practice of the worse sort of their followers, a reaction in the less steadfast against the coercion of a too violent restraint, the recoil of impulsive and ill-governed natures. Notwithstanding the confessions extorted by torture, and admissions made by those who recanted, it is probably true, according to Gibbon's remark (*Decl. and Fall*, c. 27), "if the Priscillianists violated the laws of nature, it was not by the licentiousness but by the severity of their lives." Total abstinence from animal food was enjoined; continual prayers, fasts and vigils were inculcated as a rule of strict and perfect devotion.

6. There is one article of blame upon the moral system of Priscillian that is plainly well deserved. This was their dissimulation.^b Holding an esoteric and exoteric doctrine, they affirmed, with some other of the theosophic sects, that falsehood was allowable for a holy end. Absolute veracity was only binding between fellow members of their sect. In dealings with the unenlightened, they did not feel bound always and absolutely to state the whole truth. This looseness of principle they supported by Scripture, distorting for example Eph. iv. 25 in support of their practice. It was a Priscillianist habit to affect to agree with the multitude, to make allowance in this way for what they considered their fleshly notions, and conceal from them what they regarded them as incapable of comprehending. (Dietinnius in *Libra*.) In the agitation of controversy many of the church ecclesiastics were in favour of fighting the Priscillianists with their own weapons, and adopting the same method against them. This led Augustine to enter the field on the subject. His treatise *De Mendacio* was expressly written in opposition to such laxity. It is easy to see how such practice arose from their principles. We may illustrate by their Gnostic ideas about Scripture. The Christian Scripture to the Priscillianists was an imperfect revelation. What the Jewish religion was to Christianity, that same place the Priscillianists considered Christianity to hold with regard to their speculations. As the Old Testament was full of types and shadows of Christianity, so the New Testament in their hands became a figurative and symbolical exposition and veil of Priscillianism. The outer form was for the ignorant and profane; the inner truth was for the wise and initiated. The grace of faith was fitted only for the rude mass of men; to know was the vocation of the privileged, the spiritual, the elect. Once having thus arrogated to themselves the pride and exclusiveness of a Brahminical caste, the Priscillianist had but to go a step further to disregard moral distinctions and believe himself entitled to prevaricate, which often led to things still worse, in his dealings with the common herd of man-

^b "Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli," a precept of Priscillian quoted by Augustine, *Liber de Haeresibus*, 70, and Aug. Ep. 237 ad Ceretium.

kind (cf. Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, Lect. XII. p. 196, IX. p. 135; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii. p. 26). [M. B. C.]

PRISCUS (1), father of St. Justin, martyr. [JUSTINUS (2).] [C. H.]

PRISCUS (2), a bishop of Africa (24th name in Conc. Carth. ii. de Pace). [E. W. B.]

PRISCUS (3), March 28. Martyr in the persecution of Valerian at Caesarea in Palestine with Malchus and Alexander, his friends, and with a woman belonging to the Marcionite sect. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 12.) [G. T. S.]

PRISCUS (4), the judge who tortured and condemned St. Euphemia. [EUPHEMIA.] [C. H.]

PRISCUS (5), sent by Jerome to Palestine. [EUBULUS (4).] [C. H.]

PRISCUS (6), a bishop of Mauretania Caesariensis, censured for some offence, but not removed from the episcopate. His case is quoted by St. Augustine in a letter to pope Celestine concerning the case of Antonius, bishop of Fussala. Priscus aspired to the primacy of the province, and complained of the judgment passed on him, urging that if he was guilty, he ought to be removed; if not, he ought to be regarded as a fit candidate for the primacy. (Aug. Ep. 209; Bingham, ii. 16, 7.) [H. W. P.]

PRISCUS (7) VALERIANUS, a prefect of Gaul, in the 5th century. He belonged to the family of the emperor Avitus, and was therefore a connection by marriage of Sidonius Apollinaris, who, about the year 456, sent him a copy of his panegyric on that emperor with some dedicatory verses (*Carm.* vi. vii. viii.). If he was the Valerianus addressed by Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, in his *Epistola Paraenetica ad Val. cognatum, De contemptu mundi et saecularis philosophiae* (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* i. 711-26), written about the year 432, he was, though a man of great learning and eloquence and of excellent natural disposition, yet devoted to heathen philosophy, and apparently not a Christian. For this letter see Ceillier, viii. 444. He married his daughter to Pragmatius, an orator and man of letters, struck by his eloquence on some public occasion (Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* v. 10). The authors of the *Hist. Litt. de la France* distinguish him from Valerianus bishop of Cémèle, near Nice, and from Priscus a historian of Attila's wars (ii. 360-3). [S. A. B.]

PRISCUS (8), solitary, to whom St. Nilus the ascetic wrote three letters upon the ascetic life (Nilus, *Epp.* iii. nos. 288, 289, 290, Allat. 1668; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 222). [J. G.]

PRISCUS (9), Nestorian of the fifth century, one of the most important authorities for the reign of Theodosius II. and his relations with Attila. (Evag. *H. E.* 5; Tillem. xv. 746.) Gibbon makes great use of him in his chapter xxxiv. [THEODOSIUS II.] A full account of him will be found in the *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* (cf. *Rev. Archéol.* 1868, t. xviii. p. 86, for three hitherto unpublished fragments of this historian, with notes by Mommsen.) [G. T. S.]

PRISCUS (10), a Jew attached to the service of Chilperic, king of the Franks, whose office it was to purchase objects of luxury. Gregory, the historian, relates an amusing incident in which he took part (A.D. 581). Chilperic, who dabbled in theology as he did in literature, provoked an argument with Priscus on the subject of their respective faiths. The king being soon worsted, Gregory came to the rescue, and with many quotations from the old Testament, silenced the Jew according to his own account, but could not induce him to confess the faith. The following year Chilperic, losing patience at their stubbornness, baptized a number of Jews by force, himself receiving some of them from the font as an encouragement. Priscus, however, was still obdurate in his unbelief, and the king resolved to imprison him until he was willing to accept the truth. But, before the sentence was executed, Priscus was murdered by one of the new converts, named Phatir, with whom he had engaged in an angry dispute (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vi. 5; 17). [S. A. B.]

PRISCUS (11), ST., 30th archbishop of Lyons in the latter half of the 6th century, has been the subject of much controversy. Gregory of Tours, the historian, his contemporary, brings against him the gravest charges. According to the *Hist. Franc.* (iv. 36), he set himself, with his wife Susanna, to persecute and destroy those who had been the friends of his predecessor, St. Nicetius, out of malice and jealousy, and never wearied of declaiming blasphemies against his memory, in punishment for which he was smitten with a quartan ague, and various ills happened to his wife and family. The *Vitae Patrum* (viii. 5) also has an instance of his contempt for the same prelate, whose chaplain he is said to have been. On the other hand he is numbered by the church among the saints, though his cult is not very ancient, he was present at numerous councils, the 4th of Paris in 573, Châlons in 579, Mâcon in 581 or 583, 3rd of Lyons in 581, another at Lyons in 583, Valence in 584 or 585, and the 2nd of Mâcon in 585, at some of which he presided, and at one, the last, is honoured in the preface, with the dignified title, very rare in the West, of patriarcha (Mansi, ix. 949, Ceillier, xi. 896); again by Ado, who wrote in the 9th century, he is called Sanctus (*Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxliii. 111); while an epitaph was discovered in 1308, which the Bollandists ascribe to the 8th or 9th century, of a very laudatory character, as far as it has been deciphered. Finally the chapter of the *Hist. Franc.* (iv. 36) is said to be only found in one MS., that of Monte Cassino, whence it was first published by Ruinart, and does not appear in any of the French MSS. For these reasons the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Jun. vi. 120-7) refuse credence to Gregory's charges. But it seems at least as likely that the French copyists suppressed a chapter which reflected on the honour of the church of Lyons as that a foreigner inserted it, and there still remains the chapter in the *Vitae Patrum* (viii.) to be got over. The laudatory epitaph and the subsequent canonization can have little weight against contemporary testimony. Of course it is possible that Priscus repented later, and concluded his life in a manner entitling him to the

honour (cf. *Gall. Christ.* iv. 35-8). His day is June 13. For his cult and the miracles attributed to his remains, see Boll. *ibid.*

[S. A. B.]

PRISCUS (12), patrician, a distinguished general in the reign of Maurice, appointed dux orientis in A.D. 588, and subsequently successful in various campaigns. (Theophylact Simocatta, iii. 1-3, vi. 4 end, vii. 5-13, viii. 2-4). Priscus was a friend of Gregory the Great, who wrote in A.D. 593 congratulating him on his restoration to the emperor's favour, and commending to him his apocrisarius Sabinianus (*Epp.* iii. 52). [F. D.]

PRISTINUS, a confessor who, previous to his examination, had been given by his friends medicated wine in order to deaden the pain of the torture. The consequence was that he was unable to reply to the questions of the interrogating magistrate. Tertullian tells the story (*De Jejun.* 12) in order to contrast Montanist sobriety with what he counts the unchristian laxity of the Catholics. Whether Pristinus actually died under his torture depends on the correctness of a conjectural substitution "discessit" for the "digessit" of the MSS. [G. S.]

PRITANNIUS, bishop of Treves. [PRISCIANUS.]

PRIVATIANUS, African bishop. *Cyp. Ep.* 56, 57, *superscr.* See AHIMNIUS. [E. W. B.]

PRIVATIANUS (same), bishop of Sufetula in Prov. Byzacena, *hod. Sbitha.* Conc. sub Cyp. de Bap. iii. Carth. vii. suffrag. 19. [E. W. B.]

PRIVATION, a young man who desired to be admitted into St. Augustine's monastery, A.D. 401, as a reader; but as he had officiated as reader but once, and then with the apocryphal books only, Augustine was doubtful if he could be called a reader, and applied to Aurelius bishop of Carthage to decide. (*Ep.* 64 al. 235; Tillem. xiii. 362). The Benedictine editor suggests that his true name was perhaps Privatianus. [C. H.]

PRIVATUS (1), bishop of Sufes, Colonia Sufetana, in Prov. Byzac. (suffectana *male leg.* Aug. *Ep.* 50) now *Sbiba*, 20th suffrage in Sentt. *Epp.* Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. de Bap. iii. Other bishops of the see are named, and a synod was held there. See Morcelli and Mommsen. [E. W. B.]

PRIVATUS (2), once bishop of the important but short-lived city (Gibbon, c. 41; Mommsen, *Corp. Inscr. L.* viii. p. 285) of Lambaesis in Numidia (Lambesitana Colonia, *Ep.* 59, 10—Aurelia Lambaesis; Lambaese Con. Carth. sub Cyp. de Bap. iii. suffrag. 6; Lambesis, Lambasa (inscr.) Lambaesa Ptol.). This is not to be confounded with Lamasba, v. PUSILLUS, and is the present *Tazzūt* or *Tezzulot* (Momms.). Privatius was condemned of heresy, and *multa et gravia delicta*, by ninety bishops at a council held under Donatus, bishop of Carthage, *Ep.* 59, xliii. 10). From the same passage this would appear to have been under the Roman bishopric of Fabian (A.D. 240, Morcelli). If the words are accurately taken, they would seem to state that the council was held at Lambaesis, and that afterwards Donatus,

and Fabian, both issued letters condemnatory of him and his opinions.

In A.D. 250 he visited Rome, and Cyprian, apprehensive of his influence, warns the clergy against him, and they reply (*Ep.* 36. 4) that they had already detected him and his *voxillarius*, "Futurus," (but there is no such proper name in Muratori's, Gruter's, or Mommsen's *Inscr.*), in a previous attempt to obtain "litterae" (*communicatoriae*) from them fraudulently.

He presented himself (*vetus haereticus*) and desired to be heard on behalf of the party who took the lax view as to the *Lapsi*, at the second council Id. Mai., 252, and, on being rejected, consecrated Fortunatus pseudo-bishop (*Ep.* 59. xiii.), assisted by a pseudo-bishop Felix of his own consecration, and by Jovinus and Maximus, and a lapsed bishop, Repostus Suturnicensis. His successor Januarius speaks at the council of Carthage, vii. suffrag. 6 (not as Fell supposes (note on *Ep.* 36) suffrag. 75, which is that of the bishop of Lamasba (v. l. labama, lambese) lamasva, Morcelli; Mommsen, *C. Inscr.* Latt. viii. p. 445). [E. W. B.]

PRIVATUS (3), mentioned with PROFUTURUS (1) and Servilius by Evodius bishop of Uzalis in a letter to St. Augustine c. 414. The three had been with Evodius in a monastery (his own or St. Augustine's) and had spoken to him after their death, all that they said proving true. (*Aug. Ep.* 158 al. 258, § 9; Tillem. xii. 582, xiii. 661.) [C. H.]

PRIVATUS (4), second bishop of Mende, is called by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i. c. 32; vi. c. 37; *De Mir.* ii. 30) "Episcopus Gabalitanus" and "ex Mimate." In the *Acta* (Surius, *Vit. SS.* 250-1; Venantius Bellov. *Spec. Hist.* xi. c. 75; Boll. *A. SS.* Aug. iv. 433-8, with *praev. Comment.*; *Acta Breviora* and *Acta Longiora*, which are probably based upon the notes given by Gregory and wrought up by anonymous writers) he is said to have been living in a mountain-cave above Mende, when the Alemanni, under their king Chrocus, penetrated into the south of Gaul, devastated Aquitania, and put many Christians to death. Among them was the bishop Privatus because he refused to give up the tower of Greze where his people had found refuge, or to do sacrifice to the German gods. If according to the *Acta* he lived under Valerian and Gallienus, he died c. A.D. 265. But Baronius (*Ann.* A.D. 280, c. 2) puts him slightly later, and seems to confound him with an African heretic; while Tillemont (*H. E.* iv. 221 and note, p. 651) would prefer to relegate him to the fifth century. He was buried where he suffered at Gabala, and the church erected on the spot became a great resort for pilgrimage. The feast is August 21 (*Gall. Christ.* i. 86; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, i. 308, viii. 511-3). [J. G.]

PRIX, ST. [PRAEJECUS.]

PROAERESIUUS, a bishop of Lycia, condemned by Chrysostom in his Asiatic visitation, 401 A.D. (*Phot. Cod.* 59. p. 56.) [E. V.]

PROASTIOI (προάστειοι). A book with this title was, according to Hippolytus (*Ref.* v. 14), in use among the PERATAE. It seems to

have been of an astrological character; and it professed to teach the true names of the powers of nature, which ignorance had miscalled. It is not worth while to write down obvious conjectures, as to what was intended by the titles of office, *τόπαρχαι* and *προάστειοι* bestowed on some of these powers. [G. S.]

PROBA. [FALCONIA PROBA.]

PROBA (1), sister of St. Galla [GALLA (9)] and daughter of the consul Symmachus, is very greatly praised by Fulgentius of Ruspe (*Ep.* ii. c. 16; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxx. 320) for her humility, fasting and prayer: "quae cum sit avis atavisque nata consilibus et deliciis regalibus enutrita," yet devoted herself to virginity, charity, and all good works. Fulgentius addressed to her two letters, *de virginitate atque humilitate*, and *de oratione ad Deum et compunctione cordis* (ib. *Epp.* iii. iv., Migne, lxx. 324 sq.) and another not extant. She lived about the beginning of the sixth century [FULGENTIUS (3)] (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 27 sq.) [J. G.]

PROBA (2), a lady of the province of Asia, who left a large landed estate for use of the clergy and the poor. The official entrusted with its care was faithless to his trust. Pope Coelestinus in an epistle to the emperor Theodosius II in 432, solicits his interference. (Cf. Mansi, *Concil. t. v.* col. 271.) [G. T. S.]

PROBIANUS (PETRONIUS PROBIANUS), proconsul of Africa, successor to Aelianus. The council of Rome concerning the case of Caecilianus was held October 2, A.D. 313 (*Aug. ad Don. post coll.* 33, 56). The case of Felix of Aptunga was heard by Aelian February 15, A.D. 314. Probianus succeeded Aelianus in the same year, and was desired by Constantine to send Ingentius to Rome (FELIX (26) Vol. II. p. 487). He appears to have continued in office until 316. (*Aug. Brevic. Coll.* iii. 23, *adv. Cresc.* iii. 70; *Ep.* 88, 19; *Cod. Theodos.* xi. 30, 3 and 5; *Optatus*, i. 23, 26; Baronius, vol. iii. 314, 19, 72.) [H. W. P.]

PROBINUS (1), ANICIUS, second son of PROBUS (4), consul with his brother Olybrius, 395 (Jerome, *Ep.* cxxx. 7, with Vallarsi's note). His son Probus was consul in 406. [W. H. F.]

PROBINUS (2), priest of Seville, seems to have visited Rome at least twice during the pontificate of Gregory the Great. In A.D. 595, Gregory sent by him to Leander of Seville his *Moralia* and his book *de Regula Pastoralis*, and in A.D. 599, writing to king Reccared, he mentions that he had heard from Probinus of his refusal to relax a law against the Jews (*Epp.* v. 49; ix. 122). [F. D.]

PROBUS (1), Oct. 11. Martyr at Tarsus in Cilicia with Tarachus and Andronicus. [TARACHUS.] [G. T. S.]

PROBUS (2), governor of Pannonia, tried, condemned, and tortured ST. IRENAEUS (3) of Sirmium and others A.D. 304 (Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 432, ed. 1859; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iii. 27-8). [J. G.]

PROBUS (3) (PROMUS). [ELIAS (29).]

PROBUS (4), SEXTUS ANICIUS PETRONIUS (*Corp. Inscript.* vi. 1, n. 1752), a member of one of the most illustrious families in Rome, was consul with Gratian in A.D. 371, and was four times praetorian prefect of Italy, Illyricum, the Gauls, and Africa. He had also been proconsul in Africa in 358 (*Cod. Theod.* xi. 36, xiii.). The date of his appointment as praetorian prefect of Italy and Illyricum was A.D. 368 (Amnian. xvii. 1). During his tenure of office he chose St. Ambrose, then a young advocate, to be one of his council, and afterwards appointed him governor of Liguria and Aemilia with the rank of consular. It was on this occasion that Probus uttered the words, afterwards considered prophetic, "Go, act not as a judge, but as a bishop;" and many years later he sent one of his servants, who was possessed with a devil, to be healed by him (Paulinus, *Vita Ambr.* 5, 8, 21; in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiv. 28, 29, 34). Probus continued praefect of Italy down to the death of Valentinian, in A.D. 374. He is accused by Ammianus (xxix. 6) of being panic struck by the invasion of the Quadi in 374; but if so, he soon recovered his courage, and took active measures for the fortification and defence of Sirmium against them. Ammianus (xxx. 5) further accuses him of oppressing the provincials of Pannonia and Illyricum, and states, that in consequence of this, and through the machinations of Leo, the master of the offices, who hoped to be appointed in his place, he fell into disgrace with Valentinian. He presided over the trial and torture of Faustianus on the charge of magic. He next appears as praetorian praefect of Italy in A.D. 380, and as praetorian praefect in A.D. 383, 4 (*Col. Theod.* vi. 28 ii.; xi. 13 i.; vi. 30, vi.), and after the murder of Gratian, in A.D. 383, acted as regent to Valentinian II. in Italy, and accompanied him and his mother Justina in their flight to Thessalonica on the invasion of Maximus in A.D. 387 (Socrates, *H. E.* v. 11; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 13). He died before the end of A.D. 394 (Claudian. *in Prob. et Ol. Cons.* 31), at the age of sixty, less one month, after having received baptism (*Corp. Insc.* vi. 1, p. 389). It may be owing to his Christianity that Ammianus (xxvii. 11) paints him in such unfavourable colours, a remarkable contrast to the glowing panegyric of Claudian and Ausonius (*Ep.* 16). All agree as to his immense wealth and boundless liberality. His wife, Anicia Faltonia Proba, belonged to the Anician house, and their sons, Probinus and Olybrius, had the unique honour of being consuls together in A.D. 395. Christian though he was, SYMMACHUS was his intimate friend, six of whose letters (*Epp.* i. 56-61) are addressed to him. (Tillemont, *Emp.* v. 42, 72.)

[F. D.]

PROBUS (5), friend of Innocent I. at Rome while that pope was at Ravenna. He received instructions from Innocent (*Ep.* 36) regarding a woman who had been carried into captivity, probably c. A.D. 409, and returned to find her husband married again; but the pope upheld the first marriage. Probus is said, but improbably, to have been the son of the praefect Probus and Anicia Faltonia Proba [FALCONIA] (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xx. 602; Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 646; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vii. 524). [J. G.]

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

PROBUS (6), cited by St. Jerome as one to whom Lactantius addressed some epistles (Hieronymus, *Comm. in Epist. ad Galat.* l. ii. ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xxvi. 353; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 162). [LACTANTIUS.] [J. G.]

PROBUS (7), a Christian to whom a letter of consolation on the loss of his daughter is extant, which has been ascribed to St. Augustine, but which the Benedictine editors consider to be spurious. (Aug. *Opp.* val. ii., *App.* 117, ed. Migne.) [H. W. P.]

PROBUS (8), Nov. 13. Martyr in Africa under Genseric in the Arian persecution, A.D. 437. He suffered with three other Spanish Catholics, Arcadius, Paschasius, and Euticus. Cf. Vict. Vit. *opp.* ed. Ruinart, p. 433, where is a long letter addressed to Arcadius by Antoninus, bishop of Cirta. [G. T. S.]

PROBUS (9), a man of letters in Gaul, in the 5th century. A friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, with whom he had been educated under Eusebius at Lyons, and whose cousin Eulalia he married some time before 469. Sidonius speaks admiringly of his erudition and his judgment as a critic, but no work of his survives (Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* vi. 1; *Carm.* ix. 329-334; xxiv. 95-8; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 649-51). [S. A. B.]

PROBUS (10), bishop of Canusium, legate c. 468, of pope Simplicius to the East, as mentioned in a letter of pope Gelasius to the bishops of Dardania (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1207; Baronius, *ann.* 467, xii.; Ughelli, *Ital. Sas.* x. 36; Tillemont, *xv.* 287). [C. H.]

PROBUS (11), bishop of Chalcedon c. A.D. 591, was sent as ambassador by the emperor Mauricius to Chosroës II., at Ctesiphon. (Theophylactus Simocatta, *Hist.* lib. v. cap. 15.) The Latin version of Theophylactus makes the see Chalcis, and Le Quien (*O. C.* i. 604; ii. 788) places him under both Chalcedon and the Syrian Chalcis. The Jacobite patriarch Dionysius, quoted by Le Quien, says he was appointed to Chalcedon on his abjuring the Monophysite heresy at Constantinople, whither he had come from Alexandria, but that at the close of his life he returned to his former opinions. [J. G.]

PROBUS (12), abbat of the monastery of SS. Andrew and Lucy, at a synod held at Rome in October A.D. 601 under Gregory the Great, petitioned that he might be allowed to dispose of his property by will, so as not to leave his son unprovided for. He had devoted himself to a hermit life, and had therefore not made a will, as his son would have succeeded if he died intestate; but going one day to Gregory, he was suddenly ordered by him to become abbat of the monastery, and had therefore been unable to make any disposition of his property before entering on the office. Gregory acknowledged the truth of his allegations, and granted his petition (*S. Gregorii Epist. Appendix* 9, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1344). It is doubtful if this monastery was the same as the famous monastery of St. Andrew on the Coelian founded by Gregory himself (*S. Gregorii Vita*, i. 3, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxv. 254, note). Probus may have been the same as the abbat Probus

employed by Gregory in the peace negotiations with Queen Theodelinda (*Epist.* lib. ix. ind. ii. 43, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 975). Monks were deprived of testamentary power by Justinian, except as regarded bequests to children, as to which there were special provisions (*Nov. v.* 5, *cxliii.* 38). [F. D.]

PROBUS (13), bishop of Reate, uncle of PROBUS (12). He narrated to Gregory the Great (*Dial.* iv. 12) a vision of SS. Juvenalis and Eleutherius, who appeared to the bishop on his death-bed. [F. D.]

PROCESSUS, martyr. [MARTINIANUS (1).]

PROCHOROS. Prochoros (Πρόχορος not Πρόχωρος) is the name of one of the seven deacons of the church at Jerusalem, mentioned Acts vi. 5. Later tradition makes him one of the seventy disciples, and afterwards bishop of Nicomedia in Bithynia (comp. the lists of the seventy disciples in the texts of the so-called Dorotheus, the pseudo-Hippolytus, and pseudo-Logothetes, and with these Lipsius *Apokryphische Apostelgeschichten* i. 193 sqq. *Chron. Paschale* appendix, p. 420, ed. Bonn).

Under the name of this Prochoros has been preserved an apocryphal *History of the Apostle John*, which was first published in the Greek text by Michael Neander in the appendix to the third edition of his Graeco-Latin version of Luther's Short Catechism, along with a Latin translation by Sebastian Castalio (*Catechesis Martini Lutheri parva graeco-latina postremum recognita*, Basileae 1567, pp. 526-663). The first part of Neander's text has been reprinted by J. J. Grynæus (*Monumenta Patrum Orthodoxographia*, Basil. 1569, tom. i. p. 85), and after him by Birch (*Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi*, Copenhagen, 1804, p. 263 sqq.). The latter added some further fragments. The complete Greek text has recently been edited by the Archimandrite Amphiloehios from several Moscow MSS. (Moscow, 1879), and by Professor Zahn (Erlangen, 1880), with the assistance of the MS. apparatus left behind him by Tischendorf. A new critical edition is also in contemplation by Professor Max Bonnet in Montpellier, as part of the *Supplementum Codicis Apocryphi*, which he has undertaken. We possess, besides this Greek text, an Old Latin, an Old Slavic, an Armenian, a Sahidic, an Ethiopic, and an Arabic translation. The Latin text was first published in the interpolated form of a later recension by Margarin de la Bigne (*Bibliotheca Patrum*, Paris, 1575, tom. ii., col. 185-230), and reprinted afterwards by Laurentius de la Barre in his *Historia Christiana Veterum Patrum* (Paris, 1583), fol. 1, sqq., and in the *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum* (Lugduni, 1657, tom. ii. p. i. pp. 46-67). This text is preserved in its original form in Cod. Paris. lat. 5357, saec. xiii. f. 103-127. The Old Slavic version is given by Amphiloehios, along with the Greek text, from a Moscow MS. of the 15th or 16th century. The other versions are still in MS. except only a few Coptic fragments, published by Mingarelli (*Reliquiae aegyptiorum Codd. in Bibliotheca Naniana reconditorum*, Bonn, 1785, fascic. ii. p. 302 sqq.), and Giorgi (*de Miraculis S. Coluthi*, Rom. 1793, pp. 119-121), and the beginning of the Ethiopic text in the English translation of S. C. Malan

(*The Conflict of the Holy Apostles*, London, 1871, pp. 117-137).

The narrative begins with the parting of the apostles and St. John's mission into Asia. In punishment for a first refusal to go by sea he suffers shipwreck on the voyage, but, after a wonderful deliverance, arrives safe at Ephesus, accompanied by Prochoros, his disciple. Here he takes service in a public bath; restores to life the owner's son, who has been slain by a demon, destroys the image of Diana (Artemis), and expels the demon which had harboured there, is banished himself, but soon returns to be again sent in exile to Patmos by command of the emperor. On the voyage to the island he restores a drowned man to life, stills a tempest, and heals a sick guardsman. The greater part of the following narrative is occupied with the wondrous deeds of the apostle in his banishment, his victorious encounters with demons and sorcerers, his refutation of a learned Jew in a public dispute, numerous miracles of healing and raising from the dead, and triumphant issues out of every conflict in which his persecuting enemies involve him. After a residence in Patmos of fifteen years he has converted almost the whole island. Permission being now given him to return to Ephesus, he first retires to a solitary place in the island (*καρδάμωσις*), and there dictates his gospel to Prochoros, and when finished leaves it behind him as a memorial of his work among the inhabitants of Patmos. He then goes by ship to Ephesus, and makes his abode there in the house of Domnus, whom he had formerly in his youth raised to life. After residing twenty-six years more at Ephesus he buries himself alive. Prochoros and six other disciples have to dig his grave, and when he has laid himself in it, to cover him with earth. On the grave being subsequently reopened the apostle has disappeared.

The text varies considerably in the MSS. and has received many additions from other sources. Some MSS. as Cod. Vat. 654; Marcian. 363; Paris. gr. 1468; Ambrosian. A. 63, contain fragments of the old Gnostic *πρόδοσις* in more or less altered form, interpolated into the Prochoros text, or mixed up with it towards the end, especially in the narrative of St. John's *μετάστασις*. Some MSS. add to the narrative of the way in which the Gospel originated a similar account of the origin of the Apocalypse. (So also the printed edition of Neander.) But this second narrative is evidently a mere imitation of the former.

This writing of the alleged Prochoros is (so far at least as its main contents are concerned) not in any way a recension of the old Gnostic acts of John, but the independent work of some Catholic author. Its object is not to supersede these Gnostic acts which, though the writer makes some use of, he can hardly have known in their original text. The purpose rather seems to be to supplement the Ephesian histories of the apostle which already existed in a Catholic recension by a detailed account of his deeds and adventures in the isle of Patmos. The author can have had no local interest in its composition. His notions of the situation, size, and general characteristics of the island, which he certainly never saw, are most extraordinary. In constructing his narrative he has made only partial

use of older materials. A comparison with the Syriac history of St. John, edited by Professor Wright (*Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, edited from Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, and other libraries*, London, 1872, pp. 3-60 of the English translation), and with the text of the Gnostic *μετάστασις* (ap. Tischendorf *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, p. 272 sqq. and ap. Zahn *Acta Johannis*, p. 238 sqq.), will show that for the commencement and conclusion of the work the Gnostic *περίοδοι*, or more probably some Catholic recension of them, has been made use of. Two other stories have, with a few alterations, been borrowed from the *περίοδοι Ἀνδρέου*—that of Procliana and Sosipater (p. 135, 12 seqq. ed. Zahn), with which compare the similar narrative in the Latin *Virtutes Andreae* (ap. Abdias in Fabricius *Cod. Apocryph. N. T.* ii. 461), and that of St. John assisting at a birth (p. 115 sqq. ed. Zahn), compare Fabricius ii. 295. But the most, by far, of these narrations of the pretended Prochoros are free inventions of his own. None of these independent narratives betray any leaning towards Gnosticism. The author looks with favour on matrimonial life, takes pleasure in eating and drinking, and shows no tendency to ascetic views except where he draws from older sources. Nor is he led by dogmatic interests. Even in discourses attributed to the apostle the theological element is quite subordinate. He takes no notice of the Apocalypse, and in opposition to the older tradition places the composition of the gospel in Patmos. The account given of this is certainly not derived from the Gnostic *Περίοδοι*.

The date of composition of this work cannot be set later than the middle of the 5th century, since it is made use of, not only in the *Chronicon Paschale* (p. 761, 470, ed. Bonn, cf. Zahn, p. 162, 3 sqq.), but also in the accounts of the apostles attributed to Dorotheus, Hippolytus, and others. The *terminus a quo* is the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century, since it is from that time onwards, and not before that, Catholic writers appear to have been acquainted with the Gnostic histories of the apostles. With this, moreover, agrees the fact, that the author can assume a universal diffusion of Christianity in Ephesus, and in the islands of the Aegean Archipelago. It is more difficult to determine the place of composition. The author is certainly not a native of Asia Minor, but rather perhaps of Antioch, or the coast region of Syria and Palestine. He is, at any rate, better acquainted with the topography of that part of the world than with the neighbourhood of Ephesus. Of his personal circumstances no more can be said than that he certainly was not a monk; perhaps he was a married cleric, possibly a layman.*

* The narratives of this pretended Prochoros appear to have found much favour, for they are frequently repeated. Besides the writings above referred to as having made use of Prochoros, we may mention here the Greek *Menologia* and *Encomiasts*. The great Greek *Menaea* for 26 September (Venice, 1683, p. 170 sqq.) give a long extract from Prochoros. Shorter excerpts are found in the *Menologion* of the emperor Basilius Porphyrogenetes (ed. Alhani, i. p. 70; ed. Migne, *Patr. Graec.* cxvii. 74), the *Encomium* on St. John by Nicetas David the Paphlagonian (Combesis, *Auctar. Novissimum*, i. 354 sqq.) and Nicephorus Callistus (*Hist. Ecc.* ii. 42). The *Vita Joannis* of Symeon Meta-

Compare Zahn, *Acta Joannis*, Erlangen, 1880; Lipsius, *Die Apocryphen Apostelgeschichten*, i. 355-408.

[R. A. L.]

PROCLIANITAE. Heretics mentioned by Philaster (*Haer.* 56), but concerning whom, if they existed at all, we have no independent information. [See HERMIAS, Vol. II. p. 927 b; HERMOGENES, Vol. III. 36.] Praedestinatus (*Haer.* 60) calls the sect Proclianistae, deriving the name from Proclianus. This article, compared with its original, the corresponding article in the tract of Augustine, does honour to the writer's powers of invention.

[G. S.]

PROCLIANUS, bishop, who had assisted the Christians of Suedra in Pamphylia to resist the teachings of the Arian heretics, c. A.D. 374. (Epiphanius, *Epist.* preceding the *Ancoratus*; Tillem. x. 502; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* vi. 414.)

[J. G.]

PROCLUS (1) (PROCLUS), a Montanist teacher, and probably the introducer of Montanism into Rome at the very beginning of the 3rd century. For the account given by Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* 1) of the apparently favourable reception which the new prophesying at first met with at Rome, and its subsequent rejection, see MONTANISM (Vol. III. p. 940 a). Proclus was publicly opposed by Caius, commonly called a Roman presbyter, and the record of their disputation, though now lost, was read by Eusebius and is mentioned by several other writers. [CAIUS, Vol. I. 385 a; MONTANUS, Vol. III. p. 941 a]. Pseudo-Tertullian states (*Haer.* 21) that the Montanists were divided into two sections by the Patripassian controversy, Proclus being the leader of the section whose doctrine on that subject agreed with that of the church, and Aeschinas of the opposite section. This schism among the Montanists is mentioned also by Hippolytus (*Ref.* viii. 19).

We can scarcely be wrong in identifying Proclus the Montanist with the Proculus whom Tertullian in his tract against the Valentinians (c. 5) calls "Proculus noster, virginis senectae et Christianae eloquentiae dignitas." He there refers to him as one who like Justin Martyr, Miltiades and Irenaeus, had laboured successfully in the confutation of heresy. Proculus is also mentioned as a leader of the Montanists by Pacian (*Ep. ad Sympron.*), and no doubt it is his name which is disguised as Patroclus in the MSS. of Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* iii. 2). [G. S.]

PROCLUS (2), ST., patriarch of Constantinople, was ordained a reader in his childhood, and afterwards studied in the schools of rhetoric at Constantinople. The friend and disciple of Chrysostom, he became secretary to ATTICUS, who ordained him deacon and priest. On the death of Atticus, some desired him as the new patriarch, while others favoured Philippus, but the majority wished for SISINNUS, who was ultimately appointed. Sisinnius consecrated him bishop of Cyzicus, but the people there refused to receive him, and he remained at Constantinople. On the death of Sisinnius, the

phrases (Greek and Latin text in Oecumenii *Opp.* ed. Paris, 1631, tom. ii. p. 838 sqq. and in Migne, cxvi. 683 sqq.) is also in some measure derived from Prochoros.

old rivalry broke out between the partisans of Philippus and those of Proclus, and again a third person was chosen by the emperor, namely, the famous NESTORIUS. In reply to the latter, early in A.D. 429, on a festival of the Virgin, Proclus preached the celebrated sermon on the Incarnation, which is inserted in the beginning of the Acts of the Council of Ephesus. Once more for the third time, on the deposition of Nestorius, Philippus and Proclus appear as rivals, and for the third time, the difficulty was avoided by the choice of a third person, MAXIMINIANUS (5). The excuse for passing over Proclus was, that translations were unlawful, and that he was already bishop of Cyzicus. At last, when Maximianus died on Thursday before Easter A.D. 434, Proclus was by the permission of Theodosius immediately enthroned by the bishops at Constantinople. Theodosius took this course to anticipate troubles, such as had attended the last three appointments, and the scruples felt about translation had been removed by the letters of pope Celestine to Cyril of Alexandria, John of Antioch, and Rufus of Thessalonica on the subject of translation. His first care was the funeral of his predecessor, and he then sent both to Cyril and John of Antioch, the usual synodical letters announcing his appointment, both of whom approved of it. In 436, the bishops of Armenia consulted him upon certain doctrines prevalent in their country, and attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, asking for their condemnation. The next year Proclus replied in the celebrated letter known as the Tome of Proclus, which he sent to the Eastern bishops, asking them to sign it, and to join in his condemnation of the doctrines submitted to him by the Armenians. They approved of the letters, but from their admiration of the deceased Theodore, could not bring themselves to join in condemning the doctrines attributed to him. Proclus replied that while he desired the extracts subjoined to his Tome to be condemned, he had not attributed them to Theodore or any person dead or alive, and shewed thereby that he did not desire the condemnation of any person. A rescript from Theodosius procured by Proclus, which declared it was his intention that all should live in peace, and that no imputation should be made against any one who died in communion with the church, appeased the storm. The whole affair shewed conspicuously the moderation, and tact of Proclus. In 438, he transported to Constantinople from Comana, and interred with great honour in the church of the Apostles, the remains of his old master St. Chrysostom, and thereby reconciled to the church his adherents who had separated in consequence of his condemnation. The next year at the request of a deputation from Caesarea in Cappadocia, he selected as their new bishop Thalassius, who was about to be appointed praetorian prefect of the East. It was in the time of Proclus that the Trisagion came into use. The occasion is said to have been a time when violent earthquakes lasted for four months at Constantinople, so that the people were obliged to leave the city and encamp in the adjoining fields. Proclus died most probably in July 446, though some authorities defer his death till the following year. He appears to have been a wise and moderate man, of con-

ciliatory temper, desirous, while strictly adhering to orthodoxy himself, to win over those who differed from him by persuasion rather than force.

The first edition of the collected works of Proclus, was that by Richard at Rome in 1630. Several other editions have since been published, and the whole is reprinted in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lxxv. 651. They consist of twenty sermons, originally published by Richard, some, however, being of doubtful authenticity, of five more just published by Card. Mai (*Spic. Rom.* iv. xliii. lxxviii.), of which three are preserved only in a Syriac version, the Greek being lost, of seven letters along with several addressed to him by other persons, and of a few fragments of other letters and sermons. Proclus is commemorated on October 24. (His own works: Socrates, *H. E.* vii. xxvi.—and *passim*; Theophanes, *sub an.* 430; Tillemont, *M. E.* xiv. 704; *AA.SS.* Act. x. 639.) [F. D.]

PROCLUS (3). The last of great Neoplatonists, and second only to Plotinus among them. He was born A.D. 412, and died A.D. 485. Of his life, which was written by his disciple Marinus, the following is an abstract. His father Patricius, and his mother Marcella, were both natives of Lycia; he himself was born in Byzantium, but was shortly afterwards brought back by his parents to their native country. Here he was cured of an illness that seemed likely to be fatal, by the personal aid of Apollo, who appeared before him, and proclaiming who he was, touched the head of Proclus and vanished. After some grammatical instruction in Lycia, Proclus went to Alexandria, where he lived with the rhetorician Leonas, who treated him with great familiarity and kindness, and for whom Proclus performed some domestic offices. He also was instructed by Orion the grammarian; and was at first intended for his father's profession, that of the law. He preferred, however, the study of rhetoric, and made great proficiency in it. While engaged in this pursuit, he accompanied Leonas on a journey from Byzantium, returning from which place, he determined to abandon rhetoric, and apply himself to philosophy. He frequented the lectures of Olympiodorus, the Peripatetic (not to be confounded with the commentator of that name, who was long subsequent), and also those of Hero the mathematician. He shewed his extraordinary powers of memory on one occasion by repeating almost verbatim a speech which Olympiodorus had just delivered; which was the more remarkable, as Olympiodorus, both from the difficulty of his subjects and the quickness of his utterance, was by no means an easy speaker to follow.

Proclus, however, was dissatisfied with these instructors; and mindful of an admonition he had received from the goddess Minerva at the time of his first embracing the philosophic life, he betook himself to Athens. Here he was met by Nicolaus, also a Lycian by birth, whose guest he became. It was regarded as a favourable omen that the first place in Attica in which Proclus sat down or drank water was close to a temple dedicated to Socrates. At Athens Proclus became the disciple of the celebrated philosopher Syrianus, whose acquaintance he made under circumstances which shewed to each

of them their community in religious observances; for having met casually and exchanged some remarks, they presently went apart to pay their devotions severally to the thin crescent of the new moon, which was just appearing. Whether they saw each other while engaged in this worship, is not stated; but Lachares, who was with Syrianus at the time, observed the act of Proclus, and drew deductions favourable to his virtue and intelligence. Proclus had not completed his twentieth year when he was introduced by Syrianus to the philosopher Plutarch, then very advanced in years, who treated him with great kindness, and advised him to lay aside in part his vegetarian habits. Proclus read with Syrianus the whole of Aristotle, and afterwards Plato; his industry was unwearied, and by the time he was twenty-eight years of age he had composed a variety of philosophical works, among them his commentary on the Timæus of Plato.

Proclus, unlike Plotinus, did not discourage his friends from pursuing a political life, and even at times took part in it himself; indeed he advised Archiadas, who was his greatest friend, towards this kind of action. He was never married; though, says Marinus, many wealthy persons were desirous of being allied to him; among whom was Olympiodorus, his first preceptor in philosophy, who offered him his daughter. He was singularly regardful of his friends; when any of them fell ill, he would first earnestly supplicate the gods with sacrifices and hymns. Afterwards he himself attended the sick, and consulted the physicians on their behalf. On one occasion he is said, with the aid of Aesculapius, to have effected a miraculous cure. He appears to have had a certain authority over the teachers of philosophy, and his rebukes of them, when they were negligent, were sometimes perhaps even too vehement; but he was easily appeased. He was very temperate, and is said to have weakened himself by abstinence. Yet he lived seventy-five years; but in the last five years of his life he is said not to have had the perfect use of his powers. He died in the year after an eclipse of the sun, which Marinus, as was to be expected, regards as a foreshadowing of so weighty an event.

It would be a waste of space to recount all the various instances, which Marinus delights in telling, of the devotion of Proclus to Minerva, Pan, and other heathen deities, and of the assistance which those deities gave their votary. In no respect does Proclus, who practically concludes the Neoplatonic school, stand in stronger contrast with Plotinus, who almost begins it, than in the flood of minute ceremonialism and specific acts of intercourse with nameable deities in which he is involved, as compared with the high and pure abstract religion of Plotinus. It must be held to be a mark of weakness in a philosophy, when it could descend in this way and to so great a degree. Nor has the life of Proclus any of those marks of true vitality, of living interest in men, which appear in the life of Plotinus; much is said of his virtues, but little in such a way as to persuade us that they were real. Nor can we regard his saying, that if he had despotic power, he would destroy all the writings of antiquity except the Oracles and the Timæus of Plato, as anything but a

proof of want of sanity of judgment, and blameable indifference to all that had interested men up to that time.

Still, we may suspect that something of the unsatisfactory impression which the life of Proclus leaves upon us, is due to the weakness of his biographer. Those of his writings which have descended to us are certainly not without power. When, leaving the concrete forms of Minerva, Apollo, and the other well-known heathen deities, we come to the exposition of deity in its own nature, as flowing out from a central unity and goodness into all the world of being, affecting different natures in different degrees, but kindling in all an image of itself, we are sensible of something sublime in such a conception. This is, indeed, one of the central ideas of the Neoplatonic philosophy; it is really the same in Proclus as in Plotinus, though there is a greater show of system and formal deduction in Proclus. This systematisation it is which appears to Victor Cousin so great a merit in Proclus, as to raise him, in a certain way, above all previous philosophers. With that opinion few have coincided; and it is an opinion the truth of which is entirely dependent on the question, whether the systematisation itself, apart from the ideas supposed to be systematised, is correct. It is impossible to answer this question entirely in the affirmative; and though to say that the systematisation of Proclus was entirely futile would be disparaging it too much, still this cannot be considered the striking element in the philosophy; it is too imperfect to count for very much. There are flashes of light in Proclus, but they derive little addition from the feebler rays around them, though there is a connection throughout the whole. The following, for example, is a striking remark: "Bonum autem non appetens esse aliquod entium impossibile. Omnia autem entia et facta sunt, et sunt propter desiderium istud, et salvantur secundum hoc." "Good, that does not seek to realise itself in the world, is an impossibility. All existent things have come into being by reason of this desire, and are preserved in accordance with it."—*De Malorum Subsistentia*, pp. 199–200 of vol. i. of Cousin's edition (the Greek original is lost; the Latin translation is by Guilelmus Morbeka, Archbishop of Corinth in the 12th century). But the speculations on the nature of evil which surround this passage, though not to be called feeble, possess no penetrative power. So again in the 140th proposition of his "Elements of Theology," the sentence, "All things sympathise with all," is one that Taylor, the translator, the celebrated Platonist, calls sublime; it may remind us, longo intervallo, of St. Paul's, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." The following sentences, from the proof to the 122nd proposition of the "Elements of Theology," compresses into a small space what may almost be called the pith of the Neoplatonic philosophy: "The gods abiding in their uniform nature and original substance, fill all things with their power. And everything which is able to participate, enjoys the goods which it is capable of receiving according to the measure of its proper subsistence; the gods in the meantime, through being itself, or rather through a nature prior to being, pouring their illumina-

tions on everything which exists." The "nature prior to being," of which Proclus here speaks, is a phrase which recalls Hegelian philosophy; the extract, however, is intelligible enough on the whole. A specimen of Proclus, in his less lucid phase, may be found in the forty-fourth proposition of the same "Elements," which tells us that "Everything converted to itself according to energy, is also converted to itself according to essence."

There is, it cannot be denied, something pathetic in the picture we find, whether in Proclus, or Hierocles, or in the writings that have come to us under the name of Hermes Trismegistus, of expiring Paganism. The religion to which Socrates had with much simplicity and sincerity conformed, though of course he was aware of its many failings, is here seen trying to divest itself of those failings, to put on new garments, and associate itself with a living practical strength, and to support itself in the region of pure reason by a well-considered philosophy. On the whole, notwithstanding the practical failure of the complex system thus described in its entirety, there were elements in it worthy not to be forgotten, some amount of permanent truth capable of giving light in perpetuity to the generations of mankind.

There is no edition of the entire works of Proclus; but the editions by Victor Cousin, the first of six volumes octavo (Paris, 1820), containing the commentaries on the first Alcibiades and the Parmenides, and the three treatises *De libertate, providentiâ et malo* (in a Latin translation), the second of one volume quarto (Paris, 1864) containing the hymns also (besides the above-named works), will probably be the best for an English reader who wishes to obtain a knowledge of the philosopher. Yet perhaps more genius is displayed in the two quarto volumes by Thomas Taylor, containing translations of the commentary on Euclid and the "Elements of Theology," together with a variety of essays; wherein the reader will certainly not complain of want of enthusiasm, whatever be his judgment as to the opinions expressed. Besides these may be mentioned the treatise *De mundi aeternitate, viginti duo argumenta adversus Christianos, cum refutatione J. Philoponi* (Venet. 1535, fol.); *In Platonis theologiam libri sex* (Hamb. 1618, fol.); *De unitate et pulchritudine* (p. 71 of Creuzer's *Plotinus*, Heidelberg, 1814, 8vo); *Paraphrasis in quatuor Ptolemaei libros de siderum affectionibus* (Leyden, 1635, 8vo); and the *Commentarius in Platonis Timaeum*, edited by Schneider (Breslau, 1847, 8vo). This last was the favourite treatise of its author. [J. R. M.]

PROCOPIUS (1), July 8. A native of Aelia (Jerusalem) and Martyr at Caesarea in the Diocletian persecution. He was a noted ascetic, and had served three distinct offices in the church of Scythopolis, those of lector, interpreter of the Syrian language, and exorcist. The second of these shews that divine offices were then celebrated in Syriac. He was arrested by Flavianus, the president, whom he roused to frenzy by a quotation from the Iliad, ii. 204, when he pressed him to offer libations to the four emperors:—*Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη, εἰς κοίρανους ἕστω*:—(Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. i.; Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* pp. 330, 372.) [G. T. S.]

PROCOPIUS (2), priest of Tyre, editor of the tract upon the seventy disciples of Christ attributed to his bishop DOROTHEUS (2). (*Fabric Bib. Gr.* vii. 566 ed. Harles; Ceill. xi. 747 n.)

[J. G.]

PROCOPIUS (3), an officer of the Imperial Court, commissioned by Theodosius to summon Gregory Nazianzen to the council held at Constantinople in 382. Gregory wrote to Procopius to excuse himself from obeying the mandate. He had never known any good arise from councils of bishops, which rather aggravated than remedied the evils of the church. He had therefore resolved to avoid all such meetings. Had it not been so, his state of health would have forbidden his attendance. He begs Procopius will make his excuses to the emperor. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 55, p. 814.) [E. V.]

PROCOPIUS (4), an intimate friend of Gregory Nazianzen, who addresses him in familiar terms, excusing himself for not having attended the nuptials of Olympias (*Ep.* 193, al. 57, A.D. 384 or 385; Tillem. xi. 419), and congratulating him on having another son-in-law (*Ep.* 194 al. 58). Tillemont (xi. 417) thinks that he was the uncle and guardian of Olympias, and that he might have been the son-in-law of the emperor Valens mentioned by Zosimus (v. 8, p. 257, ed. Bonn.; Du Cange, *Fam. Aug.* p. 47 in *Hist. Byzant.* ed. 1729). [C. H.]

PROCOPIUS (5), solitary in Rhodes, visited at the end of A.D. 400 or beginning of 401 by PORPHYRIUS bishop of Gaza, and John bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, on their way to Constantinople. By his consent their mission was greatly aided. (Praetermissi for Feb. 26 and *Vita Porphyrii*, v. 34-36, viii. 55, 56, in *Boll. Acta SS.* 26 Feb. iii. 629 sq. new ed.; Tillem. xi. 164.) [C. H.]

PROCOPIUS (6), a layman of rank addressed by Chrysostom. (*Chrys. Ep.* 287.) [E. V.]

PROCOPIUS (7), Julianist bishop of Ephesus. [JULIANUS (47).] [C. H.]

PROCOPIUS (8) GAZAEUS, Christian sophist under the emperors Justin and Justinian (A.D. 518-565). Of his life nothing is known beyond his being preceptor of Choricus the sophist. His fame rests on his Scripture Commentaries, which, though diffuse, are but abridgements of the collections he had made (see his *Prologus* to the commentary on Genesis): his profession of belief regarding the nature of the Triune God, the authority and inspiration of Scripture, and the importance of the sacred volume is very satisfactory. His style is highly polished and concise. He must be distinguished from his contemporary the sophist, Procopius Caesariensis. His collected works are published by Migne, *Patr. Graec.* t. lxxxvii. in three parts, but his commentaries have also appeared separately. Of more doubtful authority and probably belonging to Procopius Caesariensis, though commonly attributed to P. Gazaeus, is *Panegyricus in Imperatorem Anastasium* (Greek and Latin) in *Corp. Script. Hist. Byz.* Bonnae 1829, pp. 489 sq., and Migne, *Patr. Graec.* t. lxxxvii. pt. iii.: *Descriptio Basilicae Sanctae Sophiae* (Greek and Latin), Migne, t. lxxxvii.

pt. iii.: and *Monodia in Sanctam Sophiam terrae-motu collapsam* (Greek and Latin), in Migne, t. lxxxvii. pt. iii. (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 176 sq.; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 504; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* vi. 258; vii. 535; viii. 375; ix. 447; Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* xii. 199). [J. G.]

PROCOPIUS (9) OF CAESAREA, known as Procopius Caesariensis, in order to distinguish him from one or two others of the same name, is generally recognised as one of the last of the Byzantine historians. He enjoyed great reputation in his own time, as is clear from the fact that he is referred to in very laudatory terms by Evagrius (iv. 12, 13), and that it was in no small degree owing to the impression made by his history upon Agathias that the latter was led to take to the writing of history himself, and to continue the work which his forerunner had begun (AGATHIAS).

Procopius was born at Caesarea in Palestine, but the year of his birth is unknown. From Caesarea he went during the reign of Anastasius to Constantinople, the city to which all aspiring spirits were then attracted. There he taught rhetoric for a time, and pleaded in the courts. He must have done so with success, for he was entrusted by the emperor Justinian with highly honourable and responsible duties, received from him the rarely bestowed title of Illustrious, and in his later years was appointed a senator and praefect of Constantinople.

We meet with him first about A.D. 527, when he was sent by Justinian to accompany the celebrated commander Belisarius, as his secretary and privy councillor, in his expeditions against the Persians. This honourable position he retained, both in that and in all the subsequent campaigns of the great "Africanus of New Rome." In the year 533 he was with him in Africa, warring against the Vandals, and, after their subjection had been effected, he was left behind to reduce the conquered into order. A mutiny of the soldiers drove him in the year 536 to Sicily, which Belisarius was engaged at the time in reducing to subjection, and from this he accompanied him into Italy in his campaign against the Goths. In the year 542 he returned to Constantinople, where he appears to have remained to the end of his life, devoting himself mainly to the composition of a history of those expeditions of which he had not only been an eye-witness, but in which he had himself borne no unimportant part.

As in the case of Agathias it is a question whether Procopius was a Christian or a heathen. Gibbon speaks of the point as "an honourable problem," and concludes that the religion of both betrays "occasional conformity with a secret attachment to paganism and philosophy" (*History*, chap. xl.). It can hardly be doubted that the conclusion thus come to is just. Many expressions no doubt occur in the writings of our author which would seem to warrant the conviction that he was a Christian. He speaks of the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople as the temple of the great Christ of God (τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ μεγάλου Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *De Bello Vandal.* i. 6). He describes Jesus as the Son of God who went about clothed with a human body, showing that He was the Son of God both by His sinless life and His superhuman deeds (*De Bello Pers.*

ii. 12). Christians are in his eyes those who have right opinions respecting God (*De Bello Vandal.* i. 21). The Virgin Mary is often mentioned under the name θεοτόκος (e.g. *De Aedif.* v. 7). The Hellenic religion is alluded to as impiety (*De Aedif.* vi. 4). He relates various miracles performed by good men (*De Bello Pers.* vii.); and he even gives credit to the story of the martyrs who, after their tongues had been cut out from the root by Honorius, king of the Vandals, spoke as plainly as though they had received no injury; but two of whom, having afterwards committed fornication, lost their power of speech for ever (*De Bello Vandal.* i. 8). He believed also in prodigies, although at the same time he expresses his doubts of some that he relates. On the other hand, however, he often alludes alike to Christians and heretics as if he occupied a calm position superior to them both (*De Bello Pers.* i. 18), and the latter are more especially described by him in one place as those who are "called" heretics (*Hist. Arc.*). He disapproves at the same time of theological discussions, holding that the nature of God is beyond the comprehension of man, and that it is enough for us to believe that He is wholly good, and that He has all things in His power. In one passage he speaks of the affairs of mortals as not governed by human counsels but by some divine impulse, which men, not knowing the causes of events and only marking their issues, are wont to call fortune (*Hist. Arc.* 4). In respect to other controverted points it was his opinion that every one, whether priest or layman, ought to be allowed to think as he pleases (*De Bello Goth.* i. 3). Sentiments such as these are not easily reconcilable with the idea that Procopius had fully embraced the Church's faith; and the whole tone of his writings leads to the same conclusion. He was certainly alive to the follies and impieties of heathenism, and had gathered from Christianity many just views of God and of religion; but he seems to have looked at the whole matter with the eye of a philosopher rather than with that of a humble and sincere follower of Christ. The controversies of the Church had done much to alienate him from the reception of doctrinal Christianity; and, though he does speak at times as if he had embraced some of its distinct tenets, it is hardly possible to think that he had done so in the sense in which they were understood by those who regarded them as an express revelation of divine truth to man. The hair-splitting discussions of the theologians of his time appear to have done much to awaken in his mind a suspicion of, and distaste for, theology.

The works of Procopius were numerous and extensive. They consist of a history of the Persian war in two books, embracing the time from the year 408 to the year 549; of a history of the war with the Vandals in Africa, including events from the year 395 to the year 545; of a history of the Gothic war in four books, giving an account of the wars in Italy with the Goths from the year 487 to the year 574; of a work *De Aedificiis Justiniani Imp.* in six books, and of another work entitled *Anecdota* or a secret history of Justinian, the empress Theodora, Belisarius, his wife Antonina, and others of the court. This last work, which was intended for publication only after the author's death, is

described by Cave in the strongest terms of reprobation, as written with the purpose of shewing that the court of Justinian was no better than a *diabolorum lerna*, and as exhibiting such an amount of audacity, falsehood, calumny, and unheard of crimes laid to the charge of those of whom it treats, that it has been doubted by many whether Procopius was really the author. So infamous was the work in many of the particulars which it detailed that it was thought necessary to suppress a considerable portion of it relating to Theodora, and that it is only to be found in full in MS. in the Vatican. It is unnecessary to say more of this work than that, although there may be exaggeration in many parts and a too easy reception of calumnious stories, it is not possible to gain a correct notion of the time and of its leading personages without consulting it. Much of it is confirmed from other quarters, and history has too often had to tell that the public heroes of the world were in private its scandal and its shame. (This whole point will be found discussed in Schröckh, vol. xvi., page 168, etc.) The three works first mentioned alone deserve our attention.

As to their value there can be no doubt. Procopius had enjoyed the most favourable opportunities of making himself acquainted with the events which he describes. He had borne a part in the expeditions related by him, and had been in constant and close communion with Belisarius as his adviser and friend. It is certainly possible that he may have been thus led to flatter the emperor, his general, and the other distinguished persons whom he mentions; and if the *Anecdota* be really his work, and written as is supposed with the view of correcting the false impressions conveyed by his history as to his leading characters, he has irretrievably damaged his own historical credibility. Even then, however, his writings must be accepted as an important contribution to the history of a period for our knowledge of which we are indeed mainly dependent upon him. His sense of the value of history was deep (*De Aedif. Preface*). He felt that truth should be its distinguishing characteristic, and his resolution was to give a faithful account of everything, whether commendable or not, which he related, concealing nothing, even in the case of his dearest friends (*De Bello Pers.* i. 1). He largely carried out his intention. His work is enlivened by descriptions of cities and buildings, as well as of the manners and customs, and of the religion and art, of the peoples mentioned by him. Among other things of this kind he gives us an interesting description of Great Britain (*De Bello Goth.* iv. 20). His occasional remarks too display shrewdness of observation, as when he says that men are more ashamed of the name of base acts than of the acts themselves (*De Bello Goth.* iv. 15). Photius speaks of him as having gained eternal fame, and Gibbon draws largely on what he calls the "sober testimony of Procopius," while he again describes him as "the gravest historian of the times" (chap. xxxviii.).

The work of Procopius *De Aedificiis* is throughout a tribute to the glory of Justinian. It consists of five books, and is devoted to an enumeration and description of the great buildings, temples, forts, castles, bridges, monasteries,

and structures of every description which were erected by that emperor in all the different parts of the Roman empire. After a modest preface the author begins with a description of the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, after which he gives an account of other great buildings erected in the east. From them he turns to the west, to Epirus, Macedonia, Thessaly, and Illyricum. He then retraces his steps and passes through the different provinces of Asia Minor to Palestine and Mount Sinai. Finally, entering Africa, he speaks of what had been done at Alexandria, and in all the cities of the Proconsular province of North Africa, until he terminates his narrative at the Pillars of Hercules. The whole work is penned in a spirit of exaggerated laudation of Justinian; but, in a geographical point of view, it is extremely valuable. It is interspersed too with many notices of the different nations among whom the buildings spoken of were erected, of natural phenomena, and of religious observances.

The works of Procopius may be consulted with advantage for information on such points as the following:—the condition of the nations and tribes of the Abasgi, Bruchi, Alani, Franks, Goths, Huns, Persians, Vandals; the wars of Belisarius, together with his character and life; geographical notices of towns, rivers, seas, mountains, and countries over a wide spread area of the world; the names of the bishops, and the ecclesiastical occurrences of his time, &c.

The following editions of his works may be mentioned:—David Hoeschelius, *Augustae Vindelicorum*, A.D. 1607. Claudius Maltretus, Paris 1662, and again Venice 1729, with a Latin translation; also a Latin translation of the books on the Persian war, and on the war with the Vandals, Rome 1509, Basle 1531, Leyden 1594; Latin translation of the books on the Gothic war by Pers. Christ. Persona, Rome 1506, Basle 1531, Leyden 1594. The best edition is that of Dindorf in the *Corpus Script. Hist. Byz.*, with the Latin translation of Maltritus. His history was translated into German by P. F. Kanngiesser, 4 vols. Greifswald 1827–1831. The *Anecdota* were published by Allemannus at Leyden in 1624, who defends their authorship by Procopius, and again by Eichel at Helmstadt in 1654. The latter writer disputes their trustworthiness. An English translation was published in London in 1682. Grotius embodied in his history of the Goths, etc. two books of the Vandals and four of the Goths, 1655. [W. M.]

PROCUA (1), daughter of Euchrocia, the Priscillianist, and Delpidius, an orator and poet of Gaul. She accompanied her mother from Bordeaux with Priscillian and his colleagues to Italy. Injurious calumnies against her were vigorously circulated by their opponents. Her mother shared the fate of Priscillian, and was beheaded at Treves 386. It is not recorded what became of her (*Sulp. Sev.* ii. 48). [M. B. C.]

PROCUA (2), a widowed matron at Constantinople, one of the deaconesses of the church under Chrysostom. She was one of those who stood by him to the last, and of whom he took the affecting farewell described by Palladius in the baptistery of the cathedral. (*Pallad.* p. 90.) [E. V.]

PRORULEIANUS, Donatist bishop of Hippo, having held his appointment for some years before that of St. Augustine as catholic bishop of the see, A.D. 395. Soon after his own appointment Augustine invited Proculeianus to discuss in a friendly manner the points at issue between the two parties, apologising for the somewhat excessive vehemence of his friend Evodius [EVODIUS (3) Vol. II. 429]. Proculeianus at first consented, on condition that the discussion should be held in the presence of ten witnesses on each side, men of weight and good character, and be conducted on grounds of scripture. But he soon put off his consent with a frivolous condition, that Augustine should go either to Constantina or Mileum, where he said a council was shortly to be held. Meanwhile Victor, a Donatist presbyter, had received into the communion of his sect and rebaptized a young man who, having been reproved by his bishop for beating his mother, had passed over to the Donatists. On this subject Augustine wrote two letters to his friend Eusebius, requesting him to enquire whether Victor had received orders to act thus from Proculeianus, repeating his wish for a discussion, and in the second letter mentioning another instance of the same kind of behaviour in the case of a sub-deacon of the Spanish church, called Primus [PRIMUS (7)]. To the refusal of Proculeianus to meet his challenge Augustine refers in his letter to the Donatist party (Aug. *Ep.* 33, 34, 35; 76, 4; 88, 7). This was about A.D. 403. Two or three years later Augustine had occasion to complain of acts of extreme violence used by the Circumcellions, especially to a presbyter, Restitutus, of Victoriana, who had returned to the Catholic church, and also a sub-deacon under Marcianus, Donatist bishop of Urgi, whom, in revenge for his bishop's defection, the Donatist clergy (clerici) almost killed with stones, but Marcianus escaped. Of these complaints Proculeianus took no notice, and when called on by the municipal authorities to account for his behaviour, refused to do so (*Ep.* 88, 6, 7; 103, 3; c. *Cresc.* iii. 48, 53), A.D. c. 406. He was a troublesome neighbour to Augustine during his adverse tenure of the see of Hippo, but appears to have died before the conference in 411, as Macrobius is mentioned as Donatist bishop at that time. (*Carth. Coll.* i. 138; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 183; iii. p. 20.)

[H. W. P.]

PROCLUS (1), proconsul of Asia. [QUINTILLIANUS (1).]

PROCLUS, Montanist. [PROCLUS.]

PROCLUS (2), Numidian bishop addressed Cyp. *Ep.* 62. See JANUARIUS (1) and *Ep.* 70. Syn. Carth., de Bap. Haer. 1.

[E. W. B.]

PROCLUS (3), a bishop present at the council against Paul of Samosata (Euseb. vii. 30).

[C. H.]

PROCLUS (4), ST., and martyr, whose cult at Bologna is mentioned by Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* xxiv. 427-430). He was put to death with SS. Agricola and Vitalis by having his body pierced with nails. He is said to have been a soldier, and to have suffered in the persecution of Diocletian. He is commemorated June 1 (*AA. SS.* Jun. i. 48; Tillemont, *M. E.*

v. 135). On the same day a bishop of the same name is also commemorated at Bologna, who is said to have suffered under Totila. He is not recognised by Gams among the bishops of Bologna (*AA. SS.* Jun. i. 77).

[F. D.]

PROCLUS (5), ST., alleged bishop of Verona, said to have presented himself in the persecution of Diocletian with SS. FIRMUS (3) and Rusticus before Anulinus, who, however, refused to gratify his desire for martyrdom, but beat him and drove him out of the city. He is said to have afterwards visited Jerusalem; to have been taken prisoner and sold as a slave on his return, but to have regained his liberty, and returned to Verona, and to have died at a very advanced age. He is commemorated on March 23 (*AA. SS.* iii. 448; Tillemont, *M. E.* v. 138).

[F. D.]

PROCLUS (6), judge in Alexandria, who presided at the trial and martyrdom of SS. Didymus and Theodora V. A.D. 340 (Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 428 sq. ed. 1859).

[J. G.]

PROCLUS (7), bishop of Marseilles, in the latter part of the 4th century, but in what year he became bishop is not ascertained. He certainly was present at the council of Aquileia, A.D. 381, and joined there in condemning the errors of Palladius and Secundinianus (Ambros. *Ep.* viii. pp. 916 (786), 935 (802), 939 (805), ed. Migne). At the council of Turin, A.D. 399, or more probably 401, though Fleury places it as late as 404, Proculus claimed the primacy as metropolitan over the churches, not only of his own province, but also of Narbonensis Secunda. The council, while it laid down the rule that the bishop of the city, which was the civil metropolis in its province, should be regarded as the metropolitan, sanctioned nevertheless the claim of Proculus for his own life, in consideration of his age and high reputation (Bruns, *Conc.* ii. 114; Baronius, vol. v. 397, 43; Fleury, *H. E.* xxi. 52). His high character is acknowledged by St. Jerome in his letter to Rusticus, A.D. 411 (Hieron. *Ep.* 125, 20), but pope Zosimus appears justly or unjustly to have taken up a strong feeling against him, and in 417, September 29, decreed that Patroclus, who became bishop of Arles in 412, was entitled to the rank of metropolitan, and cancelled all consecrations made both by Proculus and by Simplicianus, bishop of Vienne, without the metropolitan's concurrence. Besides other charges Zosimus censured him for having ordained Lazarus, after his condemnation by the council of Turin, at which Proculus was present, and also Ursus and Tuentius without the participation of the bishop of Arles; but respecting these two last there appears to be much doubt (Fleury, *H. E.* xxiii. 45; Baronius, vol. v. 417, 26-44 and 51, 52; Tillemont, vol. x. p. 694). He summoned him to appear at Rome, but to this summons Proculus paid no attention, and in the following year Zosimus took steps to deprive him of his see, but towards the end of the year he died, and his decree was not carried out by his successor (Baronius, vol. v. 418, 40, 41, 75). Whether Proculus was the same as the Gallic bishop of that name, to whom St. Augustine wrote, A.D. 427, is not quite clear (LEPORIUS (1) vol. iii. 702); but if this were the case, he must have been also the bishop of Marseilles, who was

said by pope Celestine to have rejoiced over the death of Patroclus, A.D. 426, and must at the later date have reached nearly, if not quite, the fiftieth year of his episcopate (Fleury, *H. E.* xxiv. 49, 55; Tillemont, vol. x. pp. 698, 699; Ceillier, vii. p. 528-537; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* pp. 493, 573). [H. W. P.]

PROCLUS (8), sent by Genseric to compel the bishops and priests in the Zeugitane province to give up their books and sacramental vessels. His death, which followed soon afterwards, was regarded as a judgment on his impiety. [GENSERIC, Vol. II. 636] (Victor Vicensis, *de Pers. Vand.* i. 12). [F. D.]

PROCLUS (9), a poet and friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, who flourished in the latter half of the 5th century, in Gaul, though a Ligurian by birth. Nothing of his works survives, though in the ridiculous hyperbole of their coterie, Sidonius compares him to Virgil and Homer (*Epist.* ix. 15), while Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, in some verses addressed to Proculus' grandsons, makes him equal with Pindar (*Carm.* i. 3, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxiii. 311; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 538-9). There is extant a letter addressed to him by Sidonius, earnestly pleading for the pardon of a son who had fled from home (iv. 23). [S. A. B.]

PROCLUS (10), bishop of Nicotera, in Bruttii, addressed with other bishops in A.D. 599 by Gregory the Great. [PAULINUS (16).] In 603 he had returned to his see after a long absence, passed in doing penance for some offence (*Epp.* vi. 41; ix. 48; xiii. 24). [F. D.]

PROCLUS (11), deacon of Asculum in Picenum, founded a monastery on his estate of Grassianum, which Gregory the Great, in December A.D. 602, requested the bishop of Firmium to consecrate, certain conditions as to endowment being satisfied (*Epp.* xiii. 16). [F. D.]

PRODICUS, a Gnostic teacher of the second century, concerning whom trustworthy information is very scanty. He is not mentioned by the principal writers on heresies, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, or Philaster. Tertullian twice mentions him (*Scorpiae* 15, *Adv. Prax.* 3), and both times in company with Valentinus, in such a way as to suggest that he regarded the two heretics as of the same school. In the first passage Prodicus and Valentinus are spoken of as teaching that Christ did not wish His disciples to confess Him publicly if such confession would expose their lives to danger: in the second passage Valentinus and Prodicus are described as introducing in opposition to the Creator, not a single rival god like Marcion, but a multiplicity of gods. It is natural to infer that the Valentinian Aeonology, or something similar, was part of the system of Prodicus. Our only other source of trustworthy information about Prodicus consists in three notices by Clement of Alexandria. The first (*Strom.* i. 15, p. 357) states that those who followed the heresy of Prodicus boasted of being in possession of secret books of Zoroaster. We infer that in the time of Clement Prodicus was dead, but a sect founded by him was still in existence. Another passage (*Strom.* vii. 7,

p. 854) states that the followers of Prodicus objected to the practice of prayer. Clement merely mentions their doctrine (*μη δειν εχεσθαι*), but does not delay to state or answer their grounds of objection. But the most characteristic notice of the sect is found (*Strom.* iii. 4, p. 525), where we are told that the followers of Prodicus who claim to be Gnostics (falsely so called) declare that they are by nature children of the first god, and are privileged by their noble birth to live as they choose, being "lords of the sabbath," and "as king's children above the law." And living "as they chose" meant living very licentiously. The phrase "the first god" in this quotation deserves to be noticed as harmonizing with what Tertullian says as to the opposition of their doctrine to that of the monarchy of God. Clement objects to their doctrine, that king's children though they claim to be, they find that in fact they are constantly not able to do as they choose; and as for the adulteries which they actually commit they do them, not as kings, but as skulking slaves, dreading to be found out and fearing condemnation and punishment. And as the Apostle says, he who commits sin is the slave of sin.

For additional information about Prodicus we have to come down to the fifth century to Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 6); and on reading his whole section it seems plain that Theodoret had no more real knowledge of Prodicus than what he learned from Clement whom he quotes, mixing up, however, some of the things which Clement says about other of the licentious Gnostic sects. It seems, for instance, to be an unauthorized combination of Theodoret's own to connect Prodicus with Carpocrates. And we are safe in rejecting as equally arbitrary Theodoret's assertion that Prodicus was the founder of the sect of the Adamites, of which sect Theodoret would have read in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 52). Under the article ADAMIANI (Vol. I. p. 41) has been related what Epiphanius tells as to the alleged practice of this sect to worship mother naked in rooms warmed by a special heating apparatus. But Epiphanius honestly tells that he had no personal knowledge of such people, nor had he read of them in any book. He usually tells in what part of the world the heretics whom he describes are to be found, but in this case he says he really does not know whether they existed at all in his time; only, for safety's sake, he thinks he ought to tell the stories which had come to his ears. It is no unreasonable scepticism to dismiss with contempt a tale so poorly attested. It is notorious how easily stories get into circulation among outsiders as to what takes place in Freemasons' and other secret meetings. The heathen of old believed that at the Christian meetings the lights were overturned, and all sorts of wickedness perpetrated. And really, of the two, this story is more credible than that of the deliberate building of chambers with hypocausts for the purposes of indecent worship. Epiphanius does not mention Prodicus in connection with the Adamites, nor is it likely that he thought of him in that connection. He describes these people as, notwithstanding their immodesty, ascetic in their principles, inculcating continence as a duty and turning out of their "Paradise" anyone who touched the forbidden

fruit. If Epiphanius did not know of a connection of Prodicus with the Adamites, it is not credible that Theodoret had any better means of information; and, therefore, we must limit our knowledge of Prodicus to what can be gained from the passages of Tertullian and Clement already cited. [G. S.]

PROFORUS, a companion of St. Paulinus as Nola (*vid.* p. 238 a). [C. H.]

PROFUTURUS (1), bishop of Cirta, in Numidia, previously to this an inmate of the monastery established at Hippo by St. Augustine. He appears to have become a bishop about A.D. 395; for Paulinus speaks of him as such in a letter written A.D. 396 (Paulinus, *Ep.* 7; Aug. *Ep.* 32, 1). At some time in the following year Augustine wrote to him, telling him of his own suffering from a painful disorder, requesting his prayers for himself, and mentioning as an event of which he must be well aware, the death of Megalius, bishop of Calama (Aug. *Ep.* 38). Before he became a bishop, he was to have been the bearer of a letter from Augustine to St. Jerome, but was prevented from taking it by his episcopal duties. He died before 403, for it was not until that year that the letter was sent, and in it he is spoken of as being no longer alive (Aug. *Ep.* 71). He is also mentioned by Augustine in his treatise *de unico baptismo* as having died within a very few years, and being succeeded by Fortunatus. (Aug. *de unic. bapt.* 16, 29.) He is said by Evodius to have appeared to him after his death. (Aug. *Ep.* 158, 9.) [H. W. P.]

PROFUTURUS (2), bishop of Braga. A letter dated March 1st, A.D. 538, was addressed by Vigilius, who though not then pope was acting for Silverius who was then exiled, to Profuturus, who had written to consult the pope about certain practices of the Priscillianists and Arians, and on other matters. This letter was read at the first council of Braga in A.D. 561. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 611, 1018; *Esp. Sag.* xv. 107.) [F. D.]

PROJECTUS (1), a bishop of North Africa in St. Augustine's time. Augustine informs us (*De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8) that Projectus healed a blind woman by applying to her eyes the flowers he was carrying when he was removing the relics of St. Stephen to the waters of Tibilis. [G. T. S.]

PROJECTUS (2), a Gallic bishop who complained to pope Leo the Great that Hilary bishop of Arles had ordained another bishop in his place, c. 445 (Leo, *Ep.* x. cc. 4, 5). Tillemont (xv. 78) thinks his see was in the province of Second Narbonne, and that he was not the Projectus (about whom nothing is given) placed among the bishops of Die in the province of Vienne (*Gall. Chr.* xvi. 511). [HILARIUS (17), p. 69 b.] [C. H.]

PROJECTUS (3), bishop, of Forum Cornelli (Imola) consecrated by St. Peter Chrysologus (S. Petri Chrys. *Serm.* 165 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lii. 633), who, according to Agnellus (*Lib. Pont.* 51) had been ordained deacon with him by Cornelius, the former bishop of Imola. If it is true that Chrysologus was consecrated by pope

Sixtus (Agnellus 49), this Projectus cannot be the bishop of that name, one of the three legates sent by pope Celestine, the predecessor of Sixtus, to the council of Ephesus (Mansi, iv. 1287, etc.). He may be the same as the bishop Projectus, mentioned in A.D. 482 by pope Simplicius in a letter to John, archbishop of Ravenna. (Simplicii *Epp.* 2 in *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 37.) [F. D.]

PROMOTUS (1), mentioned by Chrysostom, A.D. 404, in a letter to certain Gothic monks *τοῖς ἐν τοῖς Προμάτου*, i.e., as the Latin version and note in Migne (*Pat. Gr.* lii. 726) make it, residing "in Promoti agro." But through the omission of the second *τοῖς* in another reading the expression has been taken to mean that the monks dwelt in the monastery of Promotus, viz. a monastery established in the house of Promotus, the eminent general of Theodosius. This view is taken by Tillemont (xi. 143, 179). [C. H.]

PROMOTUS (2), a priest of Chartres who was consecrated bishop of Châteaudun by Egidius, bishop of Rheims, about 572. This proceeding was the principal cause of the fourth Council of Paris. Châteaudun being in the diocese of Chartres, the action of Egidius was a direct encroachment on the jurisdiction of Pappolus, bishop of Chartres. He laid his complaint before King Guntram to whom Chartres belonged, who took up his cause, while Sigebert, the possessor of Châteaudun, upheld Egidius. The fourth Council of Paris was summoned to settle the dispute. The prelates decided in favour of the bishop of Chartres, and on Sept. 11, 573, wrote two letters which are extant, one to Egidius remonstrating on his breach of the canons, and threatening Promotus with excommunication, the other to Sigebert deprecating his support of an unrighteous cause. It seems, however, that Promotus, who did not present himself at the council, retained his position till Sigebert's death two years later, when the see of Châteaudun came to an end, in spite of an application to Guntram to reinstate him. In 585 Promotus subscribed the canons of the second council of Mâcon as a bishop without a see. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* vii. 17; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1098-9; Mansi, ix. 865 seqq.; 959. *Hist. Litt.* iii. 308-9, 343.) [S. A. B.]

PROMUS (or perhaps more correctly **PROBUS**), Dec. 19 (Bas. *Men.*), Egyptian martyr at Ascalon, in the Diocletian persecution under the president Firmilianus. He had been sent from Egypt, together with Ares and Elias, to minister to the Cilician confessors. They were arrested on Dec. 14. Ares was burned, Promus and Elias were beheaded five days afterwards (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. x.). [G. T. S.]

PROSDOCA, virgin martyr in Syria A.D. 305-306, daughter of Domnina and companion with her in martyrdom [DOMNINA (2)] (Ruinart, *Acta Mart.* 498-9; Boll. A. SS. Oct. 4, t. ii. 593 sq.). [J. G.]

PROSDOCIMUS, ST., alleged first bishop of Padua. His *Acta* are unhistorical. He is commemorated on November 7 (*AA. SS.* Oct. iii. 790, 795; Tillemont, *M. E.* v. 140). [F. D.]

PROSPER (1), supposititious primate of Numidia, to whom, with the other bishops of Numidia, pope Damasus is said to have written, but the letter is forged (Cave, i. 231; Ceill. v. 22; Jaffé, *R. P.*, *Lit. Spur.* num. clxiii.).

[J. G.]

PROSPER (2), of Africa, perhaps the author of the work on the predictions and promises of God and of that entitled *de Vocatione Omnium Gentium*, sometimes attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine. Nothing is known about him. [PROSPER (4).]

[H. W. P.]

PROSPER (3) TIRO. Probably the author of the poem *ad uxorem*, and of the small *Chronicle* mentioned in the next article, but nothing is known of his history. [PROSPER (4).]

[H. W. P.]

PROSPER (4), ST., a native of Aquitaine, but of what place is not known, though a note to the Colbertine MS. of one of his works says, but without mention of its authority, that he belonged to Toulon. (Aug. *Opp.* vol. xi. p. 1858, ed. Migne.) He is also thought to have borne the name Tiro in addition to that of Prosper, a question which will be discussed below. By many writers he has been supposed to have been bishop of Riez in Provence (Baronius, ann. 466. xiii.), or of Reggio, in the Modenese territory, but there is no evidence to show that he was a bishop, or even if he was in holy orders at all, that he ever advanced beyond the diaconate. He was probably born about A.D. 403, and if the short piece called his *Confession* be authentic, a point which is extremely doubtful, he received baptism early in life. About 426-429, for some reason unknown, but probably in consequence of the advance of the barbarians, he removed into Provence to Marseilles, and lived there as a monk until 440, but whether in a monastic establishment does not specially appear. At that time he went into Italy with Leo I. to whom, when he became pope, he is said to have filled the office of secretary (Notarius), and according to Gennadius to have been the author of the epistle bearing his name concerning the Incarnation of Christ, against Eutyches. But before this time he became, together with Hilary, also a monk, concerning whom some remarks will be found below, engaged in an active controversy on the subject of Pelagian, or rather Semi-pelagian, doctrine. At some time between 420 and 427, John Cassian published his *Collationes* [CASSIANUS (1), Vol. I. p. 415], in which he put forth a doctrine concerning grace and free-will contrary to that which had been taught by St. Augustine. This doctrine was taken up warmly by many of the monks at Marseilles, and both Prosper and Hilary were afraid lest a doctrine which they believed to be erroneous should become prevalent among the monks, and jealous for the credit of Augustine were thinking of writing to him to request him to explain some of his statements. In the meantime came out his book *de Correctione et Gratia*, by which Prosper hoped that all doubts would be settled. This, however, was by no means the case, but while those who held what in his view was the orthodox opinion were confirmed therein, those who thought differently became more obstinate

in their opposition. Although Prosper had never seen Augustine, he had written a letter to him by Leontius, a deacon, and received from him a reply, but neither the letter nor the reply have survived. He now wrote again to him in 428, as also did Hilary, and his reply to these letters is contained in the consecutive treatises *de praedestinatione sanctorum* and *de dono perseverantiae*, either in the same or in the following year, 429. (See Aug. *Ep.* 225, 226; and *Opp.* vol. x. pp. 947-1034, ed. Migne; also AUGUSTINE, Vol. I. p. 220.) Augustine died A.D. 430, and when the opponents of his doctrine in Gaul professed willingness to abide by the decision of the Roman pontiff, Hilary and Prosper went to Rome and brought back with them a letter from Celestine I. to the Gallic bishops, who appear to have been the following: Venerius of Marseilles, Marinus, Leontius of Fréjus, Auxentius of Nice, Auxonius of Viviers, Arcadius of Venice. In this he speaks of them both as men *quorum circa Deum nostrum sollicitudo laudanda est*, and reproved, but without effect, the indiscretion and ill-informed zeal of their opponents. (Coelest. *Ep.* xxi. 1, 2.) To this letter are subjoined in some editions a series of so-called decisions of the apostolic see concerning grace and free-will, which, however, cannot be regarded as authentic. When Leo I. returned from his mission into Gaul, A.D. 440, to be made pope, he persuaded Prosper to accompany him to Rome, and employed him, it is said, as his secretary (Notarius). Photius says that he confuted the Pelagians at Rome in the time of Leo, and a MS. of the monastery of Corbey adds, but without mention of authority, that he was sent by him on a similar errand into Campania, to oppose Julianus of Eclanum. Gennadius says that he was the real author of the epistle of Leo concerning the incarnation of Christ against Eutyches; but see LEO I. (5), Vol. III. pp. 653, 671. The chronicle of Marcellinus shows that he was alive in 463, but in what year he died is not known, and his memory is said to have been observed on Nov. 25, by some religious communities in France, but the Roman Martyrology mentions June 25 as his day of commemoration. Fulgentius speaks of him as *eruditus et sanctus*, Photius, as one who was truly a man of God, but with no other title than *Πρόσπερος τῆς*, who confuted the Pelagians in the time of Leo. Gennadius, who was no friend to him, speaks of him as *sermone scholasticus et assertionibus nervosus*, but such expressions as these do not show that he was in holy orders. (Fulgentius, *an Mon.* i. c. 30; Photius, *Biblioth.* 54; Gennadius, *de Scr. Eccl.* 84; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, June 25; Ceillier, vol. x. p. 278.) The letter of Prosper to Augustine describes the view which had been taken up at Marseilles and elsewhere concerning predestination. Those who adopted it, he says, believe that mankind has sinned in Adam, and that without God's grace there can be no salvation for any one. He offers salvation to all, so that they who attain faith and receive baptism are in the way of being saved. But before the creation of the world God foreknew who would believe and be saved, and predestined them to His kingdom, being called by grace, and worthy of being chosen and of going out of life sound in faith. No man, therefore, need despair of salvation, but this selection on God's part

makes human exertion needless either for recovery from sin or for progress in holiness. Thus a doctrine is introduced of fatal necessity, or one that, if no one can become other than what he was by creation, God has created two natures, and thus the very opinions which were refuted by Augustine are received with applause; but the advocates of them when called upon to explain their view refuse to do so, as being matters above human intelligence; and, further, that the Catholic view on this subject does not conduce to edification. They also think that men can by their own merit, by praying, beseeching, knocking, attain to that state of grace in which we are born anew unto Christ. Their ground for this opinion is that as none can enter into life without regeneration, so is it in the power of all to attain to this and thus become children of God. They support their opinion by all such passages of Scripture as exhort to obedience. The transgressor is called disobedient because he chose to disobey, and the faithful man obedient because he chose to obey. To the objection as to infants dying without baptism they reply that they will be saved or not according as God foreknows what their conduct would have been if they had grown up. They forget that in saying this they really imply that the grace of God, which they regard as accompanying, not preceding human merit, lies at the root of all inclinations to godliness. But they show more reason in their view of God's foreknowledge respecting nations formerly walking in darkness, which have been called into His light, and that they are without excuse who refuse to receive the Gospel. They think that Christ died for the whole race of mankind, but that some miss this salvation because they are known beforehand to have no inclination to receive it. They also deny that the merits of saints proceed from divine grace, and that the number of the elect can be either increased or diminished, and they assert that the only way in which a man is called either to repentance or to progress in holiness is by the exercise of his own free will. They thus place obedience before grace, and the first step towards salvation in him who is to be saved, not in Him who saves. Great difficulties arise, Prosper says, in his attempts to convince the holders of these opinions of their errors, not only from his own want of ability, but also from the great and acknowledged sanctity of their lives, a remark which he probably intends especially to apply to Cassian; and also from the elevation of some of them to the highest office in the Church. He therefore begs Augustine to explain these doubtful questions: *a*, How Christian faith can escape division through these disputes; *b*, how free-will can be independent of prevenient grace; *c*, whether God's foreknowledge is absolute and complete; *d*, whether foreknowledge depends in any way on human purpose, and whether there can be any good which does not proceed from God; *e*, how those who despair of their own election can escape carelessness of life. He asks him to explain all this in such a way as to be consistent with God's previous ordinance of vessels of honour and dishonour. One among the number of these men, Hilary, bishop of Arles, is known to Augustine as an admirer of his doctrine, and as wishing to compare his own view with his by writing to him, but whether

he will do so or not Prosper has no knowledge (Aug. *Ep.* 225).

The letter of Prosper was accompanied or followed very soon afterwards by one on the same subject by Hilary, concerning whom three opinions have been held: 1, That he was the same as the bishop of Arles mentioned by Prosper; 2, that he was a layman and a monk of Gaul; 3, that he was the same as Hilary, who wrote to Augustine from Syracuse, A.D. 414. See HILARIUS (15) and (17), Vol. III. p. 69, and HILARIUS (35), *ib.* p. 75. Of these opinions, the first seems to be refuted by the sentence last quoted from the letter of Prosper, compared with the address of Augustine in his reply to his "sons" Prosper and Hilarius (Aug. *de Prædest.* c. 1), and with the manner in which Hilary himself addresses Augustine, and seems to speak of Prosper as a fellow labourer. (Hil. *Ep.* i. 9, 10; Baronius, ann. 426, xx; Aug. *Ep.* 226.) That the Hilary who wrote to Augustine from Syracuse should write again to him fourteen or fifteen years later warmly on the same subject, is of course not improbable, and this view is not rejected by Tillemont (vol. xiii. 243, 343), nor by the Paris editor, though the probability seems to be lessened by the entire absence of any mention of the former letter, or of its reply either in the latter one or in the reply to it by Augustine, though the main subject of both letters is in each case very similar, and the reply to the earlier one is very long. That the later Hilary, if not identical with the earlier one, was a layman and a monk appears tolerably clear. He was evidently well acquainted with Augustine. His letter travels over much the same ground as that of Prosper, but conveys to Augustine the salutations of his parents and of Leontius, a deacon of the same name as the bearer of the former letter of Prosper, if not the same person as he, and he informs him that his brother had entered into a vow with his wife of mutual continence. He also requests Augustine to lend him his book on grace and free-will. To these letters Augustine replied in the two books mentioned above, which are in fact consecutive volumes of the same work. In the first he shows that all faith is God's gift, mentions his own former error on this point, and refers to his letters to Simplicianus, on the first of which he had corrected it. (*Retract.* i. 23, 24, 25; ii. 1; *Ad Simplic.* vol. vi. p. 101.) If it be asked, why does not God draw all men to Himself, the answer is that we cannot interfere with His will. Referring to his work against Porphyry, *de tempore Christianæ religionis*, he points out that the same answer as he then gave applies to the case proposed by Prosper and Hilary (*Ep.* 102, qu. 2). Grace is given by Christ, not according to our deserts, as is apparent in the case of infants. If it be said that God deals with them according to their prospective merits, and therefore those who die early without baptism are so treated, the answer is that the Church regards baptism as removing the guilt of birth-sin, not of future works, and the argument is of no force (12, 13). The elect are called in order that they may believe, not because they already believe (17). The Pelagian says, God foreknows those who will be holy, and therefore calls them, but St. Paul's doctrine teaches otherwise, Eph. i. 4, 5.

In the book *de dono perseverantiæ* Augustine

says that, as he has shewn in his book *de Correctione et Gratia*, perseverance is as much a gift of God as faith, and he quotes to this purpose Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer (*Cypr. de Dom. Or.* 12-27). Thus the prayer is sufficient to prove this point. To the question, why is not God's grace given according to man's desert, the answer is that it is so because He is merciful. If so, why not to all? Because He is our Judge. If it be asked, why do some, who seemed to be going on well, fall away? The answer is given by St. Ambrose, that our hearts are not entirely in our own power (*Ambros. de Fuga saec.* 1) (c. 8). Pelagianism really runs into Manicheism (c. 12, 13). But predestination is said to make preaching useless; No, because it forms a part of God's work of drawing men to Himself (c. 14). As to alleged inutility of prayer, or of reproof, the answer is that these are definitely commanded. These two treatises of Augustine are to be found in vol. x. of his works, ed. Migne, and are transcribed in the Paris edition of St. Prosper 1711, and its reprints.

About the same time as the letter to Augustine, Prosper wrote one on the same subject to a friend named Rufinus or Rufinus, about whom nothing is known except that Prosper addresses him as *Sanctitas tua*, by which may perhaps be implied a member of a religious community. He wrote in answer to a letter from his friend partly to vindicate himself from unfavourable reports as to his doctrine, partly to direct his attention to the writings of Augustine, and to vindicate him from the accusation of denying free-will and setting up Manichean doctrine in its stead. The line of argument against Pelagian or semi-Pelagian views is much of the same kind as in the letter to Augustine, but he also mentions the cases of Cornelius and Lydia as instances of persons who had been led by God's grace into the way of eternal life, and as not by any means to be quoted on the side of the Pelagian theory. Why all men are not saved is a mystery of God's, not explicable by human understanding, and of which we may be thankful to be ignorant. (*Ep. ad Ruffin.*) A long account of this letter is given by Ceillier, vol. x. 279-284.

Besides the letters already mentioned, Prosper was the author or compiler of several works both in prose and in verse.

I. WORKS IN VERSE.—Of those in verse the most important, at any rate in length, is the poem *de Ingratis*, a term by which he describes those who teach erroneous doctrine about grace, viz. the Pelagians and semi-Pelagians. It is explained clearly by the following quotation from the poem itself, v. 685:—

“Vos soli Ingrati, quos urit gratia, cujus
Omne opus arbitrio vultis consistere vestro.”

It consists of 1002 lines with a short elegiac preface, and is divided into four parts. A theological treatise in verse rather than a poem, but framed, *longo intervallo*, upon the model of Lucretius; it describes accurately the history of Pelagian doctrine, whose author it calls “coluber Britannus,” and mentions the treatment with which his opinions met at Rome, in the Eastern Church and in Africa through the influence mainly of Augustine, “the light of the

age.” The manner in which the Roman Church is spoken of is worthy of notice, v. 40:—

“... pestem subeuntem prima recidit
Sedes Roma Petri, quae pastoralis honoris
Facta caput mundo, quidquid non possidet armis
Relligione tenet.”

Though without any claim to high rank as poetry, and exhibiting, though in a less degree than is the case with the verses of Paulinus, the degenerate standard of its age in purity both of language and of versification, it nevertheless treats its subject with well-sustained vigour, and for the most part with clearness, and now and then expresses theological truths, though perhaps with severity, yet with remarkable force and terseness. J. J. Ampère, in his account of the poem, condemns what he considers to be its violence, its hard, melancholy, and desponding tone, amounting sometimes, he says, “to a pale reflection of hell.” He also points out a similarity in its sentiment to some of the works of Pascal, and the Port-Royalists, which he contrasts unfavourably with the tone of Bossuet in his essay on the fear of God. Ampère, *Hist. Litt. de France*, vol. ii. c. 16, pp. 38-58.

Besides this long poem, there are others of an epigrammatic kind which are generally regarded as genuine works of Prosper, though doubted by some editors. Two of them, doubted by Garnier, are addressed to a maligner (*obrectatorem*) of St. Augustine. In the first of them he applies to him the term *lupus*, by which Antelmi thought that he meant to denote Vincent of Lerins. The second, which is mentioned by Bede as the work of Prosper the rhetorician (rhetor), is perhaps directed against a different person (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 10). There are also 106 epigrams founded in some measure on Augustine's writings, but expressing moral and theological truths of a general kind, to be found in the works of many other Christian writers. The Paris editor judged that they must have appeared shortly before the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. Also a so-called epitaph, of twenty-six lines, on the Nestorian and Pelagian heresies, doubted by Garnier. Besides these works, generally attributed to Prosper, there are two other poems of doubtful authenticity, one consisting of 972 lines, entitled *de providentia divina*, a sort of vindication of the ways of God towards man, which was ascribed to him with confidence for the first time in the Lyons editions of his works, A.D. 1539. The style resembles that of Prosper, but some theological statements which savour of Pelagian doctrine seem unlikely to have proceeded from his pen. But besides this the poem speaks of the invasions of the Vandals and Goths during ten years past, and still afflicting the country. Now the Vandals, according to the Chronicle of Prosper, invaded Gaul, A.D. 406, and in 409 passed into Spain. The Gothic invasion began in 412, and as Prosper appears to have been born about 403, he could have hardly passed his boyhood before the close of the ten years, even though not strictly calculated.

Another poem, entitled *Conjugis ad uxorem*, has been attributed to Paulinus, and is included in some editions of his works, but is quoted by Bede in his treatise *de arte metrica* as the work of Prosper Tiro. It consists of sixteen lines of

Anacreontic metre, or iambic dimeter catalectic which Bede calls Colophon, i.e. *κολοβόν*, followed by ninety-eight elegiac lines, describing the glory of the Christian life, and having some passages of considerable force and beauty both of thought and expression. It is evident that it was composed during the time of general confusion and disaster caused by the barbarian invasions, and so may be ascribed to date about A.D. 407, but there is no evidence to show that Prosper of Aquitaine was ever married, and if so, besides the improbability arising from its date, the poem is not likely to have been composed by him.

II. PROSE WORKS. — 1. *Responsiones pro Augustino ad Capitula Gallorum*. A statement under fifteen heads, of the objections made by the Gallic bishops to the doctrines of St. Augustine on Predestination, with answers to each, followed by the same number of propositions showing in a formal manner the doctrines expressed in the pressing answers. 2. *Responsiones ad Capitula Objectionum Vincentianarum*. A similar work in sixteen chapters. The objections express in a manner which is not only harsh and revolting, but unfair, the possible results which predestinarian doctrine carried to its extreme point might suggest, and, if they are authentic, justify the severity with which Prosper rebuked the author in his epigram mentioned above; but whether the author of the objections was also the author of the *Commonitorium* it is not easy to determine. Baronius distinctly rejects this opinion, but his commentator Pagi supports it. Tillemont inclines to the view of Baronius, while Antelmi and Cardinal Noris reject it.* 3. *Responsiones ad Excerpta Genuensium*. — Some clergymen of Genoa, or, as some have thought, but on insufficient grounds, Geneva, especially two, named Camillus and Theodorus, had misunderstood various passages from the two treatises of St. Augustine, *de predestinatione sanctorum*, and *de dono perseverantiae*, and to them Prosper addresses a kindly and courteous letter of explanation, quoting the passages cited by them, and adding his own replies, gathered in some cases from the words themselves of Augustine, and in one case pointing out with astonishment the egregious blunder made by them in quoting as his opinion words intended to express an objection made by an opponent. 4. *Contra Collatorem liber*. — John Cassian had written a book entitled *Spiritual Conferences*, *Collationes*, seventeen in number, in the thirteenth of which, entitled *de protectione Dei*, consisting partly of a dialogue between Choeremon, a supposed abbat, and Germanus, he condemned severely the doctrine of Augustine on predestination. This is defended by Prosper partly by arguments drawn from Scripture and the nature of the case, and partly by the authority of the churches of Rome, of the East, and of Africa. He warns his adversary, whose name he does not expressly mention, of his near approach to the precipices of Pelagianism, and expresses the hope that his doctrine may be condemned by the present Pontiff Sixtus, as it has been by those who preceded

him. As Sixtus III. filled the papal chair from 432 to 440, the book must plainly have been published between those dates.

5. *An Exposition of Psalms c. to cl.*, but omitting cvii. (cviii.) because, as he says, it has been virtually explained before in the Commentaries on lvi. (lvii.) and lix. (lx.). Notker, who wrote in the 9th century, says that in his time a Commentary by Prosper on the whole book of Psalms was in existence, and from this statement coupled with that of Prosper himself the inference has been drawn that this was the case, but that the Commentary on the earlier portion is now lost. But as the whole Commentary is taken substantially and often verbally, though in a much abridged form, from St. Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, and as on Ps. cvii. (cviii.) the reason which Augustine gives for omitting any remarks upon it is the same, word for word, as the one given above by Prosper, the evidence as to his treatment of the earlier Psalms rests mainly on the statement of Notker, which there is no reason to doubt, but in support of which there is no further testimony. It may be added that the work is performed with great skill; not a mere servile curtailment, but a fair and judicious representation of the Augustinian work, together with some additions of Prosper's own. The date of its publication may perhaps be given as about A.D. 433. 6. *Book of sentences taken from the works of S. Augustine*, 392 in number, put together, it is probable, originally as a manual for his own use. The first thirty-eight are taken from Prosper's own work on the Psalms, many others from the *Enarrationes* of St. Augustine, and the rest from various other works of his. They are very short, and may be regarded as a sort of compendious index to the opinions of St. Augustine. Many of them are embodied in the canons of the second council of Orange. In older editions the number was 388, corrected by the Benedictine editors of Augustine and made up to 390, but in the Paris edition of 1711 two were added from other MSS., thus making up the total number to 392. As well as the letter to Rufinus, and the prose works just mentioned, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, these sentences are printed in the appendix, Part 11, to the works of St. Augustine, vol. xi. ed. Migne, where also may be found the canons of the second council of Orange. 7. The two books entitled, *de vocatione omnium gentium*, ascribed by some MSS. to Prosper, and by some to St. Ambrose, were attributed by Quesnel to St. Leo, and by other writers to one of the Hilaries, and to other authors. Joseph Antelmi, canon of Fréjus in the 17th century, in his book on the writings of SS. Leo and Prosper, took great pains to show that they belonged to Prosper, but the evidence on which he supports this opinion appears to be insufficient, and is rejected by the Paris editors of 1711. They have also been attributed to a Prosper of Africa, and a bishop of Orleans of this name about A.D. 470 (Tillemont, vol. xvi. p. 29). 8. Of the letter to *Demetrias*, otherwise entitled, *a treatise on Christian humility*, attributed by Quesnel to St. Leo, but by Antelmi, with great zeal, to St. Prosper, the remark may be made that it appears to belong to the same unknown author, as the work last mentioned. 9. The short paper entitled the *Confession of Iiro*

* Baronius, ann. 431, clxxxviii. Pagi, *in Bar.* ann. 434, xviii., vol. v. p. 1185. Tillemont, vol. xvi. p. 13

Prosper, first published by Sirmond in 1619, is rejected both by Antelmi and by the Paris editors, but not by Tillemont, *l. c.* p. 3. 10. Three books on the *Contemplative Life*, sometimes attributed to Prosper, are probably the work of Julianus Pomerius. 11. Three on the *promises and predictions of God*, attributed to him by Cassiodorus, appear to be the work of a writer who was a native, not of Aquitaine, but of Africa, whose name is unknown.

6. *a.* We come now to the *Chronicle*, probably the most generally known of the works of Prosper, and attributed to him without hesitation by Cassiodorus, Gennadius of Marseilles, Victorius, and Isidore, though Pithou and Garnier thought that it is not his. It extends from the earliest age to the capture of Rome by the Vandals, A.D. 455, and consists of three parts:—1. From the earliest age to A.D. 326, founded, as the *Chronicle* itself states, on that of Eusebius, and though much abridged both in matter and in language, treating the subject in a somewhat independent manner. 2. From A.D. 326 to 378, in which a similar use is made of the continuation of Eusebius by St. Jerome, but with additions as well as omissions. 3. From A.D. 378 to 455. Some MSS. appear to have contained as much of the work as reached to A.D. 433, others carried it on as far as 444, and others to 455. Victor, bishop of Tunno in Mauretania, about A.D. 596, who wrote a chronicle which professes to be a continuation of that of Prosper, says that this reached only to A.D. 444, but as the distinct evidence of Gennadius, Cassiodorus, and Victorius, all of them living much nearer to the time of Prosper, and the first and third of them natives of the same country as he, bears witness to the later limit of his *Chronicle*, we may adopt the supposition of the Paris editors that the work appeared at three successive periods with successive additions. Among these one of considerable importance is the mention of the Roman consuls for every year from the date, as the *Chronicle* says, of the manifestation of our Lord, i.e. his public appearance, when L. Rubellius Geminus and C. Fufius Geminus were consuls, viz. probably A.D. 29 (Clinton). This addition would be still more important if it were more correct, but, as Fabricius remarks truly, there are many mistakes, especially in the earlier portions, while in the later one they are much less numerous. As might be expected, predominance is given to events of an ecclesiastical kind, especially such as concern the rise and fall of heretical doctrines. The *Chronicle* itself arose out of an endeavour to fix the date of Easter, for which purpose Prosper constructed a Paschal cycle which, however, is lost, though a trace of its existence may be found in the *Chronicle* under the consulship of Theodosius (18) and Albinus (A.D. 444, Clinton).

b. Chronicle of Tiro Prosper. Besides the *Chronicle* just described, another in itself much shorter, and relating to the latest period only, bearing the name of Prosper, was edited by Pierre Pithou in 1588 from MSS. in the library of the monastery of St. Victor at Paris. This *Chronicle* Pithou thought himself justified in naming as the work of Tiro Prosper and regarding it as a genuine part of the entire *Chronicle* mentioned by Gennadius, in preference to the one containing the names of the consuls usually

appended to those of Eusebius and Jerome. This opinion was contradicted by Sirmond, who inferred that two *Chronicles* had been compiled by two men, each bearing the name of Prosper, but that the shorter one is not the work of Prosper of Aquitaine. (Sirmond, *Hist. Prædestinatiana*, Galland, *Bibl. Patr.* x. 404–414.) It has thus come to pass that, rightly or wrongly, the larger work has by way of distinction obtained the name of Prosper of Aquitaine, and the shorter one that of Tiro Prosper. That the latter is not the work of Prosper of Aquitaine appears plain from the following considerations: (*a.*) that the events mentioned therein often differ very much from those mentioned in the other. The writer of the one *Chronicle* was doubtless acquainted with the other, but has not followed nor even simply abridged it, but often mentions in a totally different way the events to which he draws attention. (*b.*) The names of consuls are altogether omitted. (*c.*) The manner in which it speaks of St. Augustine is entirely at variance with the opinion entertained of him in his lifetime by Prosper of Aquitaine, and the part which he took in defending his memory after his death. Thus it speaks on the authority of two MSS. of a predestinarian heresy which arose *ab Augustino*. In some MSS. these words are corrected by a note in a later handwriting, into *ab Augustini libris male intellectis*, a correction which Pithou on his own authority transferred into the text, with the obvious view of confirming the authorship of Prosper of Aquitaine. We may remark in conclusion that, after reading the two *Chronicles*, it is difficult to believe that they could be the work of one and the same writer, or if they were so, to understand his object in publishing both of them nearly, as must have been the case, about the same time. The question of the authorship of them brings us to the one already mentioned of the identity or diversity of Prosper of Aquitaine and Tiro Prosper, which appears to rest mainly on the authority of Bede, who, as has been seen above, attributes the poem *ad uxorem* to Tiro Prosper, and the epigrams or at least one of them, *in obrectatorem*, to Prosper “the rhetorician.” But of these the first appears certainly not to have been the work of Prosper of Aquitaine; the second, though doubted by Garnier, and quoted by Bede under the title of rhetorician, is by general consent assigned to him, but from the ambiguity of this title does little to settle the question at issue. On the whole it seems likely that the statement of Bede as to the poem *ad uxorem* has been misapplied, and that this may be the work of Tiro Prosper, to whom also the shorter *Chronicle* may be ascribed. In giving the title of rhetorician to Prosper, Bede may have had in view the title of *Scholasticus* given him by Gennadius, illustrated by his prose works rather than those in verse, though these, or at least the longer of them, may fairly be regarded as rhetorical rather than poetical in character. We may conclude, therefore, that Prosper of Aquitaine and Tiro Prosper were different persons, but of an African Prosper we have no historical trace.

Special works of Prosper were printed at Mentz 1524, Cologne 1531, Paris 1534, and Venice 1538, but the first edition of them that can be called complete was published at Lyons

in 1539 by the celebrated printer Stephen Gryphus. This was reprinted with additions at Louvain, 1565. A new edition, edited with great care by Jean Olivier, was published at Douai, 1576, which was the basis of subsequent editions until 1711. In the meantime, however, the *Chronicle* of Tiro Prosper, so-called, was published by Pithou in 1588, and the *Confession* by Sirmond in 1619. Editions founded on the one of Douai were printed at Cologne in 1609, and Rome 1611, but the best which had hitherto appeared, edited by Desprez and Desessarts, was published at Paris in 1711, containing all the works rightly attributed to Prosper, together with others not belonging to him, and various pieces relating to the semi-Pelagian controversy. This was reprinted in two volumes at Bassano, and published at Venice in 1782, and a revised edition has been reprinted in the *Patrologia* of Migne, vol. li. The collected works are also contained in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Lyons, 1677, vol. viii. Fabricius has given a list of the works of Prosper with critical remarks in his *Bibliotheca Latina*, vol. iii. p. 521 sq. A very full and careful account also of him and his works apparently based, chiefly on the Paris edition, will be found in an article in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vol. ii., of which the author is Dom Rivet. A short account of his writings with remarks upon them is given by J. J. Ampère, *Hist. de la Litt. de la France*, vol. ii. c. 19. Accounts of Prosper in connection with the Predestinarian controversy will be found in Rohrbacher, *Hist. de l'Eglise Cath.* vol. iv. p. 367; Guettée, *Hist. de l'Eglise de France*, vol. i. p. 204; Fleury, *H. E.* xxiv. 59-61; xxvi. 11; xxviii. 56; Robertson, *Hist. of Church*, book ii. c. 8, p. 442, and c. 13, p. 547; Tillemont, vol. xvi.; Ceillier, vol. x.; Schaff, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, § 291, p. 1113. See also *Dict. of Biography and Mythology*, vol. iii. and in the present work PELAGIUS (2).

[H. W. P.]

PROSPER (5), ST., fifth bishop of Orleans in the 5th century, is commemorated at Orleans, July 29, and appears in Beda's martyrology on that day (4 Kal. Aug.). He is only known as a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, whom he asked to write the history of the war of Attila and his siege of Orleans. The poet began it, but found the task too heavy a one (Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* viii. 15; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. vii. 82-3; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1412).

[S. A. B.]

PROSPER (6), responsalis, or bearer of letters from DOMINICUS (2), bishop of Carthage in A.D. 594 to Gregory the Great (*Epp.* v. 5).

[F. D.]

PROTADIUS (PROTHADIUS), ST., twenty-fourth bishop of Besançon between St. Nicetas and St. Donatus (circ. A.D. 612-624), is said, on doubtful authority, to have waged war against the simoniacal practices of the time (*Vita*, § 4, Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. ii. p. 412). He is remembered for the Liturgy which he composed, at the prayer of some of his clergy, to settle disputed points of ritual. This is said to be still extant, though the original work is unrecognisable through later additions and alterations, in a document given by Migne (*Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 411), where it is followed (pp. 411-

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

422) by a *Martyrologium* ascribed to him, but which has clearly been much added to, the saint's own name appearing on his day, Feb. 10. The anonymous life in the *Acta SS.* (*ibid.*) is very late and quite unauthentic (*Gall. Christ.* xv. 13; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 531-2; Ceillier, xi. 632-3).

[S. A. B.]

PROTASIUS (1). [GERVASIUS.]

PROTASIUS (2), bishop of Milan when St. Athanasius visited that city in 345 (Athanas. *Ap. ad Const.* c. 3); he also subscribed the council of Sardica in 343 (*Ap. c. Ar.* c. 50; Hilar. *Frag.* i. § 15; Tillem. vi. 31, 703). He preceded DIONYSIUS (14).

[C. H.]

PROTASIUS (3), I., ST., sixth bishop of Sion, in the Valais, in the latter half of the 5th century (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 735; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. vi. 249; Sept. iii. 72 sqq.; Ceillier, ii. 472).

[S. A. B.]

PROTASIUS (4), ninth or tenth bishop of Aix following Pientius towards the close of the 6th century, was *vice dominus* of the diocese of Arles, under Sapaudus, before his elevation to the episcopate. This office was concerned with the temporalities of the diocese (cf. Greg. Magn. *Ep.* xi. 71, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1211) and Gregory the Great, to whom his good qualities were known through Augustine of Canterbury, therefore applied to him in an extant letter (vi. 55, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 839) written A.D. 614, to urge Virgilius, a successor of Sapaudus at Arles, to forward to Rome the *pensiones* which his predecessor had withheld. A blank of 200 years follows his episcopate in the history of the see. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 302; Ceillier, xi. 506.)

[S. A. B.]

PROTERIUS, ST., patriarch of Alexandria, had been presbyter and church-steward under Dioscorus, and seems to have incurred his displeasure by taking an opposite view of the Eutychian question (see Ischyron, ap. Mansi, vi. 1017). If so, however, he must have, to some extent, regained his bishop's favour, for he was left in charge of the church when Dioscorus went to attend the council of Chalcedon. After his deposition by that council, the emperor Marcian gave orders for a new election to the see. The suffragan bishops, with the exception of thirteen detained at Constantinople by a resolution of the council (Chalced. c. 30), were assembled in synod; and the chief laymen of the city came as usual to express their mind, and assent to the prelate's choice. (Compare Liberatus, *Breviar.* c. 14, and Evagrius, ii. 5.) There was great difficulty, however, in coming to a conclusion; for the majority of the Alexandrian church people were profoundly aggrieved by the action of the late council. In their eyes Dioscorus was still their rightful "pope," the representative of Cyril and of Athanasius, the victim of a Nestorianising reaction which had enlisted the aid of the East and of the West. The tyranny of a heterodox majority could never annul a spiritual right. Dioscorus lived, and had not resigned his charge; and therefore the church which had been "espoused" to him, could not, without the guilt of "adultery," form relations with any new bishop.

2 K

Ultimately, however, opposition to the imperial mandate was felt to be impracticable: not a few must have been wearied by the despotism, or scandalised by the conduct, of the deposed patriarch. The synod, according to Liberatus, included four Egyptian prelates who had sat in the council, Athanasius, Ausonius, Nestorius, and Macarius (Mansi, vi. 571); and there, after hearing a statement of Flavian's read, had followed a number of other bishops in passing over from the side where Dioscorus sat, and joining the ranks of the "Orientals" (*ib.* vi. 681). It was resolved to elect; and then "the opinion of all inclined" in favour of Proterius, who might be deemed, in one point of view, the more acceptable, as having held a post under Dioscorus. He was accordingly consecrated and enthroned (A.D. 452); but the passions of the Dioscorian and anti-Dioscorian parties broke out at once into tumultuous dissension, which Evagrius likens to the surging of the sea. He adds that Priscus the rhetorician, when arriving in Alexandria from the Thebaid, was present at a collision between the populace and the authorities, when the soldiers were called out, were pelted, were driven into the ruinous Serapeum, and there actually burnt to death. Florus, who united the functions of Augustal prefect and commander-in-chief, punished this outrage by cutting off the general dole of bread, closing the baths, stopping the exhibitions, and sending for fresh troops from Constantinople, whose insolent license, however, did but aggravate the excitement, until Florus found it prudent to meet the people in the hippodrome, and promise to cancel his restrictive measures. Theophanes, who wrote about the end of the 8th century, tells a story which is probably no more than a story, that the people on this occasion threatened to stop the corn-supplies for Constantinople, whereupon Marcian ordered that the Egyptian corn should be exported from Pelusium instead of from Alexandria; and the Alexandrians being reduced to straits, employed the intercession of Proterius with the emperor (*Chronograph.* i. 165). Proterius sent to Leo the usual announcement of his elevation; Leo replied by asking for some definite assurance of his orthodoxy (Leo, *Epist.* 113, in March of 453), and received by the hands of Nestorius of Phragon, one of the four bishops above mentioned, a letter which, as he expressed it, was "fully satisfactory," and shewed Proterius to be a "sincere assertor of the Catholic dogma," inasmuch as he had cordially accepted the Tome (*Epist.* 127, 130). Thereupon (in March of 454) he wrote again to Proterius, advising him to clear himself in his people's eyes from all suspicion of Nestorianising, by reading to them certain passages from approved Fathers, and then shewing that the "tome" did but hand on their tradition, and guard the truth from perversions on either side. Leo took care, in thus addressing the "successor of St. Mark," to dwell on that evangelist's relation to St. Peter as of a disciple to a teacher; and he bespeaks the support of the Alexandrian see in this resistance to the unprincipled ambition of Constantinople, which in the 28th canon, so called, of Chalcedon, had injured the "dignity" of the other great bishoprics (*Epist.* 129). Another question prolonged the correspondence. The Nicene fathers were believed to have commissioned the Alexandrian

bishops to ascertain and signify the right time for each coming Easter; "because," says Leo, "skill in such computations appeared to be of old time traditional among the Egyptians" (*Epist.* 121). Leo had accordingly consulted Cyril as to the Easter of 444; and he now, in 454, applied to Proterius, through the emperor, for his opinion as to the calculation of the Easter of the next year, 455, which the Alexandrian paschal table appeared to him to place too late (*Epist.* 121, 127). Proterius, after studying the subject, as he expressed it, in the books of the (Mosaic) "law," and in the writings of "ancient teachers," replied to Leo at some length (*Epist.* 133, April 454). The paschal cycle of the "blessed father" Theophilus, representing, as it did, the mind of that Egyptian church which was confessedly "the mother of such laborious investigations," was demonstrably faultless; and Egypt and the East would, in conformity to it, keep the 24th of April in the coming year as Easter Sunday. But he would not seem to dogmatise without rendering a reason, and he proceeded to argue thus: (1) Our Lord kept the Passover on a Thursday evening, under the "14th moon" of the 1st month. He was crucified on the 15th, and rose again on the 17th. (2) It was fitting to follow the lines of the old paschal institution by closing the ante-paschal fast on an evening. (On the importance of this "closing of the fast" in the Easter question, see Euseb. v. 23.) Now (3) if the 14th moon were always to fall on a Thursday, it would be simple enough; but when it fell on a Sunday, what was to be done? (a) The fast could not be closed, the festival could not be begun, on the evening of that Sunday; because to fast on a Sunday until the evening would be worthy of Manicheans rather than of Christians. (b) Nor could the closing of the fast take place on the Saturday evening, because that would be a day too early, being the day of the 13th moon; therefore (c) in such a case, Easter must be put off for a week, as had, in fact, been the case in several preceding years, *e.g.* in 387. And (4) this would be the case for the year ensuing, when the 14th moon would fall on Sunday, April 17; the fast must then be continued until Saturday evening, April 23, and Easter Sunday must be April 24. If it was thought at Rome that this would drive the paschal festival into "another month," let it be considered that, the solar and lunar "courses" not being capable of exact adjustment ("quod velocissimum lunae motum cursus solis minime consequatur"), the paschal lunar month could not always begin on the same day of the year; *e.g.* in the year ensuing it could not begin on March 21, the day of the equinox, because the 14th moon of the first month would fall on April 17; therefore it must begin on April 4; and April 24, kept as Easter Sunday, would be well within the paschal limits. (The Ballerini observe that Proterius, in this assertion as to April 17, was assuming the correctness of his own church's cycle of 19 years, whereas the Latins followed a cycle of 84 years, according to which April 17 would be the 17th day of the moon.) Proterius concluded by expressing his belief, that all Christians everywhere would "observe one faith, one baptism, and one most sacred paschal solemnity," and by explaining that he had not thought it safe to entrust to

Alexandrian hands the task of translating this letter into Latin.

It was doubtless a relief to him to busy himself in these quiet studies—a distraction of thought from anxieties which must have deepened day by day. Leontius plainly exaggerates when he says that not a single Alexandrian would communicate with him (*de Sectis*, v. 1): but undoubtedly great numbers of his flock regarded him as a traitorous hireling, who had climbed up into a fold bereft of its true shepherd. He had troubles within the circle of his clergy; not long after the council, a priest named Timotheus, and a deacon named Peter, nicknamed Mongus, refused to communicate with him, because in his diptychs he ignored Dioscorus and commemorated the council of Chalcedon. He summoned them to return to their duty; they refused; he pronounced against them in synod a sentence of deposition (Liberatus, c. 15; *Brevic. Hist. Eutyech. or Gesta in causa Acacii*, in Mansi, vii. 1062). Four or five bishops and a few monks appear to have actively supported them, and to have been included in their condemnation, and in the imperial sentence of exile which followed it (*Epist. Aegypt. Episc. ad Leonem Aug.* in Mansi, vii. 525). These bishops were probably among the thirteen whom the council of Chalcedon had terrified by its severity (Mansi, vii. 51). The monks in Egypt, as elsewhere, were generally attached to the Monophysite position, which they erroneously identified with the Cyrilline; they knew not of, or they could not appreciate, the explanations whereby Cyril had, as he thought, safeguarded the formula of "one *physis* of God the Word, but that as incarnate," meaning, "We must ever think of God the Word as of One Person, although He has assumed our humanity." They took for granted that the late council had to all intents and purposes been striking at Cyril through Dioscorus; and that what was at stake was Christ's single personality as against the error which had resolved the Incarnation into a signal association between the Word and a pre-eminent saint. Thus, besides those monks who had overtly taken part with Timotheus and Peter, others apparently had suspended communion with the archbishop; and Marcian had found it expedient to address them in gentle and persuasive terms, assuring them that the doctrine of "one Christ," symbolised by the term Theotocos, had been held sacrosanct at Chalcedon, and exhorting them therefore to unite themselves to the Catholic church of the orthodox, which was one (Mansi, vii. 481). But the schism, once begun, was not thus to be abated; the zealous seceders raised a cry, which has practically never died out, that the Egyptian adherents of the council of Chalcedon were a mere state-made church, upheld by the court against the convictions of the faithful. Even to this day the poor remnant of orthodoxy in Egypt is weighted with a name which in that connection is a stigma, Melchites, or "adherents of the king." (Comp. Renaudot, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 119; Neale, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* ii. 7. They both add that the orthodox accepted the term.) Even after the death of Dioscorus in exile, Proterius had to see himself ignored and disclaimed, to know that he was the object of a hatred that was biding its time, and "during the greater part

of his pontificate," as Liberatus tells us, to depend for personal safety on the presence of a military guard. Thus imperilled and thus protected, "the emperor's bishop" had to live, and to do what work he could—often surely with much sickness of heart, and with grave apprehensions as to the future. At last, in the January of 457, Marcian died, and the Monophysites thought they saw their opportunity. Some of the malcontent Egyptian bishops renewed their outcry against the council (Eulogius, in Photius, *Bibl.* 130, p. 283, ed. Bekk.); and Timotheus, having ventured back to Alexandria, began those intrigues which won for him the title of "the Cat" (TIMOTHEUS AELURUS). Theophanes quaintly couples his arrival with that of a camelopard, some "ox-deer," and other wild beasts (*Chronograph.* i. p. 170). When his plans were matured, he called to his aid a force which had for ages been proverbially terrible—the *familiaris furor* (*Hist. August.* ii. 311) of the Alexandrian mob, which had burst forth against the Jews in the days of Philo, and "polluted every street with blood" in the reign of Gallienus (Gibbon, i. 414); and by its very unaccountableness had led a pagan historian of the fourth century to refer to some oracular predictions (Ammianus, xxii. 114), even as in after days it was commonly said that the mere fracture of a vessel might be an occasion for stirring the city to wild tumult (Evagr. ii. 8). It so happened that the "dux" Dionysius was absent in Upper Egypt; and Timotheus found it all the easier to gather a disorderly following, and to procure for himself an irregular consecration. When Dionysius returned, he expelled Timotheus; and the latter's partisans in revenge rushed to the house of Proterius, and after besetting him for some time in the adjacent church of Quirinus, pursued him when he fled into its baptistery, ran him through with a sword, and completed the bloody work with many wounds. Six of his clerics perished with him. The murderers fastened the corpse to a cord, and dragged it in ghastly procession across the central place called Tetracylon, and then through nearly the whole of the vast city, with hideous cries, "Look at Proterius!" it was beaten as if it could still suffer, torn limb from limb, and finally burnt, and its ashes "scattered to the winds"—a scene of horror which recalls the murder of George the Arian bishop in 361, but is aggravated by the fact that the performers were professing Christians, that the place of the murder was a baptistery, which, say the fourteen Egyptian bishops in their narrative to the emperor Leo, partly quoted by Evagrius, is "awe-striking even to barbarians and savages," and, to add one more circumstance which distinguishes it from the murder of Hypatia by "Christian fanatics," that the time was, according to the Egyptian bishops, the festival (*παθηγγυσις*) of the Passion of salvation, which naturally means Easter day, or, as Theophanes says, "the first day of the Paschal festival," although Liberatus and the Breviculus say it was "three days before Easter, the day on which Coena Domini celebratur," i.e. Maundy Thursday. Easter Sunday in the year 457 was March 31. (For authorities see *Ep. Aeg. Episc.* in Mansi, vii. 525; Leo, *Epist.* 156. 5; *Breviculus Hist. Eutyech.* in Mansi, vii. 1062; Liberatus, *Brev.* c. 15; Evagrius, ii. 8. See also Le Quien, ii. 412; Neale,

Hist. Alex. ii. 12.) The biographer of Peter Mongus, as Evagrius tells us, naturally tried to make out that Proterius provoked his death by exciting a disturbance, and that it was inflicted by soldiers, not by the people. Theophanes, in a passage which seems defective, intimates that the new emperor, Leo I., caused two men to have their tongues cut out and to be sent into exile as having taken part in the murder; but the Latin version, ignoring his ἀμφοτέρους, has merely "eos qui...caedi communicaverant." St. Proterius is venerated as a martyr in the Greek and Latin churches, on February 28. [W. B.]

PROTOCTETUS, presb. [ORIGENES, p. 101 a.]

PROTOGENES (1), bishop of Sardica in Dacia, comes first before us in the question of slavery, as Constantine, in A.D. 316, addressed to him the rescript (*Cod. Just.* I. xiii. 1; Kriegel, *Corr. Jud. Civ.* vii. 89) which allowed manumission to take place in church before the priest and congregation, the master also giving a written deed as permanent evidence (Fleury, *H. E.* x. 20). He subscribed the Acts of the council of Nice as "Protogenes Sardicensis," and was one of the chief disputants (Gelasius *Cyz. De Act. Nic. Conc.* ii. c. 13). "Protogenes admirabilis" was charged at the close of the council with the duty of promulgating the decrees through the churches of Dacia, Calabria, Dardania, and their borders (*Act. Conc. Nic.* iv.; Gelas. *Cyz.* ii. c. 35). He and Hosius of Cordova were the most prominent bishops at the council of Sardica (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 20; Athanas. *Cont. Ar.* ii.), and had to bear the calumnies and excommunications of the council of Eastern bishops at Philippopolis (Sozomen, *H. E.* iii. 11). Among those who signed the decrees at Sardica we find, "Protogenes a Dacia, de Sardica," but though it was in his own city, he was not president of the council, that honour being given to Hosius. Gams (*Ser. Episc.* 416) dates his episcopate from A.D. 316 to 343-4. (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 301; Tillemont, *H. E.* vi. 143, 275, 291, 293, and notes; Hefele, *Conc. Gesch.* i. 624 sq.) [J. G.]

PROTOGENES (2), a presbyter of Charrae, one of the most distinguished among the confessors of Edessa (ἁγίαστος, Theod.), in the persecution under Valens, A.D. 371. He and his friend Eulogius were banished to Antinous in the Thebaid, where Protogenes applied himself to the education of the youth of the city who were chiefly pagans, giving them instruction in writing and in the Holy Scriptures. His prayers having been answered in the cure of some of his pupils who were dangerously sick, he induced them to embrace the Christian faith. On the restoration of peace to the church, Protogenes and his friend received orders to return home, to the great regret of the inhabitants of Antinous. Protogenes was appointed to the charge of the church at Charrae, where the people were wedded to Gentile superstitions (Theod. *H. E.* iv. 18). [EULOGIUS (4).] [E. V.]

PROTOGENES (3), prefect of the East and consul 449, one of the leading men to whom Theodoret wrote in 449, defending himself from the calumnies of his enemies, and exhorting him

to defend the truth, and do what he could to restore peace to the church (Theod. *Ep.* 94). He was officially present at the council of Chalcedon in 451. (Labbe, iv. 77.) [E. V.]

PRONONICE. [THADDEUS.]

PRUDENTIUS, MARCUS (?) AURELIUS CLEMENS, the chief Christian poet of early times, was born A.D. 348 (Praef. 24, cf. *Apotheosis*, 449), in the north of Spain, near the Pyrenees (*Peristeph.* vi. 146). The exact place is uncertain; he applies the epithet "noster" to Tarragona (*Perist.* vi. 144), Calahorra (i. 116; iv. 31), and Saragossa (iv. 195), but this may refer to his dwelling-place or to the whole country. His name, as well as his education and career, imply that he was of a good family; he was educated in rhetoric and law, and his poems shew an exact knowledge of the Latin classical poets, especially Virgil, Ovid, Horace, and Juvenal; he does not seem to have known Greek, or at best only enough to apply some doubtful Greek titles to his works, and shews no knowledge of Hebrew. He speaks of his early life as stained with much sinfulness, but he must have been held in high respect, for after practising as an advocate, he twice held an important civil office, perhaps that of rector of the Provincia Tarraconensis, or only that of *defensor civitatis*, and was at last raised to some high position, either civil or military, at the emperor's court (cf. Kayser, p. 254 n.; Brockhaus, p. 16 n.; Faguet, p. 17.). Late in life, he received some deep religious impression, making him feel how little he had yet done that would be of use for a future life. In consequence of this, he gave up public life and devoted himself to Christian poetry. Some expressions of his seem to imply that he joined some religious society (*Cath.* ii. 45; iii. 56; cf. *Psych.* 551-573). He has no longer any money to relieve the poor (*Epilogus* 10); the only offering he can make to God is his poetry (ib.). To this aim to prayer he devoted his life; making it his aim to spread among the educated classes a correct knowledge of Christianity, or, like a "Christian Pindar," to sing the triumphs of the martyrs on their festal days and so to win them greater honour. At some time in his life he paid a visit to Rome. It was a time of great anxiety to himself; on his way he passed Imola, and there poured out his soul in prayer before the picture of St. Cassian in the church (*Perist.* x. 103, 104). At Rome his anxiety remains and is increased by illness; and again he prays and implores the intercession of St. Hippolytus (xi. 127). His prayer, whatever it was, was answered. While at Rome, he was deeply impressed with the memorials of the martyrs in the catacombs and the churches (*Perist.* xi.) and composed his poem on the death of St. Peter and St. Paul (*Perist.* xii.). While there, he probably became acquainted with the poems of pope Damasus, which influenced some of his own. On returning to Spain, he wrote his poem on St. Cassian (ix.) and that on St. Hippolytus, requesting his bishop to introduce the observance of that saint's festival into Spain (xi.). In A.D. 403 or 404 he wrote the second book *contra*

* Cf. Dressel, p. ii. n. Migne, lix. p. 593.

Symmachum, and in A.D. 405 published an edition of his poems, with a preface that shews that all his extant works, except the *Dittochaon*, and perhaps the *Psychomachia*, were then written. Of his later life or of his death nothing is known.

His character, as it appears from his writings, is very lovable. He is a loyal Roman, proud of the empire, for he sees in its past conquests and its capacity for government a preparation for the kingdom of Christ, and he looks forward to greater conquests under the banner of the Cross (*Perist.* ii. 1-35, 413-484, x. *passim*; c. *Symm.* i. 415-505; ii. 577-771). He has a great fondness for art, wishing to keep even Pagan statues if regarded only as ornaments (c. *Symm.* i. 505).

As a Christian he has an intellectual horror of heresy and heretics, though with a personal tenderness for the latter (c. *Symm.* ii. *Pref.*). He is loyal to all church customs and ordinances, and withal has a strong appreciation of spiritual truth. This is seen in his lofty conception of the Nature of God (*Cath.* iv. 7-15; *Apoth.* 84-90; *Ham.* 27 sq.; c. *Symm.* i. 325; *Peristeph.* x. 310), of the True Temple (*Cath.* iv. 16-21; c. *Symm.* ii. 249; *Apoth.* 516), the True Worship (*Perist.* x. 341), the True Fast (*Cath.* vi. 201-220), the True Nobility of birth (*Perist.* x. 123), the True Reward (c. *Symm.* ii. 750), the True Riches (*Perist.* ii. 203). He shews a pious tenderness of spirit (cf. *Apoth.* 393), kissing the sacred books (*ib.* 598), and the altar (*Perist.* ix. 100), and a deep personal humility which does not venture to contend with *Symmachus* (i. 609); which offers his verses to Christ, though they are but the "earthen vessel" (*Epilogus* 29) of a "rustic poet" (*Perist.* ii. 574; x. 1); which has no merit in itself, is not worthy of high thoughts at night (*Cath.* vi. 117), but pleads for the intercession of the saints that he may be transferred from Christ's left hand to His right on the judgment day (*Perist.* ii. 574; vi. 162; x. 1136), content if he be saved from the fires of hell and gently purified for the lowest place among the saved (*Ham.* 931). (Authorities—his own works, especially the Preface, and *Gennadius, de vir. ill.* cap. 13.)

Works.—Trithemius speaks of Prudentius as having written secular poems in early life. There is however no trace of them, unless the style of the later works be held to imply previous practice. He also mentions prose works and letters written later. Of these, too, there is no trace. The only non-extant work for which there seems to be any authority, is an "Hexaameron," a poem on the Creation, attributed to him by *Gennadius*. The extant works are described in detail below. They fall into three classes—(a) lyrical, (b) apologetic or didactic, (c) allegorical. Their most remarkable characteristic is certainly their variety. The lyrical poems are influenced in form and expression by *Horace*, and also by *Ambrose*, and in a less degree by *Damasus*. The choice of metres and treatment, however, shew much originality. He uses 20 metres, 11 of which are slightly different from any in previous writers. What had been with *Ambrose* a short hymn, becomes a long ode with moral exhortation, rhetorical speeches, and frequent Biblical illustration; rising at times to much lyrical sweetness, and combined with a clever variety of metre. The didactic aim is however too prominent for lyri-

cal perfection, and only a few extracts have been used in church services. The apologetic poems are also perhaps primarily didactic. With the exception of the *Libri c. Symm.* they do not seem called forth by any special occasion, but serve a general purpose of presenting Christian doctrine in an attractive form; naturally at the time, such an attempt would take the shape of an answer to heretics. For form they are much indebted to *Virgil* and, in a less degree, to *Lucretius* and *Juvenecus*: for substance, to the earlier Christian apologists, especially *Tertullian* and *Ambrose*. The allegorical poem is vigorous, and mainly interesting as the first specimen of a treatment which was frequently imitated in later Christian literature, both poetry and prose. All the poems have a considerable literary value; they are written on the whole in good classical Latin, with many new words needed for church purposes, and with a touch of archaic forms and words which is characteristic of this period. The prosody is fairly correct. Final *o* is shortened in all terminations; short final syllables are freely lengthened in caesura or before double consonants: *a* in acc. plural is frequently lengthened (*utrūque, Cath.* x. 5; *cādem, Perist.* i. 3), and there are a few rare forms, and un-classical quantities, but such eccentricities are very rare in Latin words, though Greek and Hebrew are treated with great freedom (v. lists in *Migne, Prolegg.* xxiii. *Obbar*, pp. xvii. xviii.; and esp. *Faguet*, pp. 92-142, for a full examination of the language and metres).

The poems are written with great fluency, relieved by dramatic vividness (e.g. *Perist.* v.; c. *Symm.* ii. 654 sqq.), by rhetorical vigour of description (e.g. *Apoth.* 450-503; c. *Symm.* i. 415), by considerable power of satire (*Apoth.* 186-206; *Ham.* 246) and humour (*Perist.* ii. 169, 407; ix. 69, 82), and much epigrammatic terseness of expression; but at the same time there is much tasteless dwelling on unpleasant details, as in the accounts of martyrdoms (e.g. *Perist.* x. 901), or of the coarsenesses of heathen mythology (*Cath.* vii. 115 sqq.). They are full of typical adaptations of the Bible history (e.g. Prefaces to *Ham.*, *Psych.*, and i. ii. *Symm.*). In this way, and in the substance of their arguments, they have a theological value, as shewing the tone of thought common at the time. The very fact, that they shew little originality of thought, makes them even more valuable for this purpose. (For the substance of the theology v. *Brockhaus*, cap. vii.) But perhaps their historical value is the greatest. They give us considerable information about heathen antiquities, e.g. the kinds of torture in use (*Perist.* i. 42), methods of writing (*Perist.* ix. 23), the corn supplies of Rome (c. *Symm.* ii. 920), the gladiatorial shows (c. *Symm.* i. 384; ii. 1090), the religious rites (i. ii. c. *Symm.* *passim*, and *Perist.* x.). But more particularly is this true of Christian antiquities: we see the luxury and avarice of the times (*Ham.* 246; *Apoth.* 183, 210, 450), the position of deacons and archdeacons at Rome (*Perist.* ii. 37; v. 29), the times and details of fasting (*Cath.* iii. 57; vii. viii. 9), the use of anointing (*Cath.* vi. 125; ix. 98; *Apoth.* 357, 493; *Psych.* 360), of the sign of the cross (*Cath.* vi. 129; ix. 84; *Apoth.* 493; c. *Symm.* ii. 712), of lights in churches, especially on Easter Eve (*Cath.* v.), of funeral rites (*Cath.* x. 49), of the

eneration for the saints (*Perist. passim*, esp. i. 10-21; ii. 530 sqq.; x. ad fin.; xi. ad in. xii.) One point deserves to be specially noted; the illustrations of the art of the time. We have mention, and in some cases a full description, of the Lateran Church (*c. Symm.* i. 586), the church of St. Laurence (*Perist.* xi. 216), and of buildings over the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul (*Perist.* xii.) and of the catacombs (*Perist.* xi. 153) at Rome; also of a church at Merida (*Perist.* iii. 191), and a baptistery apparently at Calahorra (*Perist.* viii.). We have also descriptions of a picture of the martyrdom of St. Cassian in the church at Imola (*Perist.* ix.), of St. Hippolytus in the catacombs (xi. 123), and of St. Peter (xii. 38). The *Dittochacon* consists of titles for pictures, and it is noticeable that nearly all the symbols which Prudentius uses to express Christian Truth (the Dove, the Palm, the Good Shepherd &c.), as well as the Bible scenes with which he illustrates his poems, are found on gems, or on the walls of the catacombs, so that Prudentius may have derived his use of them from thence (Brockhaus, cap. ix.).

From the first the poems of Prudentius were held in great honour; they are quoted with high praise by Sidonius Apollinaris, Avitus, Leo, Isidore, Rabanus Maurus, Alcuin, &c. They were edited in the 6th century by Vettius Agorius Basilius, the consul and editor of Horace. They were used as a school book by Archbishop Bruno in the 10th century, and by Vives in the 15th. On no book, except the Bible, are there so many German glosses found. No less than 33 MSS. are in existence: and as early as the 9th century a commentary on them was written by Iso, a monk of St. Gall. In the middle ages the *Psychomachia* and the *Cathemerinon* were special favourites, and the rest were rarely copied. On the invention of printing, the whole or parts of his works were frequently printed; more than sixty editions have appeared since 1470, though apparently none in England. In addition to those in the different collections of the Fathers and the Christian poets, the most available editions are those of Heinsius, 16mo. Amsterdam, 1667; F. Areval, Rome, 1788 (reprinted with very full prolegomena in Migne's *Patrologia*, lix. and lx.); Chamillard, Paris, 1687, in the "Delphin" Classics (with useful index); Obbar, 8vo. Tübingen, 1845, and Dressel, Leipzig, 1860, both of these with short but useful prolegomena, critical apparatus, and slight exegetical notes. The other editions, as well as the MSS. and chief translations, are enumerated by Obbar, by Dressel, and by Fagnet, who adds the chief various readings in the Codex Puteanus. To these should be added an English verse translation of the *Cathemerinon* (Rivingtons, London 1845); a German translation of *Cathemerinon* xi. by Schmidt in *Zeitschrift für Lüth. Theologie*, 1866, and of the Apotheosis in Brockhaus, *A. Prudentius in seiner Bedeutung für die Kirche seiner Zeit*, Leipzig, 1872. This last monograph forms a most valuable introduction to the poems. A very good account of them will also be found in Ebert, *Christlich-Lat. Lit.* pp. 243-283, and Fagnet, *De A. Prudentii Clementis Carm. lyricis*, Burdigalae, 1883. We give a fuller account of each poem.

A. *Lyrical.* (a) *Cathemerinon* (i.e. *καθημερινών ὕμνων*) described in the Pref. 37, 38; a collection of hymns, the first half for the different hours of the day; the latter half for different

church seasons. A question has been raised whether the fifth refers to the *daily* lighting of lamps in the churches, or to the ceremonies on Easter Eve, but its position and language both favour the former view. There is no evidence of the time or place at which they were written, except that it was before A.D. 405, and apparently while Prudentius was leading a religious life. The metre is very varied, though always in strophes, and often admirably adapted to its subject; e.g. in vi. where the metre has a "lulling" character in the hymn at bed-time; and ix. where the trochaic tetrameter effectively expresses the instantaneous effect of the words of Christ. Both metre and treatment shew the influence of Ambrose (cf. i. ii. xi. xii.); the language that of Virgil, Ovid, Horace, and Juvencus. They are poems rather than hymns. The main tone is hortatory, the readers are called on to praise God, fast, lead pure lives, &c. This is enforced by long narratives from the Bible (cf. i. 49; ii. 73; iii. 101; iv. 37; vi. 57; vii. 26; x. 69), often treated typically. At times the subjects are drawn out to wearisome length (cf. vii. 115-120, 164 sqq.), but on the whole they are vigorous and clear, and at times sweet and simple (e.g. vi.), so that for their sweet simplicity they have been compared with the paintings of Fra Angelico, at times very spirited (ix. and xii.), with true lyrical inspiration. Good specimens will be found in ii. 97-112; v. 113-124; vi. 125-152; x. 117-137; xii. 125-140. Though necessarily too long for public worship, extracts were made at least as early as the 9th century, and are found frequently in the Mozarabic Liturgy (cf. v. vi. vii. ix. x.), and a few in the Roman and Salisbury breviaries; on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday at Lauds (i. ii.), Compline at Christmas (ix.), Compline on Good Friday (vi.), Easter Eve (v.), Epiphany, the Holy Innocents, and the Transfiguration (xii.). (Daniel, i. 119, and Kayser, *Geschichte der Kirchenhymnen*, 275-336.)

(b) *Peristephanon* (i.e. *περὶ στεφάνων*, De Coronis Martyrum), described in Preface 42; a collection of 14 lyrical poems, all (except viii. which is an inscription for a baptistery), written in honour of martyrs. The choice of the martyrs is inspired by the circumstances of the poet's life; the details perhaps taken from existing Acta Martyrum. Half of them are connected with his own native church of Spain (i. ii. (?) iii.-vi. xiii.), the rest are saints whom he found specially honoured at Rome (ii. vii. x. (?) xi. xii.) or on his journey to Rome (ix.). The reason for the choice of Romanus (x.) is doubtful. Perhaps his name had procured him honour at Rome. More probably it is due to the opportunity afforded by his life for an attack on heathenism. xii. was written at Rome, ix. and xi. in Spain after his return. The dates of the rest cannot be fixed. Though much too long for church service, extracts from many of them are found in the Mozarabic Liturgy (i. ii. iii. vi. x. xiv.). They generally begin with a reference to the blessings gained by the martyr's death, then describe the martyrdom, and end with a request for the martyr's intercession. Like the *Cathemerinon*, they are frequently illustrated by Old Testament stories (ii. 362; iii. 51; vi. 86, 109; vii. 61; x. 736). They have much lyrical power, the metre being varied with the subject, e.g. in i. the tetrameter used for a

soldier's death; in vi. the three-lined metre to describe the three martyrs. The narrative is often marked by dramatic vividness (ii. v.), quiet humour (ii. 169; ix. 69), and satire which in tone as well as language recalls Juvenal (x. 203, 221, 258, 515, 710), and by a deep appreciation of spiritual truth. At the same time, the details of the tortures are dwelt upon in a way offensive to modern taste; and the digressions are at times quite out of proportion to the rest of the poem, so that some of them become apologetic treatises rather than hymns (x.).

B. *Apologetic* (referred to in Preface 39). (1) *Apotheosis* = ἀποθέσις, which is translated by Gennadius "De Divinitate," and in some MSS. "De Trinitate," as though it meant "The Divine Nature," but perhaps it is more exactly "The Deification of Human Nature in Christ" (cf. Pref. 8, 9 and 176, 177; c. *Symm.* ii. 268).

The Preface consists of a statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, followed by an iambic poem on the need of some rule of faith at a time of such controversy. A special occasion may perhaps be found for its composition in the condemnation of the Priscillianists by the council of Saragossa A.D. 380; the writer does not however mention them by name, but deals with all the chief errors on the subject of our Lord's Nature.

First he shews that there is a real difference between the Father and the Son: (a) as against the Patripassians: Christ was not the Father, for "no man hath seen God." Even in the Old Testament, it was through the Word that God appeared to the patriarchs; so now the Father has not descended, but the Son has taken up human nature to the Father's throne (1-177).

(b) As against the Sabellians: Christ is not a mere form of the Father's working. This denies God's Fatherhood, and so falls back upon the heathen conception of God as merely the ruler of the universe (178-216). He is really Father, and the Son really Son by an eternal generation, which is beyond all thought, but yet is proved by Scripture (217-320).

But secondly, the difference was not such as to imply that Christ was not God: (a) as against the Jews: The Jews deny his Divinity, but they are blind to the teaching of their prophets, and the facts of history. Christ is praised throughout the world; heathen demons and oracles and victims, as in the story of Julian, quail before the Cross. The true Christian temple is eternal, while the Jewish is in ruins (320-551).

(b) As against semi-Jewish Christians, such as the Ebionites: These say Christ is only man; but his work is immortal, and therefore his origin probably was. This is proved by the Gospels and Isaiah, by the adoration of the Magi, and by his miracles. He was the True God, redeeming the whole of human nature (552-781).

(c) A digression, perhaps against some exaggeration of Origen's teaching: It is said, the soul being inspired of God cannot perish and need redemption. But though inspired by God, it is not God; it had a beginning, is limited in power, and so liable to sin and its penalties. It did sin when united to the body, and transmitted its sin to posterity. Therefore Christ took human nature apart from sin and so conquered death (782-952).

Lastly, Christ, though really God, is also really man: as against the *Docetae*. He himself

prophesied of his real sufferings; the genealogies shew a real human descent, and any unreality would be unworthy of God. He was True Man and True God, and as he has risen so we shall rise (953-1085).

The poem is even and correct. In arrangement and treatment it is very likely influenced by some earlier treatise, and shews traces of a knowledge of Tertullian adv. Praxeam (177, 305, 325). In language it has reminiscences of Ovid (212) and Virgil (312, 662, 1028); the dry argumentative character is relieved by the vigorous account of Julian (450 sqq.), and by the frequent typical use of Scripture (59, 325, 358, 995, 1005). It is edited in Hurter's *Patrum Selecta Opuscula*, Innsbruck, 1876.

(2) *Hamartigenia* = ἁμαρτιγενία. A treatise on the origin of sin; discussed in a polemical argument against Marcion. In a short iambic preface the conduct of Cain, wrongly "dividing" his offering and murdering his brother, is explained as typical of Marcion's treatment of God's nature.

The poem itself falls into two parts.

(a) 1-639. God is not the creator of Evil. The existence of good and evil does not justify Marcion's theory of two Gods, for (i.) unity is essential to our conception of God. This is not violated by the Christian doctrine. There is a real unity in the Trinity, as real as the union of motion, heat, and light in the sun (1-94). (ii.) Such dualism leads to polytheism (95-105). (iii.) It is impossible to assign a separate sphere to either God. Marcion's theory of an evil God (110-125) is then contrasted with the Catholic truth of Satan, a created being, fallen through pride, leading man to sin, and so bringing barrenness and savagery upon earth (126-246). Through luxury and avarice man has misused his senses (246-333). All were created good (334-355), but man has misused them under the influence of Satan and of the "principalities and powers," which were typified by the Canaanitish kings in the wars against Israel. Man is as completely captive as Israel was in Babylon (356-523), but it is owing to his own free will. Like the viper, he has begotten a brood that devours himself (524-639).

(b) 640-931. God permits evil but does not sanction it. The whole object of the Incarnation was to save man from evil (640-669). The cause of evil is man's free will, but this was needed to secure moral goodness and his power of ruling creation. This implies choice: some choose good, and some evil, like Lot and his wife, Ruth and Orpah, two boys choosing different paths, or a flock of birds, half snared, half avoiding the snare (670-823). Those who choose evil pass into hell, the good into paradise; though each can see the other, as the limitations of earth are removed (824-931). The poem ends with a prayer of sweet humility that after death his spirit may be gently purified (931-966).

The poem bears no trace of its date. The thought is mainly based on Tertullian adv. Marcionem. The language shews reminiscences of Virgil, Persius (384), and Juvenal (763). Like the other poems, it is full of Old Testament illustrations, mystically applied (Pref. 409, 564, 723). The full description of hell and paradise, and also the graphic portraiture of Satan, are especially noteworthy as the earliest in Christian litera-

ture, and so probably of great influence upon later Christian art and literature. Both Dante and Milton may indirectly be indebted to them.

(3) *Libri c. Symmachum* (described in Preface 40, 41). The date and occasion of these books can be clearly determined. In 384 Symmachus had presented a petition to Valentinian II. for the restitution of the altar of Victory in the senate house, which had been removed by Gratian, and also of the incomes of the vestal virgins. Owing to the influence of St. Ambrose (*Ep.* 17, 18) this had been refused. In 392 the altar was restored by Eugenius; in 394 again removed by Theodosius. After his death the heathen party, encouraged by the invasion of the Goths, which they attributed to the neglect of heathenism, made a fresh attempt to have it restored by Arcadius and Honorius. It was at this time that Prudentius wrote these books, to counteract their influence. The date of Lib. ii. is fixed, as after the battle of Pollentia A.D. 403, and before the abolition of the gladiatorial games, A.D. 404 (ii. 710, 1114). Prob., Lib. i. is to be placed at the same time, though Faguet has argued for the earlier date, A.D. 395.

Book i. deals generally with the history and character of heathenism (cf. ii. 1-3) After a preface which applies the story of Acts xxviii. 3-6 to the new danger which was attacking the church, Prudentius explains his reason for writing (1-41), then ridicules the immorality of the gods of Olympus (42-144), of the Roman emperors with their ancestors and favourites (145-296). Such had been Rome's gods! nay, worse than this, the powers of nature, even the sun, though it is only one part of nature and has not even man's freedom (297-353), and the powers of the world below (354-407) had been worshipped, until Theodosius called on the senate to put away a religion so unworthy of an imperial state, and to adopt the Cross which had led Constantine to triumph (408-505). So he won in peace a glorious triumph over the gods (505-544). Senate and people flock to Christian altars, though a minority still dissents, and pagans like Symmachus still hold office (545-609). Would that his eloquence would tell of a nobler theme. I may not match myself with him, but I must do my best to prevent him from doing harm (609-658).

Book ii. also has a preface, with a prayer to Christ to help the poet as he once helped St. Peter on the water. The poet then deals in detail with the arguments of Symmachus.

(a) "The worship of Victory is needful for success." No; success is due to the soldier's bravery and the blessing of God Almighty, not to gods who are only the creation of that "trinity of deceit," painting, poetry, and superstition (1-76).

(b) "Custom is in favour of it; each nation ought to be allowed to worship the unknown God in its usual way."

True, man cannot know God Himself; yet faith can trust Him, and argue up to His nature from His gifts. For this there is only one way—to rise above earth and abstain from sin. The true temple is man's own heart created and redeemed by God (91-269). Mere plea of custom cannot hold against truth. It would have prevented all improvements in social life as well as in religion (270-374).

(c) "Fate has assigned this Genius to Rome." But the Genius has sanctioned many changes, why not this? Mere fatalism is foolish (402-486).

(d) "Our past victories are due to the gods." Many of them were the gods of conquered nations, conquered by Roman courage. Will they be more constant to us? Why have they permitted our defeats? In the growth of the empire God was preparing the way for Christ. Rome still gains new victories such as that of Stilicho and Honorius (487-771).

(e) "All men have a right to worship God in their own way, as they have to enjoy the sky, sun," &c. No, the laws of nature cannot consider a man's character; they treat him as they do the animals. But his character is not therefore on a level with theirs. In religion there are only two paths, one to truth, the other to error, whether of polytheism or atheism (771-908).

(f) "The stopping of the income of the Vestal Virgins is causing a famine." There is no special famine; only the ordinary changes of harvest, which do not affect Christians more than the heathen. How different is their culture of the soul! how different too their virgins from the Vestals marrying late in life, and gloating over the gladiatorial games! Appeal to the emperor to put down the games (909-1130).

The poem is very interesting, and of great historical value, both for the circumstances of the time and for the details of Roman mythology and religious rites. The prefaces consist of the typical use of Scripture, but there is no scope for it in the body of the books. They are full, however, of a sense of Rome's majesty, of vigorous description, and of high moral scorn. The language recalls Virgil (*passim*), Ovid, Juvenal, Horace, and Claudian (ii. 704). Plato is quoted in i. 30. The subject-matter is influenced in parts by Tertullian (i. 396) and Minucius Felix (i. 48), but mainly by St. Ambrose, whose arguments are at times reproduced almost verbally.

C. *Allegorical*.—*Psychomachia* = *Ψυχμαχία*, "De Compugnancia Animi" (Gennadius). The Spiritual Combat. The date is uncertain. Possibly Pref. 35 may refer to it (cf. *Psycho.* 875, 915), but this is doubtful. It seems to be later than the *Hamartigenia* as it expands a simile used there. Possibly it is later than St. Augustine's *De Civ. Dei*, for Ebert (p. 276 n.) points out a parallel between 769 f. and *De Civ. Dei* xix. 10. If so, it must have been written much later than the preceding works.

The Preface consists of a mystical application of the story of Gen. xiv. As Abraham with his 318 servants freed Lot, was blessed by Melchizedek, then begat Isaac; so the Christian, with the aid of Christ's Cross (*τῆμ*, 318, = the Cross (*τ*) of *Ἰησοῦς*), frees his soul, wins Christ's blessing, and brings forth good works. The poem itself opens with a prayer to Christ to shew how the soul is aided in its conflict (1-20). Then the conflict is described. Faith, with a legion of 1000 martyrs, defeats Idolatry (21-39). Modesty triumphs over Lust, recalling the victory of Judith and the chastity of Mary. She bathes her sword in the font and lays it on the altar (40-108). Patience, at whose side stands Job, endures all the attacks of Anger, until the latter kills herself (109-177). Pride taunts Humility, but

falls into a trap prepared by Deceit and is slain (178-309). Luxury almost wins over the Christian host, when Self-Restraint raises the standard of the Cross, and puts her to flight (310-449). Avarice seizes on the booty, and wins over many Christians, even some priests, till Reason puts them on their guard. She then disguises herself as Respectable Frugality, and so wins them to care for money. At last Active Charity slays her, and peace is restored (450-664). In the midst of the rejoicing, Discord, surnamed Heresy, who has joined the ranks in disguise, wounds Concord; but is soon slain by Faith (665-725). Concord and Faith then address the hosts, Concord dwelling on the beauties of Peace and danger of Heresy; Faith exhorting them to build a worthy temple. This is done on the plan of Rev. xxi., and Wisdom takes her seat in it (726-888). The poem ends with a thanksgiving to Christ for His aid (889-915).

The work is thus primarily a Spiritual Combat, describing the conflict between good and evil in the soul. The poet seems, however, also to have in his mind the fortunes of the church; the great Christian virtues first triumphing over heathen vices, and then having to contend against evils in the church. On this side it is akin to the *Libri c. Symmachum*; in the lines on the Incarnation (70 sqq.) and Heresy (710) to the *Apotheosis*. It has much dramatic vigour; the description of peace is of special beauty (755); and it is full of the typical use of Holy Scripture. As is natural in a military poem, the language is often based on Virgil; at times it recalls Ovid (384) and Claudian (560, 685), but its chief interest is its allegorical form. The idea seems original. The personification of virtues and vices had been common in Christian writers, especially in Tertullian; it was also common in late heathen poets, e.g. in Apuleius and Claudian (v. Ebert, pp. 276-8). The metaphor of the conflict is found in Ham. 393, but here for the first time it is worked out in detail. The poem soon became popular: it is found illustrated in some MSS.; and so it gave an impulse both to art and allegory, and proved the forerunner of Bunyan's works.

D. The *Dittochacon*, *διττόχαιον*, (?) *δίττος*, *ὄχη*, the double food, or double Testament. (This title has more authority than *Dirochaeus*, or *Ditrochaeus*, or *Cheirochaeus*, or *Diptychon*.) This work stands by itself, and can scarcely be called a poem. It consists of 49 sets of 4 verses on scenes from the Old and New Testament. They are dry and jejune, and their main interest arises from the fact, that they seem to be composed to describe a series of paintings (cf. hoc . . . ista in 4, hoc illud in 5, &c.). These paintings depicted chiefly historical events, sometimes with several scenes in the same painting (cf. 8 and 17); also buildings and ornaments (16, 20, 24). There is however no trace to shew where the pictures were, or when the poem was composed. Many editors deny that it is by Prudentius; but it has the authority of Gennadius and internal evidence favours it. The prosody agrees with the rest of Prudentius in the shortening of the final *o* (17, 35, 42), the lengthening of short syllables (16, 25, 42), in the Greek false quantities (12, 18).

There is the same typical application of Scripture (2, 14-16, 18, 20, 21, 40, 41), and many of the scenes are described elsewhere in his poems (2, 4, 8, 11, 15, 19, 21). [W. L.]

PRUNIKOS (*Προύνικος*, *Προύνεικος*). In the Gnostic system described by Irenaeus (I. xxx. see OPHITES, p. 87), SOPHIA, who is an important personage in the mythology of that system, is said to have the alternative names 'Αριστέρα, Προύνικος and 'Αρρενόβηλος; and the name Prunikos several times takes the place of Sophia in the relation of her story. The name Prunikos is also given to Sophia in the account of the kindred Barbeliot system, given in the preceding chapter of Irenaeus. Celsus, who shews that he had met with some Ophite work, exhibits acquaintance with the name Prunikos (Orig. *Adv. Cels.* vi. 34), a name which Origen recognizes as Valentinian. That this Ophite name had really been adopted by the Valentinians is evidenced by its occurrence in a Valentinian fragment preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 5). Epiphanius also introduces Prunikos as a technical word in the system of the Simonians (*Haer.* xxi. 2), of those whom he describes under the head of Nicolaitans (xxv. 3, 4) and of the Ophites (xxxvii. 4, 6).

Neither Irenaeus nor Origen indicates that he knew anything as to the meaning of this word; and we have no better information on this subject than a conjecture of Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxv. 48). He says that the word means "wanton" or "lascivious," for that the Greeks had a phrase concerning a man who had debauched a girl, 'Επρουνίκευσε ταύτην. One feels some hesitation in accepting this explanation. Epiphanius was deeply persuaded of the filthiness of Gnostic morals, and habitually put the worst interpretation on their language. If the phrase reported by Epiphanius had been common, it is strange that instances of its use should not have been quoted from the Greek comic writers. It need not be denied that Epiphanius had heard the phrase employed, but innocent words come to be used in an obscene sense, as well by those who think *double entente* witty, as by those who modestly avoid the use of plainer language. The primary meaning of the word *προύνεικος* seems to be a porter, or bearer of burdens, the derivation being from *ἐνεγκεῖν*, the only derivation indeed that the word seems to admit of. Then, modifying its meaning like the word *ἀγοραῖος*, it came to be used in the sense of a turbulent violent person. The only distinct confirmation of the explanation of Epiphanius is that Hesychius (*s. v.* *Σκίταλοι*) has the words *ἀφροδισίων καὶ τῆς προνικίας τῆς νυκτερινῆς*. This would be decisive, if we could be sure that these words were earlier in date than Epiphanius. In favour of the explanation of Epiphanius is the fact, that in the Gnostic cosmogonical myths, the imagery of sexual passion is constantly introduced. For example, in the Valentinian extract already quoted from Epiphanius, we find the passage, *Μετὰ τοῦτο ἡ Ἀλήθεια μητρικὴν προενεγκομένη Προνικίαν ἐθήλυσε τὸν πατέρα ἐαυτῆς εἰς ἐαυτήν, καὶ συνήεσαν ἐαυτοῖς ἀφάρτῳ μίξει καὶ ἀγνήρατῳ συγκράσει*. This passage also illustrates the connection between *πrouνεικία* and *προφέρω*, and it seems on the whole probable that *πrou-*

velkos is to be understood in the sense of *προφερής* which has for one of its meanings (see the references in Liddell and Scott) "precocious in respect of sexual intercourse." The word harmonizes very well with the description of the passion of Sophia given in the second chapter of Irenaeus, *πρόηλατο δὲ πολὺ ὁ τελευταῖος καὶ νεώτατος τῆς δωδεκάδος κ.τ.λ.* The only difficulty is that in the Valentinian extract of Epiphanius, the name *προυvelkos* is applied, not only to Sophia, but to the other Aeons. [See SOPHIA (1), p. 713].

[G. S.]

PSAIS (Ψάις), an Egyptian bishop at the synod of Tyre (Athanasius, *Ap. c. Ar.* § 79), one of the bishops driven from their sees by the Arians (*Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 72; Tillem. viii. 698).

[C. H.]

PSALLIANI, a reading for Massaliani, heretics. (Aug. *Haer.* 57 and Bened. note; Tillem. viii. 528.)

[C. H.]

PSATHYRIANI, a party among the Arians in the reign of Theodosius II., so-called after a certain Syrian confectioner (*ψαθυροπώλης*), who was an energetic supporter of the party. The question on which schism arose among the Arians was whether the Father was to be regarded as Father before the Son came into existence. A certain Marinus, who came from Thrace, was the leader of those who maintained the affirmative, and who were called Psathyriani. The schism lasted about 35 years. (Socrates, v. 23; Sozom. vii. 17.) [MARINUS (2); THEOCTISTUS; PLINTHAS.]

[G. S.]

PSENOSIRIS (*Ψενόσιρις*), one of the Egyptian bishops banished by the Arians in 356. (Athanasius, *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 72; *Ap. de Fug.* § 7; Tillem. viii. 697.)

[C. H.]

PSENTHESUS, friend and pupil of St. Pachomius at Tabenna (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 243; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iii. 358).

[J. G.]

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA IN THE FATHERS.—In the present article we give references to notices occurring in the earlier Christian writers to a variety of ancient books and shorter documents, some falsely ascribed to the personages of Scripture, others being apocryphal accounts of their life, or of some part of it. Books known only to the Jews or Mahometans will not be noticed here. For them see especially Jon. Alb. Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus V. T.* Hamb. 1722-3; and *Codex Apocryphus N. T.* Hamb. 1719.

I. *The Prae-Christian Era.*—Epiphanius (*De Mensuris*, § 5) tells us that the Seventy-two translated twenty-two (in § 11, "seventy-two," a manifest error) of the "Apocrypha" of the Jews (not including the Epistles of Baruch). We cannot identify the books to which he refers. Most of the known Jewish apocrypha were written in Greek, and needed no translation. It is said in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vi. 16) that "some among the ancients composed apocryphal books of Moses and Enoch and Adam, of Isaiah also and Elijah and the Three Patriarchs." A great number of such works must have been known to St. Jerome, who speaks of "fictae revelationes omnium patriarcharum et prophetarum" as extant in his time (*c. Vigilant.* § 7).

A list is given by Pseudo-Athanasius: "Enoch (4800 verses), the Patriarchs (5100), the Prayer of Joseph (1110), the Testament of Moses (1100), the Assumption of Moses (1400), Abraham (1300), Eldad and Medad (400), the Pseudepigrapha of Elijah the Prophet (3016), of Zephaniah the Prophet (600), of Zachariah the father of John (500), of Baruch, Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel" (*Synopsis S. Scripturae*, *Opp. S. Ath.* ii. 154; Col. 1686). The numbers of verses in the greater part of the foregoing catalogue are added from the "Stichometria of the Holy Scriptures," at the end of the *Chronographia Compendaria* of Nicephorus Cyprianus (ad calc. Georg. Syncelli *Chronographia*, 787, Bonn.).

(1) There was a Gnostic forgery entitled the *Revelations of Adam*. This subject has been already handled at length. [See ADAM, BOOK OF], and cf. Renan, in *Journal Asiatique*, 1853, t. ii. 439-460; Malan's *Book of Adam and Eve*, 1882.

(2) Anastasius Sinaita refers to the *Testament of the Protoplasts* (*In Hexaem.* 7; *P. G.* t. 89, col. 967, ed. Migne), a book not mentioned by any other writer.

(3) Epiphanius describes and cites a Gnostic forgery bearing the title of the *Gospel of Eve* (*Haer.* xxvi. 2, 3, 5), which may be the same as the *Gospel of Perfection* mentioned by him (*u. s.* 2) as used by some of the Gnostics. Philastrius mentions their *Evangelium Consummationis* (*De Haeres.* 33).

(4) Euty chius Alex. (*Annal.* i. 14) gives an account of the murder of Abel and its cause, which could only have proceeded from some writer of fiction.

(5) Many books on astronomy were ascribed to Seth by the Mahometans (Fabr. *u. s.* 155, &c.), who, in making him an author, only followed the Gnostics (Epiph. xxvi. 8), and Sethians, the latter boasting of "seven books under his name" (xxxix. 5). [SETHITES.] Pseudo-Chrysostom, probably a Latin writer of the 7th century (*Opus Imperf. in Matth.* Hom. 2, inter *Opp.* Chrysost. vi. App. xxviii, ed. Ben.), tells us that a certain "nation in the very first part of the East" had a "writing inscribed with the name of Seth concerning the appearance of the star" of Bethlehem, &c.

(6) References to the Book of Enoch are very frequent, but this subject has already been fully discussed under ENOCH, BOOK OF.

(7) St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 38) seems to have known of some apocrypha ascribed to Noah; among which was probably the *Prayer over the Body of Adam*, printed by J. Gregory, *Observ. Sacr.* 25, from an Arabic Catena on Genesis. Georgius Syncellus (*Chron.* 83) tells us that Noah, when about to die, "gave his Testament" to Shem, an expression which seems to imply a written document.

(8) A book called *Noria*, compiled by the Gnostics from various heathen sources, was ascribed to the wife of Noah, who was alleged to have borne that name (Epiph. *Haer.* xxvi. 1).

(9) Many prophecies and books on philosophy, medicine, &c., were ascribed to Shem, but they do not appear to have been known to the earlier Christians. The *Prophecy of Ham* is mentioned by a writer in Clemens Alex. (*Strom.* vi. 6, § 53). Cassian relates a tradition, that Ham concealed in the ark metal plates on which were

inscribed various magical secrets (*Collat.* viii. 21). Similarly Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxix. 3). Hence many books on magic were reported to be by him (Pseudo-Clemens, *Recogn.* iv. 27). The *Elementa et Praxis Artis Necromanticoe* (Sextus Senensis, *Biblioth. Sanct.* ii. 57) is, however, a very late work.

(10) *Cainan* compiled a book on Astronomy after the flood, according to Joan. Mal. (*Chronogr.* p. 6. ed. Bonn.), assisted by the inscription on stone graven by Seth and his children, who had sought to preserve their names and their knowledge of the stars from fire by stamping a record on tiles, and from destruction by a flood by entrusting it to stone. He also "found the *Book of the Giants* as he was walking through the plain" (Georg. Syncellus, *Chron.* p. 150, ed. Bonn.).

(11) Fabulous histories of *Melchisedech* abounded. One, which refers to the Eucharist and to the council of Nicaea, is among the spuria of Athanasius (*Opp.* ii. App. 189, ed. Ben.). The *Chronicon Paschale Alex.* (90) cites another, which alludes to both the great Christian sacraments. This work also supplies an epitaph derived entirely from Hebr. vii.

(12) The Sethian heretics had a book entitled the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (Epiph. *Haer.* xxxix. 5), to which Origen appears to refer in *Hom.* 35 in *Luc.* v. 217. In the Imperial Library at Vienna is a Greek MS., *Testament of Abraham*, which Lambecius (*Biblioth. Caes.* vi. 304) supposes to be taken from his *Apocalypse*. The Greeks, according to Suidas (*v. Abr.*), assigned to him a book on the *Interpretation of Dreams*, cf. Julius Firmicus (*De Mathesi*) and Vettius Valens of Antioch (in an unpublished MS. of the 5th century or later (Dodwell *De Tabulis Coelestibus*, 5, in Grabe, *Spicil. PP.* i. 341, ed. 2). Merely Jewish ascriptions to Abraham were numerous, of which the *Book of Jetzirah*, often printed, was the most important.

(13) A fabulous account of Lot, and of his planting the tree of the cross, is found in one MS. of the *Annals of Michael Glycas* (P. II. p. 254, note, ed. Bonn.).

(14) The *Ladder* (*Ἀναβαθμοί*) of *Jacob* was an Ebionite forgery (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 16).

(15) The *Testament of the Three Patriarchs*, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is quoted in that of Benjamin (*Testam. XII. Patriarch.* xii. 10). The *Testament of Jacob* is mentioned in some copies of Pseudo-Gelasius, that of *Job* in others. Both readings probably originated in the error of a Latin transcriber who supposed *ιβ'* in *Διαθήκη ιβ'*, *The Testament of the Twelve*, to represent *Job* or *Jacob* (Grabe, i. 138).

(16) The *Testamentum XII. Patriarcharum*. See the article on that subject.

(17) The *Prayer of Joseph*. Quoted by Origen (*Comm. in Ev. Joan.* tom. ii. 25, Lomm. i. 147; and *Comm. in Gen.* tom. iii. §§ 9, 12, viii. 30, 38)—the latter reference being preserved by Eusebius in an extract, *Praep. Evang.* vi. 11; both by Basil and Gregory in *Philocalia*, c. 23, xxv. 219, 224), by Procopius of Gaza (*Comm. in Gen.* i. p. 29) in a probable reference to Origen (*Comm. in Gen.* iii. 12), and Glycas (*Annal.* i. 321, ed. Bonn.).

(18) The *Story of Aseneth*, the wife of Joseph. See *ASENETH, HISTORY OF*, where the topic is fully discussed.

(19) The Septuagint gives an additional paragraph at the end of the book of *Job*, which professes to be from the Syriac Bible. Fabricius (*u. s.* 793) gives the same passage from a Greek Catena. A similar passage is found in the Arabic (794).

(20) Books falsely ascribed to *Moses* or fictions representing him are the *Sermones Mystici* (*Acta Conc. Nic. I.* lib. ii. c. 18, *Hard. Conc.* i. 397), the *Testament of Moses* (Pseudo-Athan. *u. s.*), the *Assumption or Ascension of Moses* (Origen, *De Princ.* ii. 2, § 1; *Acta Nic.* *u. s.* 18, 20, pp. 398, 408), the *Revelation of Moses*, which Cedrenus (*Compend. Hist.* 9) enables us to identify with the *Parva Genesis* (*ὡς ἐν Λεπτῇ φέρεται Γενέσει ἣν καὶ Μωσέως εἶναι φασί τινες Ἀποκάλυψιν*) of Jerome (*Epist.* 78 ad Fabiol. 18) and Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxix. 6), and the *Leptogenesis* of Pseudo-Gelasius (*Hard. u. s.* 941). The last says, "Liber de filiabus Adae *Leptogenesises*, apocryphus."

JUBILEES (BOOK OF). It is also called by Epiphanius the *Book of Jubilees*. This is the most important of all the Pseud-Epigrapha, and to it we must therefore devote a notice somewhat longer than usual, referring the reader desirous of fuller instruction first of all to an able article by Dr. Ginsburg in the last edition of Kitto's *Biblical Encyclopaedia*, and then to the literature mentioned below. The *Book of Jubilees*, as is evident from the notices quoted above, was well known in the early ages. It was originally written in Hebrew. A Greek version of it was current in the East till the twelfth century, the age of the Byzantine historians Joannes Zonaras and Michael Glycas. After that date it was lost. In 1844 it was discovered in Abyssinia in an Ethiopic version, which was printed in a German translation by Dillmann in *Ewald's Jahrbücher* for 1851-53. Dillmann published the original Ethiopic in 1859. A critical English edition of the work is still a desideratum. Now as to the title of the book. It is called the *Book of Jubilees* because it divides Bible history from the creation to the conquest of Canaan by Joshua into fifty Jubilees of forty-nine years each. It is called the *little Genesis* because it selects only portions of Genesis, though from its lengthy comments on them it actually exceeds the canonical Genesis in length. The date of the book is variously fixed, but all accord to it a very early one. Every one places it prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, as its references to the Levitical and sacrificial system are made as to one in actual existence. Dillmann thinks it was written in the century immediately before the Christian era, while Ewald makes it contemporary with our Lord's birth. Its great interest for us consists in the fact, that it shews what an uninspired pious Jew thought and believed just when our holy religion took its rise, and what therefore our Gospels would have been if their origin was purely human. It gives us too a picture of the beliefs of the Jews at that time upon the following among other questions, upon the soul and a future life and judgment, upon Satan, evil spirits, and the doctrine of a Messiah. It is also of importance as regards the composition of the Talmud and the state of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament prior to our Lord; as it furnishes us with some readings differing from our *Textus Receptus*.

tas. It throws light too upon some New Testament difficulties, as, for instance, Acts vii. 53 compared with Galat. iii. 19, and Hebrews ii. 2, distinctly declaring that the law was given through the Presence Angel, and may have been quoted in 2 Pet. ii. 4 and Jude 6. It shews also the state of Biblical criticism and tradition among the Jews as it undertakes to explain difficulties occurring in Genesis and Exodus. It accounts, for instance, for the Serpent speaking by teaching that all animals spoke before the fall; it explains also how Noah got the animals into the Ark, why Esau sold his birthright for a mess of pottage, how the infant Moses was nourished in the ark, and that it was the enemy, not God, who hardened the hearts of the Egyptians. All critics agree that the author was a Jew and wrote in Hebrew, in fact, some of its points cannot be understood till translated back into Hebrew. Some, however, make him an Essene, others a Dosithean, and others an Egyptian Jew. The Greek version was made at an early period as is manifest from Clement. *Recognit.* xxx.—xxxii.: Epiph. *Panar.* lib. I. t. iii. *Haer.* xxxix. Cap. vi. in Oehler's edit. t. ii. pars i. p. 529, and St. Jerome's *Ep. ad Fabiolam, de Mansionibus*. It has been largely discussed by German theologians as Beer, Frankel, and Krüger, and by Rönisch in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1874, p. 435.

(21) The book of *Eldad and Medad* (Num. xi. 26) is mentioned in the *Shepherd of Hermas* (I. ii. 5), where the names appear as Heldam and Modal.

(22) In 2 Tim. iii. 8, St. Paul, referring to the magicians who withstood Moses, gives them the names of "Jannes and Jambres" (much varied in other writers). Origen: "Quod ait, 'Sicut Jannes et Mambres resisterunt Mosi,' non invenitur in publicis scripturis sed in libro secreto, qui superscribitur *Jannes et Mambres*" (*Comm. in Matth.* § 117 ad xxvii. 9; v. 29). Hilary the Deacon remarks on 2 Tim. iii. 8: "Exemplum hoc de apocryphis est" (*Comm. in Epp. S. Pauli inter Opp. Ambros.*). Pseudo-Gelasius (u. s.): "Liber qui appellatur *Poenitentia Jannae et Mambrae*, apocryphus."

(23) Pseudo-Gelasius: "*Liber Ogiae* nomine gigantis, qui ab haereticis cum dracone post diluvium pugnasse fingitur, apocryphus." This was Og the king of Bashan (Num. xxi. 33), of whose size and age Jewish writers told many fables. Cf. Migne's *P. L.* t. 59, col. 162.

(24) Origen thought that the Magi who came to Bethlehem "had the *Prophecies of Balaam*, which Moses also compiled" (c. *Cels.* i. 60; xviii. 108); and a later writer, perhaps referring to Origen, says, "Legi apud aliquem, Magos istos ex libris Balaam divinatoris appariturae hujus stellae scientiam accepisse" (*Opus Imperf. in S. Matth. Ev.* Hom. ii. u. s. xxix.).

(25) In several copies of the Greek Psalter ("etiam in Horologio Graecorum, et in versione Psalmorum Arabica, Aethiopica, Syriaca Sionitae, et Anglo-Saxonica," Fabr. u. s. 908), a *Hundred and fifty-first Psalm* is ascribed to David. It assumes to have been written after his triumph over Goliath. It was known to Christians at an early period, as appears from the mention of it by St. Athanasius (*Epist. ad Marcell.* i. 971), and from the existence of a paraphrase in hexameter verse by Apollinaris of Laodicea

(Galland. *Biblioth. PP.* v. 457). Later it is recognised in the East by Pseudo-Athanasius, who expressly ascribes it to David (*Synops. Sacr. Script. u. s.* 57, 87, 89, 90), and much later by the forger of the letter of Maria Cassib. to Ignatius c. 4; cf. Lightfoot's *Ignatius* ii. 728; by Euthymius Zigabenus (*Praef. in Psalmos*; Le Moyne, *Varia Sacra*, i. 152, 154), and others below our range. It does not appear in the Psalter with notes under the name of Athanasius (*Opp. S. Athan.* ed. Ben. iii. 289). In the Latin church the author of the *Altercatio cum Serapione*, ascribed to Vigilius Tapsensis or Arnobius the younger, cites it ("David quoque in suo proprio Psalmo," i. 18; Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* liii. 270. The edd. refer incorrectly to Ps. lxxvii. 70), but Arnobius himself does not notice it in his Commentary on the Psalms (see Migne, *ibid.* 570).

(26) The author of *Opus Imperfectum in S. Matth. Ev.* (*Opp.* Chrysost. vi. App. xxxiv.) speaks of Nathan and Esdras as having written prophecies, though not in the canon. It is probably from the book of Nathan that Pseudo-Epiphanius derives the story of his being hindered by Belial while hastening to Jerusalem in the hope of saving David from sin (*De Vita et Interitu Prophetarum in Nathan*, *Opp.* Epiph. 420, ed. Bas. 1578; Migne, *Pat. Graec.* xliii. 394).

(27) Alexander Polyhistor, according to Clemens Alex. (*Stromata*, i. 19, § 130), inserted in his history certain letters which passed between Solomon and the kings of Egypt (Vaphres=Hophra) and Tyre. Letters which we identify with these between Solomon and Vaphres, and Suron (=Hiram. "Forte interpres Graecus legerat regem Zoop, hoc est Tyri"—Fabr. u. s. 1022) of Tyre, are given at length by Eusebius (*Praepar. Evang.* ix. 31-34) from Eupolemus. Josephus also gives letters between Solomon and Hiram of Tyre on the same subject (*De Antiq. Jud.* viii. 2, §§ 6, 7). Such letters, we are told by Theophilus of Antioch, were preserved in the archives of Tyre (*Ad Autoly-cum*, iii. 253). A correspondence on various branches of knowledge passed between Solomon and the philosophers of Tyre, which Theophilus says were reported to be extant in his time (*Ibid.*). St. Jerome refers to this in *Epist.* 70, *ad Magnum Orat.* 2. See also Josephus, *Contra Apion.* i. 17; *De Ant.* viii. 5, § 3. Josephus further ascribes to Solomon adjunctions and exorcisms (*De Ant.* viii. 2, § 5), which Origen refers to as extant (*In Matth. Comm. Ser.* § 110; v. 6). Pseudo-Gelasius: "Scriptura quae appellatur *contradictio Solomonis*, apocrypha" (u. s. 942).

The Psalms of Solomon are contained in Fabric. *Pseud-Epig. V. T.* They are eighteen in number, and were first printed in Latin by Johan. Ludovicus de la Cerda, A.D. 1626, and lately in Greek by Hilgenfeld in his *Messias Judaeorum*. Kuenen, in his *Religion of Israel*, English trans., t. iii. p. 268, regards them as originally composed in Hebrew, and assigns them to the first century, B.C. They shewed the Messianic conception then current among the Jews, and thus illustrate the N. T. text. Cf. Salmon's *Introd. N. T.* 2nd ed. lect. 26.

(28) Origen (*Comm. in S. Matth. Ev.* § 117) mentions the "secreta (apocrypha) Eliae" (old Lat. vers.), which is, we presume, the "Apo-

calypsis Eliae" of St. Jerome (*Epist. 57 ad Pammach.* § 9; *Comm. in Isai.* 17, lxiv. 4). See also Epiph. *Haer.* xlii. in Ep. ad Eph.

(29) The ASCENSIO ISALAE has been already discussed, s. v.

(30) St. Jerome (*Comm. in S. Matth.* iv., xxvii. 9) says of the prophecy, "And they took the thirty pieces," &c., "Legi nuper in quodam Hebraico volumine, quod Nazaraenae sectae mihi Hebraeus obtulit, *Jeremiae apocryphum*, in quo haec ad verbum scripta reperi." It is an obvious conjecture that this was a forgery, which the heretical author sought to recommend by the insertion of that text. The way had been paved for him by a suggestion of Origen that if there was no error of the copyist in St. Matth. (u. s.), the prophecy might be found "somewhere in the apocrypha (old Lat. vers. secretis) of Jeremiah" (*In Matth. Comment. Ser.* 117). Justin Martyr (*Dial. c. Tryphone*, 72) accuses the Jews of having omitted the following passages from their later copies of the book of Jeremiah, "The Lord remembered His dead tomb (χαύματος, barrow) of Israel who were asleep in the land of the mound, and He descended to them, that He might preach to them His salvation" (see 1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 6). It must remain a question whether this had been an apocryphal addition, or was, as Justin supposes, a fraudulent omission. The passage is cited by Irenaeus (*C. Haereses*, iv. 22) as from Jeremiah; but elsewhere (iii. 20, § 4) as from Isaiah; in other places (iv. 33, §§ 1, 12; v. 31, § 1) without any name of author.

(31) The "Baruch" of Hippolytus Pseudo-Athanasius and Nicephorus is probably the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, edited in Latin by Fritzsche, *Libri Apocryphi V. T.* Lips. 1871. See JUSTINUS (3) and Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift Wissenschaft. Theolog.* 1872, p. 230.

(32) The writings falsely ascribed to "Habakkuk" are probably Susannah and Bel and the Dragon. Porphyry objected to the book of Daniel that it was written in Greek, quoting Susannah to prove it. To this, says St. Jerome, both Eusebius and Apollinarius replied that the fables of Susannah and Bel and the Dragon were not in the Hebrew, but part of the prophecy of Habakkuk the son of Joshua of the tribe of Levi (*Praef. in Comm. in Dan.* v. 619, ed. Vall.).

(33) A *Life of Daniel* containing a prophecy ascribed to him is found in the *Chronicon Paschale Alex.* (298, ed. Bonn.). The prophecy however is so short that Pseudo-Athanasius and his follower probably refer to the Song of the Three Children, which has been ascribed to Daniel (so Fabricius, u. s. 1116), or to the *Apocalypsis Daniel* of age unknown which exists in many MSS. (Tischend. *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, Prol. xxx.).

(34) Clemens Alex. quotes a passage in which the prophet Zephaniah is made to declare that he was taken up into the fifth heaven, &c. (*Strom.* v. 11, § 78). This must be from a pseud-epigraph.

(35) Sozomen (*Hist. Eocl.* ix. 17) relates that the head of a monastery at Gerari in Palestine found "a writing in Hebrew and ancient, not of those recognised by the church," in which an account was given of the death and burial of the prophet Zechariah.

(36) Justin M. (*Dial. c. Tryphone*, 72) accuses the Jews of having omitted from the book of

Ezra a speech with reference to the passover (vi. 19), which in the Greek begins thus: "And Esdras said unto the people, This passover is our Saviour and our Refuge." Though the passage is also quoted as from Ezra by Lactantius (*Div. Institut.* iv. 18), it is far more probable that it was an apocryphal addition, or came from an apocryphal book. Nicephorus of C. P., A. D. 806, condemns the Apocalypse of Esdras and Zosymas (can. 13, al. 46, in Pitra, *Jus. Antiq. Graec.* ii. 331).

St. Jerome (*c. Vigilant.* § 7; ii. 393) accuses an opponent of citing "an apocryphal book under the name of Esdras." St. Ambrose also refers to a "Book of Esdras" (*Ep. 34 ad Horont.* 2). As the subjects indicated correspond to nothing in the Esdras of the Vulgate and our English Apocrypha, it was formerly supposed that these writers had before them a lost pseud-epigraph, of which no other notice had survived. Both references were found, however, in the Arabic version of the 4th Book of Esdras, translated by Ockley (*Whiston's Primitive Christianity*, App. vol. iv. Lond. 1711), now published in the Arabic (by Ewald in *Abhandlungen der k. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1863), and occur equally in the Armenian version, printed with the rest of the Bible in 1666 (see Long, *Bibl. S.* ii. 1, p. 175; A. D. 1781), the Ethiopic published by Archbishop Laurence (with an English and Latin version, Oxon. 1823), the shorter Arabic (Ewald, u. s.), and the Syriac printed by Ceriani (*Monum. Sacr. et Prof.* v. 1, 1868; preceded by a Latin translation, *ibid.* i. 2). The references occur in a long passage between vv. 35 and 36 of ch. vii. in our Second Book of Esdras. In the same passage were found other quotations of St. Ambrose (*De Bono Mortis*, 10, 11, 12) from a "prophet." Quite recently the missing passage has been discovered in a MS. Esdras at Amiens, and its omission in the Tridentine Vulgate accounted for by the patient research of Mr. R. L. Bensly, to whose most learned and elaborate work on the subject (*The Missing Fragment of the Lat. Trans. of the 4th Book of Ezra*, Camb. 1875) we are indebted for the above particulars. Fritzsche had already (*Libri Apocryphi V. T.* Lips. 1871, 607-612) translated the passage from Syriac, and inserted it in his Latin Fourth Book of Esdras, from which, as given in the Vulgate, it may be well to mention in passing, he cuts off the 1st, 2nd, 15th, and 16th chapters to form a Fifth Book. The Fourth (or Second) Book was also printed by Hilgenfeld, under the title of *Esdras Propheta*, 1869, 8°, in Lat.; Syr. Lat.; Ethiop. Lat.; Arab. Lat.; Armen. Lat.; and in Arab. Lat. by J. Gildemeister, Bonn, 1877.

(37, 38) Two otherwise unknown prae-Christian apocrypha, one from an historical book, the other a fictitious prophecy, are cited in *Sermonum Arrianorum Fragment. Antiquissima*, nn. xx. xxi.; Mai, *Script. Vet. Nova Collectio* III. ii. 238-240, Rom. 1828.

II. *The New Testament.*—Among writings put forth "in the name of Christ" (*Const. Apost. u. s.*) was the *Epistle to Abgarus*, ruler of Edessa. [See ABGARUS.] This has been however already discussed under Abgarus and EPISTLES APOCRYPHAL. The Priscillianists and others professed to have the *Hymn* which Christ sang with the disciples at the Last Supper (St. Matt. xxvi. 30; St. Mark xiv. 26). For an

account of it see Augustine, *Epist.* 237 *ad Ceret.* A third production ascribed to our Lord was the *Epistle to Peter and Paul*, a book on magic, of childish absurdity, written, as St. Augustine thinks (*De Consensu Evang.* i. 9, 10), either by an enemy of the name of Christ, or by a professor of the black art, who sought by this means to recommend it to the ignorant. About the year 584, Licinianus, bishop of Carthago Spartaria [LICINIANUS], remonstrates with another bishop for receiving and giving currency to a forgery, which claimed to be an epistle of Christ that had "descended from heaven upon the altar of Christ in the memoria of St. Peter the Apostle" at Rome. This epistle, the writer says, insisted on a Judaizing observance of the Lord's day (*Ep. iii. ad Vincentinum*, Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* 72, col. 699). In the 8th century an epistle which may be the same as the above, or an imitation of it, for its object is the same, was dispersed by the heretic Adelbert under the title of the *Epistle of Christ which fell on Jerusalem*. It was condemned by a council held at Rome in 745 (*Act. ii. Hard. Conc.* iii. 1939; see also *Epist. Bonifacii* 67, p. 173, ed. Würdtw.), and in 789 Charlemagne ordered it to be burnt (*Capit. Aquisgr.* 78, *Cap. Reg. Franc.* i. 73). (5) The Manichaeans also brought out an epistle of Christ (*Aug. c. Faust.* xxviii. 4), of which the subject is not known.

False Gospels.—There were a great number of Apocryphal Gospels and Epistles put forth under the name of our Lord and his immediate followers. These we omit though properly falling under this head, as they have been already discussed by Dr. Lipsius under GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, EPISTLES APOCRYPHAL, ACTS APOCRYPHAL, and by Dr. Salmon under CLEMENTINE LITERATURE, LEUCIUS (1), MELITO, and on the TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES and APOCALYPSES, APOCRYPHAL.

Books respecting the Virgin Mary.—There was a book, *De Nativitate Sanctae Mariae*, which Pseudo-Jerome (*Ep. ad Chrom. et Hel. Opp.* xi. p. ii. 280, ed. Vallars) ascribes to Seleucus (Leucius) "qui passiones Apostolorum conscripsit." This the impostor under the name of Jerome rejects as heretical, but he professes to have a Hebrew MS. on the same subject which he will translate, as innocent, but without affirming that it was written, as alleged, by St. Matthew. The fabulous narrative purporting to be his version accordingly follows. [MELITO.] The object of the Latin imposture was, apparently, to get rid of a statement in the fiction of Leucius, that Mary was the daughter of a priest, and therefore not of the family of David. This is the *Gospel of the Nativity of St. Mary* in these collections. Another history of the Virgin agreeing on this point with Pseudo-Jerome is cited by Gregory Nyssen, who styles it apocryphal (*Orat. in Diem Nativ.* ii. 778). There are still extant three romances, one in Greek (*De Dormitione Mariae*) and two in Latin (*Transitus Mariae*, A, B), of which the death of the blessed Virgin is the subject. These have been amply discussed already by Dr. Salmon under MELITO, iii. p. 899. We may also mention, though of unknown age, the *History of Joseph the Carpenter*, which is extant in Arabic and in the Memphitic and Sahidic dialects of ancient Egypt (Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. N. T.* p. xxii.). Dr. L. Stern discussed

it, and gave a German translation of it in *Hilgenfeld's Zeitsch. Wissenschaft. Theol.* 1883, p. 267. He assigns the Coptic Version to the fourth century at least. The MS. is dated A.D. 1067. The Greek *Apocalypse of Mary*, found in many MSS., is much later than our period (Fischend. *Apocal. Apocr. Proleg.* xxvii.).

Pseudo-Gelasius also condemns the books entitled *The Repentance of Origen*, and *The Repentance of St. Cyprian* (*Pat. Lat.* t. 59, col. 163); and "Liber qui appellatur Nepotis," which is believed to be that work of the Egyptian bishop Nepos, against which Dionysius of Alexandria wrote (*Euseb. Hist.* vii. 24). We are told that Nepos interpreted the promises of Scripture in a Jewish sense (*u. s.*). The statement of Eusebius is cited by Vigilius, A.D. 551, *De Tribus Capitulis*, 60; *Labb. Conc.* v. 366. A book of *Præverbs* "ab hæreticis conscriptus et S. Xysti nomine prænotatus." [See XYSRUS.] St. Jerome ascribes them to Xystus (Sextus) the Pythagorean, and accuses Rufinus, their translator, of the false imputation (*Ep.* 133 *ad Ctesiph.* 3; *Comment. in Jerem.* xxii. 24; and in *Ezech.* xviii. 5, without naming Rufinus). St. Augustine (*De Nat. et Grat.* 64, § 77) cites the book as by Xystus of Rome; but he discovered his error, and in *Retr.* ii. 42 he ascribes it to Sextus. Neither he nor Gennadius, A.D. 495 (*De Vir. Illust.* 17, n. Ruf.), charges Rufinus with fraud, nor does Jerome himself when quoting the *Sententiae*, before his mind was excited against Rufinus (*Adv. Jovin.* i. 49, written in 393). Rufinus himself, if the text be as he left it, only says that it was ascribed by some to Sixtus, the Roman martyr. See *Sextus Pythagoræus* in *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biography*. One of its *Γνώμαι* is quoted by Origen (*c. Cels.* viii. 30) as acceptable to most Christians. Citing another, he says that the book was approved by many (*Comm. in Matth. Ev.* xv. 3). Hence we need not suppose that all its higher sentiments were interpolations of Rufinus. *Physiologus*, a book written by heretics, but ascribed to St. Ambrose, is also proscribed by Pseudo-Gelasius. Cf. Pitra's *Spicileg. Solesm.* III., p. lxxvii.

The *Sibylline Oracles* are discussed elsewhere. [See SIBYLLINE ORACLES.]

The book of *Hystaspes* is discussed under that name, as is also the impostor *Hermes Pseudo-Trismegistus*.

The writings ascribed to *Orpheus* were classed by Faustus the Manichæan with those of the Sibyls and *Hermes* (in *Aug. c. Faust.* xiii. 1). St. Augustine replies that anything well said of the Son or the Father by such writers "valet quidem aliquid ad paganorum vanitatem revincendam, non tamen ad istorum auctoritatem amplectendam" (*ibid.* 15). See PROHIBITED BOOKS in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* Vol. II. 1721.

[W. E. S. & G. T. S.]

PSEUDO-CHRYSOSTOMUS.—*Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum*. Among the works which have been ascribed to Chrysostom is a commentary on St. Matthew's gospel. It is at present divided into fifty-four homilies; but this division does not proceed from the author, and we find* (32, 132) that the work was one intended, not for oral delivery, but to be read

* In the references the first figure denotes the Homily; the second the Benedictine page.

by persons from whom the writer was absent in body. The work as we have it is defective, wanting from the middle of the thirteenth to the end of the nineteenth chapter, and breaking off at the end of the twenty-fifth. Hence it was known as "Opus Imperfectum" in contradistinction to the genuine series of Chrysostom's ninety homilies on St. Matthew, which have been preserved complete. This work is quoted as Chrysostom's by Nicolas I. (*Respons. ad Bulg.*) Mansi, xv. 403, and by other popes; and in the middle ages was accepted without doubt as Chrysostom's. In the *Catena Aurea*, for example, of Thomas Aquinas, it is largely employed; and Fabricius quotes Dionysius the Carthusian as saying that he would rather have this imperfect work perfect, than be lord of all Paris. Yet it is likely that if he could have had his wish he would have been very unpleasantly surprised; for it is certain that the author of this book so valued, far from being Chrysostom or any other orthodox divine, was a bitter Arian; and it is quite possible that the lost portions of the book were those most at variance with orthodoxy. Much of the heresy of the book was disguised from many of its readers by the expurgations of successive transcribers and editors, and some parts may have been so deeply tainted with heresy that no remedy short of total excision would suffice. Some early critics indeed defended the genuineness of the expurgated form, contending that the passages found in some copies, where the doctrine of our Lord's equality with the Father is formally combated, had been but scribbles by an Arian in the margin of an orthodox writer, which through mistake had obtained admission into the text. And it is true that in some cases the heretical passages can be cut out without injury to the context, but there is an abundance of passages of undisputed genuineness in which the author defines his position beyond possibility of mistake. He reveals himself as a member of a small persecuted sect which condemned the dominant church as heretical, and was in turn denounced as heretical by the state, and as such was visited with temporal penalties; and he marks the reign of Theodosius as the time when orthodoxy was overwhelmed, and when what he calls the heresy of the Homoousians became triumphant. Thus he looks (1, 18) on the revolt of the ten tribes under Rehoboam as a type of what has taken place in the last days when as iniquity abounded and the love of many waxed cold "maxima pars Christianorum" went off into heretical schism and "vix paucissimi Christianorum" remained in the church under Christ; and (19, 94) he speaks of heretics as so multiplied that "Christiani vagi potius videantur quam illi." He complains (45, 190) of the persecutions inflicted by the heretics, who thus shewed themselves to be the children of those who slew the prophets. "Did the apostles and martyrs ever wish to imitate their persecutors? Did they persuade men to believe by carnal threats or worldly promises? Their only arguments were good teaching and holy life; their only threat that of the future judgment of God; their promises, not of worldly advancement, but of the kingdom of heaven. Those men who persecute and bribe can be no children of theirs." Elsewhere (20, 94) he remarks that when our

Lord said, "Beware of false prophets," in order to shew that it was not heathen or Jewish teachers he had in view, he adds "who come to you in sheep's clothing." How then are we to know those who inwardly are ravening wolves? "Does a sheep persecute a wolf, or a wolf the sheep? The Jews persecuted Christ, not Christ the Jews; heretics persecute Christians, not Christians heretics. He whom you may see on the meadows of Scripture cropping the flowery herbage of righteousness is a sheep. he who delights in the blood of persecution is a wolf." The successive trials of the church are said to be, first the Jews persecuted her, then the heathen, now it is the heretics; last of all it will be Antichrist.

We can otherwise see that the readers whom our author addressed were not only a small body but poor and excluded from the paths of worldly advancement. He teaches (38, 159) that a merchant can seldom or never please God, and therefore that any one wishing to be a merchant ought to be cast out of the church, as the Psalmist says "Quia non cognovi negotiationes, introibo in potentiam domini." In all merchandise there must be cheating and perjury, the one party swearing the goods are worth more, the other that they are worth less, than their real value. It is true buying and selling takes place in lawful business; the husbandman buys steers to plough his land, and sells the corn it produces. But a man is not a merchant who buys materials and sells a manufactured article; for then it is only his own work he sells; but a merchant is one who buys a thing and sells it again unchanged. Of all merchants the most accursed is the usurer; for no other merchant wants back what he sells, but he is not satisfied with getting his commodity back none the worse but must have more besides. Elsewhere he stigmatises as "opus inhonestum" not only merchandise, but official dignity and military service. We may safely infer that the preacher who taught this doctrine had for his disciples a small sect, and not the bulk of the Christian people.^a Still more clearly is this brought out (44, 195) where we are told that the new Jerusalem is the church, that is, the spiritual Christians who, leaving the bodily church, which the perfidious had occupied by violence, went out from them. "Nay, rather they went out from us, as the apostle John teaches; for not he leaves the church who goes out bodily, but he who spiritually leaves the foundations of the church's truth. We went out from them in body, they from us in mind: we left the foundations of walls, they the foundation of the Scriptures: we went out from them according to the sight of men, they from us according to the judgment of God." And this is the trial of the last days, that now the abomination of desolation is in the temple: that is to say, heresy occupies the church of God (43, 204). "Then must they who are in Judaea flee to the mountains, that is to say, Christians, who, as the apostle teaches, are the true Jews, must betake

^a The Vulgate has "litteraturam," corresponding to a various reading in the Greek, γραμματείας for πραγματείας.

^c Compare St. Augustine on the same passage in Psalm lxx.

themselves to the mountains of holy Scripture, of which it was written (Ps. lxxv. 5) 'Illuminas tu mirabiliter in montibus aeternis,' and (Ps. lxxxvi. 1) 'Fundamenta ejus in montibus sanctis.' For now, except the Scriptures, no means are left of distinguishing the true church from the false. Heretics have their churches, they read the same Scriptures, they have bishops and the other orders of clergy, they have baptism, eucharist, and in short everything. In former days miracles were a means of distinguishing the true church, and unbelievers could only exhibit barren wonders, not beneficial miracles like the Christian; but now the working of miracles has ceased and more are alleged to be done among false Christians. Peter foretold (Clem. *Recog.* iii. 60) that Antichrist is to have the power of working even beneficial miracles. Formerly you could tell the true church by the morals of its members; for the conversation of all, or at least of the greater part, exhibited a holiness not to be found among the impious. But now Christians are as bad or worse than the heretics or the heathen. Indeed you will find more continence among these schismatics than among Christians. God, then, foreseeing the confusion of the last days, warned those desiring to know the true church to flee to the Scriptures, for if they betake themselves anywhere else they will be scandalised and perish."

Passages where the reign of Theodosius is named as the time when the church was overwhelmed by heresy will be found (48, 199; 49, 20). It being clear from the proofs we have given that the author was not a member of the Catholic church, it is unreasonable to doubt the genuineness of the passages where he exhibits his Arianism, as, for instance, where he explains that our Lord called heretics "spinas et tribulos," because, foreseeing what heresy would prevail above all others, he called them "tribulos, quasi trinitatis professores et triangulam bajulantes impietatem." We must therefore rather take the expurgation of the heretical passages as illustrating the difficulty of transmission to our times of sentiments of ancient authors at variance with later orthodoxy. Thus, in the present case, it was not only the Arian passages which were expurgated. For instance, where the writer speaks (19, 93) of "offering the sacrifice of bread and wine," he is made to say "the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood;" and a passage is cut out altogether where he argues that if it be dangerous to transfer to private uses the consecrated vessels "which contain not the Lord's real body, but the mystery of His body," how much more to profane the vessels of our own body which God has prepared for His dwelling-place.

When the controversial passages had been expurgated, there was nothing to excite orthodox suspicions in our writer's language about our Lord's divinity. The Arians, it will be remembered, were quite the reverse of Unitarians, their doctrines, on the contrary, being open to the charge of Ditheism. Accordingly our writer uses very high language concerning our Lord, speaks of Him as "our great God and Saviour," as does also Maximinus (of whom we shall say more presently, and whose doctrine is in accurate accordance with that of the

present work). His formula is "Deus genitus de ingenito Deo." Sometimes it is "unigenitus Deus" (*μονογενής θεός*). If in his controversial passages he is eager to argue that the Son, "to whom all things were delivered by the Father," can neither be identical with the Father nor equal to Him, he is equally energetic in repelling the doctrine that He was mere man; and the heresy of the Homoousians is not more reprobated than that of Photinus, who, in his recoil from Arian ditheism, completely separated the Saviour's manhood from the one supreme Divinity. The third person of the Trinity is comparatively seldom mentioned, but on this head the writer's doctrine is even more distinctly heretical. The Holy Spirit is evidently regarded as a third being, as much inferior to the Son as the Son is to the Father (34, 146). This is the representation also of the "Ascension of Isaiah," a work quoted in the present treatise.

The heretical character of the book being recognised, it becomes manifest how much light it must throw on the history of Arianism, which it presents in a more favourable aspect than any in which it can be seen elsewhere. Arianism, as known from other sources, we are tempted to regard as a mere creature of court favour, contending against the religious feeling of the Christian world. Its utterances are controversial and negative, and we have scanty information as to the influence on the heretics of the positive truth which they held in common with other Christians. Naturally a better side of Arianism is exhibited in this work, in the main not controversial but exegetical and practical, written when all court favour had long been lost, and when the sect met from the state with nothing but persecution. How much there was in the book to recommend it to a religious mind is evident from the fact that it passed so long as Chrysostom's. We cannot explain how the mistake originated, for the work itself makes no claim to such authorship; the writer is evidently addressing persons who knew him, and to whom he had no motive for trying to pass himself off as other than he was. He had also written commentaries on St. Mark (49, 211) and on St. Luke (1, 23; 9, 56). Fragments of ancient Arian homilies on St. Luke have been published by Mai (*Bib. Nov. Vet. Pat.* iii.), but they have no resemblance to the work of the present writer. It would be easy, if space permitted, to give many favourable specimens of this commentary which would well justify the estimation in which it was so long held: see, for instance, the whole comment on the text "Seek and ye shall find" (Hom. 17). But possibly the book was commended to medieval readers less by its merits than by what a modern reader would count its faults. The whole spirit of the commentary is utterly unlike that of Chrysostom, who may be referred to the Syrian school of rational historic and literal interpretation, whereas this writer constantly follows the mystical and allegorical method which is commonly connected with Alexandria. And in this style he shews a remarkable amount of ingenuity. A reader only acquainted with modern commentaries could little divine what lesson would be deduced from any given text. This may appear from the example already given of his exegesis of the text "Flee ye to the moun-

tains," and we merely give one illustration more. The name Bathsheba, or as he reads it Bersabee, he finds in Hebrew denotes seven wells. But he deduces from Prov. v. 15 that "well" denotes a wife. Bathsheba was the seventh wife of the literal David; but we learn spiritually that Christ is the spouse of seven churches, for so the one church is designated on account of the seven Spirits by which it is sustained, and accordingly both Paul and John wrote to seven churches. This last remark may suggest that the writer was acquainted with the work of which the Muratorian fragment is a part.

The writer shows a strong preference for the ascetic life. He remarks (24, 135) that when the disciples said "If the case of the man be so with his wife it is not good to marry," our Lord did not contradict them or say it was good to marry. The writer holds (1, 24) that conjugal union is bad, and in itself considered is a sin; and although on account of God's permission it ceases to be sin, yet it is not righteousness. In the beginning of the world men married sisters—a sin excusable at the time on account of the fewness of men. Afterwards this was forbidden, but a man was allowed to have more wives than one; then, as population increased, this too was forbidden, but a man was allowed to have one wife; "now that the world has grown old we know what is well-pleasing in God's sight, though on account of incontinent men we dare not say it." Some hard language concerning the female sex will be found (24, 135). Yet to those who will not take his counsel he condescends to give advice concerning the choosing and the ruling of a wife—"See what she comes of a good stock; if both parents are virtuous you may safely venture. If both are bad have nothing to say to her; if one is good, the other bad, it is an even chance how she will turn out. If, after marriage, she plays the harlot, send her away. If her misconduct stop short of adultery, she is to be dealt with in three ways: first, admonish her before God; secondly, if that avail not, publicly rebuke her, that she who regards not the fear of God may be influenced by shame of men; but if, after repeated rebukes, she will not reform, beat her with a stick, for it is meet that she who cannot be made to blush like a freewoman should be chastised like a slave." The writer does not even withdraw the apostle's permission of a second marriage, though regarding this as but license given on account of the hardness of men's hearts, a second marriage, in itself considered, being but "honesta fornicatio." This is quoted as Chrysostom's in the *Decretum* of Gratian (pars 2, caus. 31, quaest. 1, 9). It has been already mentioned that the writer owns there were more examples of continence in the dominant church than in his own sect, but he is not a whit the more on that account disposed to condone that church's heresy. A heretical sect is no more a church than an ape is a man. If you see a man who does not worship God in truth doing what seem to you good works, do not believe your eyes and say he is a man of good life, but believe God, who says "An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit." If you call him good you make Christ a liar; you only see the outside, God sees the heart. The works of a man

who does not care to believe rightly can spring from no good motive, for it is better to believe rightly than to act rightly. Faith without works is dead, but still it is something; works without faith are nothing at all. The foolish virgins had the lamps of right faith, but not the oil of good works to burn in them; but what avails the oil of good works to Jews or heretics who have no lamps wherein to light it? The writer will not even own the baptism of heretics as valid.

It has been questioned whether the original language of this commentary were Greek or Latin, but it appears to us that the original was certainly Latin. Some proofs may be rejected as indecisive; for instance a translator may conceivably have modified the language "*Jesse latino sermone refrigerium appellatur*" (p. 16), or "in graeco non dicit 'beati pauperes' sed 'beati egeni' vel 'beati mendici'" (9, 56). But there are other passages where the argument turns on the use of Latin, as, for example (53, 223), money passing from hand to hand—"usu ipso multiplicatur, unde dicitur usura ab usu," or (7, 53) where an explanation is suggested why, at the call of the apostles, Peter and his brother are described as "mittentes retia." John and his brother "retia componentes," "quia Petrus praedicavit evangelium et non composuit, sed Marcus ab eo praedicata composuit; Joannes autem et praedicavit evangelium et ipse composuit." The commentator, however, clearly uses Greek authorities. From such he must have derived his explanation (49, 205) why the commandments are ten—"secundum mysterium nominis Jesu Christi quod est in litera iota, id est perfectionis indicio" (see also 1, 23). The writer knew no Hebrew, though he lays great stress on the interpretation of Hebrew names, making use for this purpose of a glossary which we have not been able to identify with that used by any other writer. It must have been from the work of some Oriental writer that he came by the name of Varisus as that of a heretic (48, 199), for it would seem plain that Barjesus is intended. The commentator does not use Jerome's Vulgate, but a previous translation. Thus (Matt. v. 22) he has "sine causa," which Jerome omits, and he anticipates bishop Butler in his observations as to the uses of anger—"Justa ira mater est disciplinae, ergo non solum peccant qui cum causa irascuntur sed e contra nisi irati fuerint peccant." In the Lord's prayer he has "quotidianum," not "supersubstantialem." He has the doxology at the end; in this differing from the usage of Latin versions but agreeing with the Apostolic Constitutions (iii. 18), a work which he highly valued. In the beatitudes he follows the received text in placing "Blessed are they that mourn" before "Blessed are the meek," contrary to Jerome and the bulk of the Latin versions. Both here, however, and in the case of the doxology, he agrees with the Codex Brixianus. He reads "neque filius" (Matt. xxiv. 36); he distinctly omits Luke xvii. 36 (50, 213).

Besides the Scriptures he uses the Shepherd of Hermas (33, 142), but acknowledging that it was not universally received; the Clementine Recognitions (20, 94; 50, 212; 51, 214), the Apostolic Constitutions or Canons as he calls them (13, 74; 53, 221). The first of these

passages does not appear in our present text of the Constitutions; the second is from the eighth book, which Krabbe gives good reason for thinking to be an Arian addition to the previously known work. It would seem that in the latter half of the 4th century the Arians made active use of literary forgery. In their interests was made the longer edition of the Ignatian epistles, which Zahn has conjecturally attributed to Acacius of Caesarea. Interpolations of Arian tendency were also made in the Clementine Recognitions. Our writer used Josephus. We have already referred to his use of the "Ascension of Isaiah;" he had also another Old Testament apocryphal book (not the book of Jubilees), from which he learned the names of Cain and Abel's sisters, fuller details about the sacrifice of Isaac, was enabled to clear Judah from the guilt of incest in his union with Tamar, &c. He had further New Testament Apocrypha, which, though not absolutely authoritative, might, in his opinion, be read with pleasure. These related in full detail the story of the appearance of the star from a book preserved in their nation, called the book of Seth, and had in consequence for generations kept a systematic look-out for this star. It was probably the same book which told that Joseph was not present when the angel appeared to Mary; and related how our Lord conferred His own baptism on John the Baptist. Directly or indirectly the writer was much indebted to Origen. We think that we discern traces of his acquaintance with two or three other of the antenicene fathers, but his fanciful interpretations of Scripture, though including some few of what may be called patristical commonplaces, are for the most part, as far as we know, original. But with reference to the question of authorship, it would be important to determine whether his coincidences with St. Augustine are purely accidental. The author is certainly no follower of Augustine. In his commentary on St. Matthew he has little in common with Augustine's treatment of the same passages; and he differs from him in a number of details, as for instance (49, 205), he follows Origen's division of the commandments, making "Honour thy father and mother" the fifth and (p. 218) counting it as belonging to the first table, in these points differing from Augustine; yet it appears to us that he was acquainted with Augustine's "Enarrationes" on the Psalms. There is scarcely a quotation from the Psalms in the "Opus Imperfectum" which does not shew some resemblance to Augustine's commentary on the same passage. A few examples must suffice: (4, 43) in Psalm viii. 4, "The heavens, the work of thy fingers" mean the Holy Scriptures; (5, 37) on Psalm xc. 11, the remark, "Portatur non quasi infirmus sed propter honorem potestatis" verbally agrees with Augustine's "Obsequium angelorum non ad infirmitatem domini pertinet sed ad illorum honorificentiam." There is a striking verbal similarity (7, 52) between the comment on "mittentes retia" and Augustine's remarks on the same subject in Psalm lxi. 4. The interpretation already quoted that the "mountains" to which Christians are to flee are the Holy Scriptures, may have been suggested by Augu-

tine in Psalm lxxv. 2; see also the sermon (46) "De Pastoribus." Other examples might be added.

With regard to our author's date, he himself lays claim to no great antiquity. He says (52, 218) that the time since our Lord's ascension had been nearly as long as the life of an antediluvian patriarch. Accordingly Mill (*Praef.* N. T.), taking him literally at his word, fixes his date A.D. 961. In favour of the late date may be urged the use of the medieval word "bladum" for corn, though such a point cannot be rigidly insisted on in the absence of information as to the exact date when such words crept into popular language.^d But the argument for an earlier date is very strong, that the author's studies appear all to have lain in Christian literature earlier than the middle of the 5th century; and that he appears to know nothing of, or to take no interest in, any of the controversies which distracted the Christian church after that date. Making all allowance for the narrowing influence of a small sect, we find it hard to believe that the type of Arianism which existed at the time just specified could have been preserved in such complete purity two or three centuries later. It must be observed that our author does not appear to have lived in an Arian kingdom outside the limits of the Roman empire. He draws illustrations (30, 130) from the relative powers of the offices praefectus, vicarius, consul; from the fact that a "solidus" which has not the "charagma Caesaris" is to be rejected as bad (38, 160). When our author wrote, heathenism was not extinct, as appears from the end of Hom. 13, and from what he says (10, 30) as to the effect on the heathen of the good or bad conversation of Christians. All things considered, we are not disposed to date this work later than the middle of the 5th century, which would allow it time to grow into such repute in an expurgated form as to pass for Chrysostom's with Nicolas I. If so early a date can be assigned to the work, we have at once a claimant for its authorship in the Arian bishop Maximinus, who held a conference with St. Augustine. The *Opus Imperfectum* was written by an Arian bishop at a distance from his people, as Maximinus was at the time in question. The doctrine of the two writers is identical, and there are also points of agreement in what Maximinus says as to the temporal penalties to which the expression of his opinions was liable, and as to the duty, notwithstanding, of confessing the truth before men. Maximinus, while in Africa, could hardly help making some acquaintance with the writings of St. Augustine, and might very conceivably adopt his exegesis of particular passages, though on the whole slightly regarding his authority. This quite falls in with what we have noticed as to the relations between the two writers. [G. S.]

PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS [DIONYSIUS (1)].

PSYCHICI. In the New Testament a contrast is made between the ψυχικοί and the πνευματικοί, in the former of whom the mere animal soul predominates, the latter exhibiting

^d The word *callicula*, given by Ducange on our author's sole authority as a medieval word for ink, really means an inkbottle, being only a diminutive of *calix*. (See Freund's "Dictionary.")

the working of a higher spiritual nature (Jude 19; 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15; compare also xv. 44-46). In the Valentinian system this contrast is sharpened, and is made to depend on an original difference of nature between the two classes of men, a mythical theory being devised which professed to account for the origin of the different elements in men's nature (see Gnosticism, Vol. II. 682 b, VALENTINUS); the psychic element being something higher and better than the mere material element, but immeasurably inferior to the pneumatic. It may well be believed that in the language of the Gnostic sects, the "pneumatici" were those who had been initiated in the mysteries of the sect, ordinary Christians being branded as "psychici."

Such was also the use made of the latter word by Tertullian, who in his latest works, written after his Montanism had involved him in complete separation from the church, habitually uses the word Psychici to designate those from whom he had separated.

[G. S.]

PTOLEMAEUS (I) (Πτολεμαῖος), a disciple of Valentinus [VALENTINUS], some remains of whose writings have come down to us. He is spoken of in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 35) along with Heracleon as head of the Italic (i.e. Western) school. He was still living circa A.D. 180, when Irenaeus composed his great work *Against Heresies*. Irenaeus writes in his *Præfatio*, c. 2: "Καὶ καθὼς δύναμις ἡμῶν, τὴν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, λέγω δὴ τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαῖον, ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς, συντόμως καὶ σαφῶς ἀπαγγελοῦμεν καὶ ἀφοριῶς δόσομεν κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν μετρίότητα πρὸς τὸ ἀνατρέπειν αὐτήν." In these words he not only declares his intention to give a special description and refutation of the Ptolemaic form of Valentinian Gnosis, but expressly intimates that he is moved thereto by the fact that οἱ περὶ Πτολεμαῖον are his own contemporaries. The phrase appears to admit of no other interpretation than this, that Ptolemaios was still living when Irenaeus wrote, and standing at the head of his school. We know no more of the circumstances of his life. For Hippolytus he belongs already to the past. In the *Syntagma* against all heresies he is associated with Secundus, in the *Philosophumena* with Heracleon, without our informant seeming able to give us any further account of him. The excerpt in Pseudo-Tertullian (*Haer.* xiii.) joins together Ptolemaeus and Secundus as Valentinus' two first disciples (*post hunc sc. Valentinum extiterunt Ptolemaeus et Secundus haeretici*); but all the epitomator is able to tell us is taken from the statements of Irenaeus (I. ii. 2; 5) concerning Secundus and other Valentinians who are unnamed. Philaster dedicates a special article to each of these heretics, and places Ptolemaeus at the head of all the *successores Valentini* whom he enumerates (*Haer.* 397); but what he relates concerning a double tetrad of Aeons finds its explanation in Pseudo-Tertullian, according to whom "Ptolemaeus and Secundus" added (*addiderunt*) a double tetrad to the thirty Aeons of Valentinus. Hippolytus, on the other hand (as is evident from the epitomators), had no longer any acquaintance with Ptolemaeus and his system. The *Philosophumena* introduce a notice (vi. 38, p. 199) taken from Irenaeus

(I. 12, 1) concerning those "qui sunt circa Ptolemaeum scientiores" with the words, οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον . . . λέγουσι. Otherwise they have nothing more to tell us about Ptolemaeus than what was mentioned above, that he was a head of the Italic school. For in the third place, where they yet again refer to him (vi. 38, p. 198) they put him in conjunction with Secundus just after the manner of the excerpt in Pseudo-Tertullian—Σεκοῦνδος μὲν τις κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ ἅμα τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ γενόμενος οὕτως λέγει. The system of teaching which is reported in the sequel is the same as that given by Irenaeus (I. 11, 2), or the older source from which he borrows, as that of Secundus only. Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* 1, 8) barely mentions the name of Ptolemaeus. Epiphanius, on the other hand, has a whole article upon him based on Irenaeus (I. 12, 1), in which he makes more definite use than the *Philosophumena* of the notices there given concerning the "more knowing" adherents of Ptolemaeus, and that for the purpose of describing Ptolemaeus' own doctrine (Epiph. *Haer.* 33, 1). Tertullian appears however to have had a more correct view of Irenaeus' meaning when he refers what he says of the doctrine of the *γνωστικώτεροι περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον* not to Ptolemaeus and his original school, but to certain reformers of it (*emendatores Ptolemaei Adv. Valentin.* 33).

Concerning the date of Ptolemaeus no safe conclusion can be drawn from the order of succession in which later haeresiologists mention his name. If Hippolytus and his epitomators assign him a place at the head of the disciples of Valentinus in advance of both Secundus and Marcus, this is simply explained by the fact, that Irenaeus names Ptolemaeus before either of the others (and independently of the οἱ περὶ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον of the Preface) at the end of the fragment taken from one of his writings (I. 8, 5); while Secundus is first mentioned (I. 11, 2) in a summary account drawn from another source; and Marcus, although certainly one of the oldest disciples of Valentinus, is brought in still later (I. 13 sqq.). A further and independent notice concerning Ptolemaeus is found in Tertullian, who relates (*Adv. Valentinian.* 4) of him that in distinction from Valentinus, who had regarded the Aeons as mere affections of the Deity, he (Ptolemaeus) made of them independent personal subsistences:—*Eam (sc. viam) postmodum Ptolemaeus intravit nominibus et numeris Aeonum distinctis in personales substantias, sed extra Deum determinatas, quas Valentinus in ipsa summa divinitatis ut sensus et affectus et motus incluserat.* The accuracy of this statement, no less than its origin, we are quite unable to determine; we can only conjecture that Tertullian may have derived it from the work of Proculus against the Valentinians.

To what extent the account given by Irenaeus (I. 1-8) was drawn from the writings of Ptolemaeus must likewise remain doubtful. One fragment only can with certainty be referred to Ptolemaeus himself (Iren. I. 8, 5). After giving in previous paragraphs an anthology of allegorical interpretations of Scripture made by Valentinians, Irenaeus adds a long connected piece of a Valentinian commentary on the prologue of St. John, and follows up this extract with the words (omitted by Epiphanius): *et*

Ptolemaeus quidem ita." Beside this fragment we possess further an *Epistle of Ptolemaeus* addressed to a Christian lady named Flora, in which he informs this lady of the origin of different parts of holy Scripture. This important document is preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 33, 3-7), and also in the editions of Irenaeus by Grabe and Stieren. It was published also in a separate form by Hilgenfeld in 1881 (*Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theologie*, pp. 214-230).

The fragment in Irenaeus (I. 8, 5) endeavours to prove that John, "the Lord's Disciple," had expressly indicated the first Ogdoad. St. John (according to him) wishing to describe how the Father produced the Universe, lays down first a Principle (*ἀρχήν τινα*), generated by God and called *Noûs*, *Τίος* and *Μονογενής*, in whom the Father produced the Universe *σπερματικῶς*. From this he says was produced the *Λόγος*, and in him the whole substance of the Aeons, to which the *Λόγος* afterwards gave form. Having to speak of the first origin of things John rightly begins his doctrine with the *ἀρχή*, i.e. the *Τίος* and the *Λόγος* (St. John i. 1). He first distinguishes these three—God, the *ἀρχή*, and the *Λόγος*, and then joins them again together in One, in order to exhibit at once the emanation of the *Τίος* and the *Λόγος*, and their oneness with each other and with the Father. For in the Father and from the Father is the *ἀρχή*, in the *ἀρχή* and from the *ἀρχή* is the *Λόγος*. Well says he therefore *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος*, for the Logos was in the Son; and *ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, i.e. in the *ἀρχή* (read *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, instead of *ἡ ἀρχή*) and *θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος* rightly follows; for that which is born of God is God; *οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν* hereby he exhibits the order of emanation, *πάντα γὰρ δ' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδ' ἔν* for to all the Aeons after him is the Logos the Cause of their origin and form. But when he adds *ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἐστίν*, he intimated the Syzygy. For he says—Everything came into existence through him, but the *Ζωή* in him. But that which is in him must be more nearly related to him than that which is through him, and being united to him through him produces fruit. And when he adds *καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων* by naming the *Ἀνθρώπος* he by the like name with *Ἀνθρώπος* indicates also the *Ἐκκλησία*, in order by the likeness of the name to intimate also the communion of the Syzygy. For *Ἀνθρώπος* and *Ἐκκλησία* proceed from the union of *Λόγος* and *Ζωή*. But *Ζωή* he calls the Light of Men, because they are enlightened by her, i.e. are by her formed and manifested. The same is also said by Paul in those words, *πάν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστίν*. Because there the *Ζωή* has manifested and produced *Ἀνθρώπος* and *Ἐκκλησία*, she is called their "Light." With these words then has John plainly indicated the Second Tetrad, *Λόγος* and *Ζωή*, *Ἀνθρώπος* and *Ἐκκλησία*. And so he has also the First Tetrad. For in treating of the *Σωτήρ*, and saying that everything outside the Pleroma has been formed by Him he calls Him the fruit of the whole pleroma. He calls Him the light shining in the darkness, and not comprehended thereby, inasmuch as He has given form to everything produced by the suffering (of the Sophia), and yet remained unknown to her (the darkness). Further, he calls Him "Son" and "Truth" and

"Life" and Logos (or Word) made flesh, whose *δόξα* we have seen as it was, he says, His *δόξα* as that of the *Μονογενής*, and given Him by the Father, *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας* (John i. 14). In this way he clearly indicates the first Tetrad also—*Πατήρ* and *Χάρις* and *Μονογενής* and *Ἀλήθεια*. And thus has John spoken of the First Ogdoad, the Mother of all the Aeons, consisting of *Πατήρ* and *Χάρις*, *Μονογενής* and *Ἀλήθεια*, *Λόγος* and *Ζωή*, *Ἀνθρώπος* and *Ἐκκλησία*.

It is possible that the other allegorical interpretations of Scripture given by Irenaeus in his cc. 3 and 8 are taken from the same work of Ptolemaeus as the above fragment. But from the little which we can with certainty trace back to Ptolemaeus no conclusion can be drawn as to the nature of that work. It is only probable, not certain, that like the writings of Heracleon, it was mainly exegetical in its character. Of more importance is it that the agreement of the fragment with the description given of the Gnostic doctrine in I. 1, 1, confirms the assumption that, in that description, Irenaeus had the Ptolemaic form of the Valentinian system really in view. For in both cases the doctrine of Aeons is in complete agreement. But at the same time it is clearly proved that by the "scientiores" (*Haer.* i. 12, 1) are not meant the whole party of Ptolemaeus, but only one branch of it which, like those mentioned at I. 12, 3, would fain be more 'knowing' than the rest.

A more exoteric character belongs to the *Epistle of Ptolemaeus* to Flora. Its purpose is to impart instruction concerning the origin of the Mosaic Law. One may suppose that the lady to whom it is addressed had sought for instruction as to how the (Gnostic) view of two different authors, one of the gospel the other of the law, could be brought into harmony with Christian Monotheism. The answer given by Ptolemaeus represents his own opinion as the right medium between two opposing errors, one deriving the law from God the Father and the other from the devil (Marcion?). It cannot indeed come (so argues Ptolemaeus) from the perfect God and Father, being itself imperfect, needing that another should come and fulfil it, and containing precepts discordant with the essence and the will of the Perfect God. Neither can we assign its origin to the unrighteous adversary, seeing it forbids unrighteousness, and a house or city divided against itself cannot, as the Lord saith, stand. This latter view were as impossible as that which would assign the creation of the world to the author of destruction, instead of the righteous and all evil-hating God. Both sides are in error, the one as not knowing the God of Righteousness, the other as ignorant of the Father of All, whom the only one who knew Him (Christ) has revealed at His advent. In opposition to both these errors Ptolemaeus promises to solve the question concerning the nature of the law and the lawgiver on the basis of the Redeemer's own utterances, these alone shewing us the way to apprehend the truth (cap. 1). In the first place the whole of that complex of precepts contained in the Pentateuch did not proceed from one author. On the contrary, the Redeemer's own words suggest a threefold division—(1) Commandments given by God Himself through Moses; (2) Commandments derived by Moses from his own specula-

tion; and (3) Commandments invented by the elders of the people. This is proved partly by the words of Jesus, Matt. xix. 6 sqq., where he speaks of Moses having allowed what God forbids in the matter of divorce on account of the people's hardness of heart, and partly by reference to Matt. xv. 4 sqq., where Jesus expressly opposes to the divine command to "Honour father and mother" the human traditions (*παροδοσεις των ανθρωπων*) which enjoined its transgression (c. 2). Of these three constituent divisions, the first, consisting of Divine commandments, may again be subdivided into three parts. (a) The first of these consists of the purely moral precepts constituting the law in the strict sense which the Redeemer came not to destroy but to fulfil; (b) the second are the ordinances which, being mingled with that which is worse and with unrighteousness, the Saviour has abrogated as contrary to His own nature; (c) the third part are the typical and symbolical ordinances which, passing over their application to things sensible and visible, the Redeemer has transferred to the spiritual and unseen. The first and pure portion of the ordinances of the law is the Decalogue, which only needed to be fulfilled by the Saviour. The second portion, which is intermingled with unrighteousness, includes such ordinances as sanction retaliation (Lev. xxiv. 20). It is a condensation to human weakness, but in itself opposed to the nature and goodness of the Father of All, though based on a certain necessity, as that of requiting murder with the punishment of death. The third, the typical and symbolical portion, has reference to sacrifices, circumcision, the Sabbath, fasting, the Passover, Azymes, and the like. For all these are but figures and symbols of the truth, which in their literal sense are done away, but in their spiritual are retained, the things being altered, while the names remain. In the place of animal sacrifices and incense-offering the Saviour has enjoined sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving; instead of bodily circumcision the circumcision of the heart; instead of the sabbatical rest an abstaining from bad works; instead of bodily fasting the spiritual fast which is interpreted as abstinence from all evil. Bodily fasting is indeed (he adds) also practised among our people, because it may in some degree benefit the soul, if performed with reason (*μετα λόγου*), not from mere imitation of an alien example, not for mere custom's sake, or because a certain day has been enjoined for the observance. At the same time it may serve to remind us of the true spiritual fast, and admonish us to steer with all our might to keep that. In like manner as Paul himself teaches (1 Cor. v. 7 sqq.), Passover and unleavened bread are figures the one of Christ, the other of heart-purity (c. 3).

The Saviour has then confirmed the first portion of God's law (Matt. v. 22, 28, 34); for the second He has substituted other and opposing precepts (Matt. v. 39); the third, the symbolic portion, He has interpreted spiritually, and so put the truth itself in the place of the figure. The same things taught also His disciples and the Apostle St. Paul, who has shewn in one case how a precept is to be understood spiritually (namely in the words already referred to concerning the feast of the Passover and unleavened

bread). That portion of the law which is mixed with unrighteousness St. Paul designated (Eph. ii. 15) as *τον νόμον των εντολων εν δογμασι*, which has been done away. Finally, the pure and unmixed portion he has in view when (Rom. vii. 12) he calls the law holy, the commandment holy and just and good (c. 4).

Now at length Ptolemaeus turns to the question who the God is who was giver of the law. It cannot have been the perfect God, as has been shewn already, neither can it have been the devil, a thought which it was not even lawful to utter, but a third one, the Demiurge and creator of this present world, who occupies a middle place between the other two, and has therefore received the name of the Midst (*της μεσότητος*). The perfect God is good by nature, and indeed (according to St. Matt. xiv. 17) the only good; the adversary is bad, wicked, and unrighteous; he who stands in the midst, between the two, is neither good nor bad nor unrighteous, but properly called 'righteous,' the Umpire and Prizegiver of his own righteousness. He is inferior to the perfect God because he is begotten and not unbegotten, as is that only One, but he is greater and more exalted than the adversary. Moreover, he is of a different essence from both the others. The essence of the adversary is corruption and darkness, for he is hylic and multiform. The essence of the unbegotten Father is incorruption, and a one simple, uniform and self-existent Light. But the essence of the Demiurge is the product of a *διττη δυναμις*, he himself being an image of the better. The epistle concludes with an admonition to Flora not to suffer herself to be disturbed in the conviction that along with the one *αρχη των όλων*, the unbegotten, incorruptible and good, which is also confessed and believed in by us, the two other Natures had a co-existence, that of Corruption and that of the Midst, and this notwithstanding that they were not of the same essence (*ανομοουσιοι*), though it be the nature of the good to bring forth that which is like to and consubstantial with Himself (*τα θυμοια αυτω και ομοουσια*). A full insight into this condition of things is held out to Flora as what she may look for in future times, and at the same time assurance is given her that she must be made partaker of the apostolic tradition, which has also been transmitted to us, along with the injunction to judge of all words by the rule of the Saviour's doctrine (*αξιουμένη της αποστολικής παραδόσεως ην εκ διαδοχής και ημεϊς παρειλέφαμεν, μετὰ και του κανονισια πάντας τους λόγους τη του Σωτήρος ημών διδασκαλία*). [R. A. L.]

PTOLEMAEUS (2), Oct. 19. A martyr at Rome, mentioned by Justin Martyr in his Second Apology. He suffered under the city prefect Urbicius, with LUCIUS (14) and another unknown martyr. He converted a woman to the faith, and her husband in anger accused him of being a Christian (Just. Mart. *Apol.* ii. cap. 2; Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 17; Dodwell, *Dissert. Cyprian.* xi. 33); Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* fixes the date of his martyrdom A.D. 166. Cf. the article on JUSTINUS MARTYR, t. iii. p. 569. [G. T. S.]

PTOLEMAEUS (3), Dec. 20. Soldier of Alexandria, and martyr there under Sabinus, in

the Decian persecution. He is mentioned by Dionysius Alexand. as quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 41). [G. T. S.]

PTOLEMAEUS (4), bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, but probably intruded (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 540). He attended the Councils of Seleucia in 359 and Constantinople in 360. He was a partisan of Acacius of Caesarea [ACACIUS (2)], and is called Μελετιῶν τινα by St. Athanasius (*De Synod.* § 12), as a follower of Meletius of Lycopolis [MELETIUS (2)]. (Baron. *Annal.* A.D. 359, lxix.; Tillem. vi. 469, 488; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* iv. 333.) [J. G.]

PTOLEMAEUS (5) (συγκλητικός), addressed by St. Nilus the ascetic (*Epp.* i. nos. 1, 2, 3, 8-21) upon the honour attached to the monastic life. [J. G.]

PTOLEMAEUS (6), bishop of Rhinocorura, upon whose information to Timotheus patriarch of Alexandria the presbyter Alphaeus was degraded for embracing the Messalian heresy (Phot. *Cod.* 52; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 543). Tillemont (viii. 536) thinks that the Timotheus here spoken of was Salofaciolus. [C. H.]

PUBLIA, Oct. 9, deaconess and widow of Antioch, and confessor under Julian. She was mother of a certain John, presbyter of Antioch, whom some have taken to be John Chrysostom. She was head of a community of women who tormented Julian by chanting psalms, ridiculing the worship of idols. On one occasion he was so vexed by her audacity in thus hearing him, that he ordered a soldier to strike her on the face. (Theodoret, *H. E.* iii. 19.) [G. T. S.]

PUBLICOLA, son of Melania [MELANIA (1) Vol. III. p. 888], the only one remaining to her after the loss of two others, who from his station and fortune might have attained to senatorial rank, but of whom his mother was anxious that he should renounce the world and live a monastic life. However, he married Albina, daughter of Rufius Ceionius Albinus, and by her had a daughter, Melania. He died before A.D. 406, for in that year his widow was residing for a time at Nola in the house of Paulinus, together with her mother-in-law, the elder Melania and others. (Paulinus, *Ep.* xxix. 8-11; *Carm.* xxi. 281-295.)

He was probably possessed of property in Africa, near Arzuges, perhaps the name of the heathen native inhabitants of Arsura or Azzura, a place of unknown site in the province of Byzacene in Africa, and wrote to St. Augustine to consult him as to his own conduct towards them and also on some other cases of conscience which troubled him (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 84). Surrounded by heathens he found himself and the business transactions of his estate in contact frequently with them. I. In respect of oaths taken by them in the names of their deities; (a) respecting carriage of goods; (b) respecting care taken by them of agricultural produce belonging to him; (c) respecting passage through their territory. He was in doubt whether they who relied on such oaths, whether taken to the owner or to the magistrate of the district, were

not polluted by receiving them, and not only so but also the goods in respect of which they were taken. Again, supposing that he knew by hearsay only of the oaths being taken, and the information should turn out to be untrue, would not the doubt until it should be cleared up contaminate the object, and also its price, and make it unfit for him to meddle with: following out the principle laid down by St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 28, what ought he to do in such a case? If a heathen should induce a Christian proprietor or magistrate, heathen or Christian, to swear that he will keep a promise, is the Christian polluted by such an oath, and in any case are the objects in question polluted: (d) If he sends a messenger to the Arzuges, is he at liberty to take an oath from them, or does he pollute himself by so doing? II. As to Offerings. (a) May a Christian eat of produce out of which an idol-offering has been taken: (b) May he cut wood from an idol-grove: (c) Going to market and buying meat, if a doubt crosses his mind as to its origin, does he commit sin by eating it: (d) Does doubt about the nature of a good action involve the doer of it in sin: (e) If a man says falsely that such or such food is idol sacrifice, and afterwards confesses his untruth, is a Christian justified in eating or selling it or making use of the price paid for it: (f) Is he justified in eating such food in extreme necessity, in order to save his own life: (g) May he drink of a well, with which any portion of idol-sacrifice has entered, or of a spring in a deserted temple not so tainted: (h) At a feast if a Christian have idol-meat set before him, and refuses to eat it, and afterwards in ignorance buys the same meat when exposed for sale, is he guilty of sin: (i) May he buy vegetables from a temple-garden, or from a heathen priest: (j) Ought a Christian to bathe in places where idol-sacrifices are offered, especially on heathen festival-days, either at the same time as heathens, or in their absence: (k) Ought he to sit on the same bathing-seat (*solium*) on which heathens here sat on such occasions. III. *Conduct in general.* (a) Is a man justified in killing another to prevent his killing him: (b) Is he at liberty to surround his property with a wall, and thence defend it even to the killing of invaders?

On all these questions he begs Augustine to give him immediate and decided answers so as to leave no doubt concerning them, and quotes many scriptural passages and instances bearing on them. (*Aug. Ep.* 46.)

In his reply, St. Augustine, while expressing his great anxiety to calm his friend's sensitive mind, expresses also his doubts as to his ability to do so. He points out (a) that a man who swears by false gods and breaks his promise is guilty of two faults, but that no one would blame him for keeping his promise: (b) he that makes use of the true promise of one who has sworn by false gods involves himself in no sin on that account. Not that his faith can be placed on a level with that of a Christian, but it is plainly a less evil to swear truly by a false god than untruly by the true one, for as the object of appeal is greater, so also is the perjury more heinous. It is a question therefore whether he who causes another to swear by false gods is not guilty of sin, a question which he

should consider more serious, but for the cases mentioned by Publicola of Isaac and Abimelech (Gen. xxvi. 31) and Laban and Jacob (Gen. xxxi. 53). The command also of our Lord about not swearing at all (Matt. v. 34, 36) seems to be directed mainly against perjury, from which, as a heinous sin He wishes Christians to be as far removed as possible. As a Christian ought not to swear at all, so he ought not to compel others to do so, though scripture nowhere forbids him to take an oath from another, for if so, there would be no such thing as peace, and not only produce guarded by heathens would be polluted, but every thing included in a treaty of peace with them. (c) To permit any produce from floor or press to be used to idols is plainly forbidden to Christians, but there can be no reason against their using the general store to which it belongs, as water, even though some be taken for sacrifice. We do not scruple to breathe the air into which the smoke of sacrifice ascends. The point to be considered is to do nothing, nor be thought to do anything in honour of false gods, and when temples or groves are overthrown, Christians ought not to use the stores, or the timber for themselves, but only for the service of God, as was the case with Jericho, and in other cases. As to meat offered to idols we have St. Paul's rule. He who eats idol-meat in ignorance, sins not: so vegetables in general are a part of God's creation, but if offered to idols ought to be rejected. But if it be unlawful to eat a vegetable grown within a temple-enclosure, St. Paul would have been precluded from eating any at Athens, which was wholly consecrated to Minerva. So also with water, unless any parts of an idol-sacrifice be thrown into it. We behold the sun and breathe the wind, though some offer sacrifice to them both. Doubts concerning an idol-sacrifice, if it be proved not to be so, cannot cause sin, because every one is at liberty to correct falsehood, and turn it into truth. To do a bad deed which the doer thinks at the time to be good is a sin of ignorance: (d) As to killing those who are endeavouring to kill us, the church thinks it wrong to do so, except in the case of soldiers, and bearing in mind Matt. v. 39. A man who builds a wall round his property is not guilty of murder if another man be struck from it, nor if his beast wound him. So St. Paul was justified in revealing the plot laid against him, and accepting the guard provided for him. If it were otherwise, no iron tools or ropes could be used, lest people should destroy themselves with them; nor windows, lest they should throw themselves out: (e) As to the case of the famishing Christian, if he knows food to be idol-meat, he does better to reject it, but if he does not know this, he may lawfully partake of it. The letter and its reply are not without importance, and though the former may appear over-scrupulous and even frivolous in its doubts, it is an instance of conscientious casuistry, in respect of the questions which must have arisen frequently in the minds of Christians living among heathens, and which to a feebler and over-sensitive mind presented difficulties which the clear judgment, strong common sense, and better informed mind of Augustine were able in most cases easily to solve. (Ep. 47.)

[H. W. P.]

PUBLIUS (1), bishop of Athens in the 2nd century, and martyr in some persecution of that time. He was succeeded by Quadratus, who revived the faith of the Athenian Church, which had almost failed. Cf. Ep. of Dionysius of Corinth in Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23 [DIONYSIUS (3)]. The exact date of Publius is a matter of doubt, and depends upon the identification of Quadratus. If Quadratus, bishop of Athens, were the apologist mentioned by Euseb. (*H. E.* iv. 3), he lived in the time of Hadrian, and Publius may have been the successor of Dionysius the Areopagite as bishop of Athens. This, however, is disputed by Valesius in his notes on Eusebius, though asserted by Jerome in his *Catalog.* (cf. Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* prae. p. xxxv.). Valesius's principal objection is this; Eusebius (iii. 37) says that Quadratus was distinguished for his prophetic gifts; Dionysius on the other hand calls his Quadratus a bishop. But a bishop could also have been a prophet. Cf. the words of the *Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων*, ed. Bryennios, cap. 15. Upon this controversy see writers cited by Fabricius in his *Biblioth. Graeca*, t. vi. p. 154, when discussing Quadratus. [G. T. S.]

PUBLIUS (2), the eighteenth bishop of Jerusalem, followed Cassianus as the third of the Gentile succession. The beginning of his episcopate is placed in the 4th year of Marcus Aurelius, A.D. 165. Two years of office are assigned him by Eutychius (361) (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12; Epiphani. *Haer.* lxxvi. 20; Chron. Armen.). [E. V.]

PUBLIUS JULIUS. [AELIUS.]

PUBLIUS, persecutor. [POLLIO.]

PUBLIUS (3), a solitary, commemorated by Theodoret in his *Religiosa Historia*, cap. v. born at Zeugma, on the Hellespont, of a family of senatorial rank. His person was singularly handsome, and his mental endowments were equally remarkable. On his father's death Publius sold all that he inherited from him, and distributed it to those in need, and built for himself a small hut on a high ground about seven miles from his native town, where he passed the remainder of his days. He devoted his whole time to psalmody, reading the Scriptures, and prayer, together with the labour necessary for his maintenance and the entertainment of strangers, and latterly for the government of his brotherhood. His reputation for sanctity gathered many about him whom he lodged in small huts contiguous to his own, but not under the same roof. Over these he exercised a very strict oversight, imposing on them a very severe rule of abstinence, and nightly prayer. After a while, on the advice of one of these fellow ascetics he erected a common house, or coenobium which they might occupy together, and each derive profit from the virtues of his companions, while all would be more immediately under his eye. At first all his fellow coenobites were Greeks. But the native Syrians having expressed a desire to join the society, he built another house for them, and between the two erected a church common to both, where each might attend matins and evensong, singing alternately in their own language. This

double coenobite establishment remained to Theodoret's time, and he gives a record of its successive provosts. (Theod. *Rel. Hist.* c. v.)

[E. V.]

PUCH, a "comes," residing at a township ("villa") about two miles from the monastery of Inderaunda (*i.e.* Inderwood, perh.—In Deira Wood), afterwards named Beverley, while John bishop of York, JOANNES (201) BEVERLACENSIS, was living there in retirement (*i.e.* 718–721), and Berchthun was abbat. Puch becomes known to us from the following incident related by Bede (*H. E.* v. 4) in the words of Berchthun, who was Bede's personal friend. Puch's wife, suffering under an acute disorder, had been three weeks confined to her room when the bishop, upon Puch's invitation, came from Inderaunda accompanied by the abbat, to consecrate a church close by, erected, as we should infer, by Puch himself. After the consecration the bishop was bent on returning to his monastery, but overcome by the entreaties of Puch and Berchthun remained at the villa to dine. One of his attendants carrying from him some of the holy water which had been employed at the consecration to the sick lady for her to use both as a medicine and a lotion, she forthwith arose cured, and ministered to the guests during their repast. Folchard's *Life of St. John of Beverley* places Puch's villa at South Burton (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. ii. 170 B). An anonymous life of the same bishop seen and described by Leland (*Collect.* iii. 155, Hearne's vol. iv. 100) also makes Puch possessed of a manor at South Burton, not far from Beverley, and further adds that his daughter Yolfrida became a nun at Beverley, where she died March 13, 742, and was buried, and that her father bestowed with her the manor of Walkington upon the monastery. The same statement occurs without reference to the source in Dugdale (vol. i. p. 170, ed. 1682), and in the modern edition of the *Monasticon* (ii. 127). South Burton (also called Bishop Burton) is a likely spot for Puch's township; it is two miles west of Beverley, and its antiquity is attested by three circumstances. Sepulchral tumuli abound in the neighbourhood, an ancient road of Roman date has been found to have run between the spot and Beverley (Oliver's *Beverley*, pp. 5, 13); and two Roman tessellated pavements in two separate fields were discovered there about 1721, as narrated in Gent's *Beverley*, 1733, p. 77. Kemble in his essay on *The Names of Anglosaxons*, p. 85 (in the volume *Proceedings at Winchester*, Sept. 1845, of the Archaeological Institute of G. B. and I.), reckons Puch among the names of the Anglo-Saxon period allied to Cymric or Pictish roots, suggesting a not inconsiderable admixture of blood between the conquerors and the natives, instancing also the names of Pecthelm (Bed. v. 23), Padda (iv. 13), Oiddi (*ib.*), Pehtat (*Cod. Dipl.* 34) occurring in this dictionary. We may further remark that Puch survives nearly unaltered, both in the common Welsh name Pugh, and in that of Pook which occurs in Devonshire.

[C. H.]

PUDENS (1), a pro-consul of Africa, who favoured the Christians and discouraged persecution at the end of the 2nd century (Tertull. *Ad. Scap.* 4; Tillem. iii. 127).

[G. T. S.]

PUDENS (2), a soldier, who guarded the martyr Perpetua and her companions. He was converted by them, and received a ring from Satorus bathed in his blood. A Pudens was commemorated in the ancient Carthaginian calendar on April 29, with whom our martyr may have been identical (*Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felicit.* c. vi.).

[G. T. S.]

PUDENS (3), a friend of Sidonius Apollinaris, who addressed him (lib. v. ep. 19) in reference to a crime committed by one of his serfs (Tillem. xvi. 206).

[C. H.]

PUDENTIANA. [PRAXEDIS.]

PUDENTIANUS, bishop of Cuical (if that is its name, for none but oblique cases occur) in Numidia, between Sitifis and Milevum; recently made a bishop, and on that ground voting with the majority in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. de Bap. iii. suffr. 71. The city was a very fine one, as notices of it and its remains and numerous inscriptions indicate. It is called a "respublica" and a "colonia." It had bishops till after the middle of the sixth century. Now Djemila.

[E. W. B.]

PULCHERIA (1), daughter of Theodosius I. She died in 385, aged six years. Gregory of Nyssa delivered an eloquent funeral oration over her [GREGORIUS (15)] (Greg. Nyss. *Opp.* t. ii. p. 946; Ceill. vi. 210).

[G. T. S.]

PULCHERIA (2), Sep. 10, daughter of the emperor Arcadius and sister of Theodosius II. She acted as guardian of the latter, and practically ruled the eastern empire for many years. Her secular history will be found in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, her religious history alone will therefore here be told. She must have been a precocious young person, as she was only two years older than her brother, whose education she superintended, having been born Jan. 19, 399. She was declared Augusta and Empress July 4, 414, and at once entrusted with the management of affairs. She was learned and vigorous, could speak and write Latin and Greek, personally investigated the affairs of state, directed much attention to religion, and brought up her brother in the strictest orthodoxy (Soz. *H. E.* ix. 1). She was a correspondent of St. Cyril during the Nestorian controversy, two letters are still extant addressed by him to her in the year 430, requesting her assistance (see Mansi, iv. 618–883). [CYRIL.] Twenty years later again she had a long correspondence with pope Leo and his archdeacon Hilarius on the subject of Eutyches and the Monophysite heresy (see Mansi, tt. v. vi. vii.) [LEO (5) in t. iii. p. 657–659; HILARIUS (18)]. We possess also an epistle of hers addressed to the Palestinian monks in defence of the council of Chalcedon, and another to one Bessa, abbess of a convent at Jerusalem, on the same topic. Bishops and clergy from every part of the empire appealed to her and on every subject. Theodoret (*Ep.* 43) wrote to her in 445 about the taxation of his episcopal city of Cyrrhus; the clergy of Ephesus, in 448, concerning the episcopate of Bassianus. Pulcheria had in early life taken a vow of virginity in conjunction with her sisters, Arcadia and Marina. In 450 she was obliged to assume the government of the empire, and feeling herself

incompetent for the task married Marcian, an eminent general. She reigned till her death, Feb. 18, 453. During that period she convoked and assisted at the fourth general council of Chalcedon. Her devotion to the culture of relics was very great. She transported to Constantinople the relics of St. Chrysostom with great pomp in 438, and those of the forty martyrs of Sebaste in 446 (*Soz. H. E.* ix. 2). [FORTY MARTYRS.] Ceill. viii. 471, 533, x. 20, 67, 213-226 gives full details of her religious history. Suidas, s.v. Pulcheria, reports a horrible charge that was brought against her: it was almost certainly only the outcome of intense religious hatred. Hefele's *Councils*, Clark's translation, t. iii., gives the details of her action against Nestorius and Eutyches. [G. T. S.]

PUPPIANUS. [FLORENTIUS (3).]

PURPURIUS, bishop of Limata, or Liniata, a place of unknown site in Numidia, a truculent ruffian, whose case is mentioned both by Optatus and Augustine as a sample of the leaders of the Donatist party. (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 205.) For some cause unknown he murdered his own nephews in the prison of Mileum, and when taxed with the crime made no attempt to deny it, but threatened to do the same by any one who stood in his way. (*Opt.* i. 13; *Aug. Brevic. Coll.* iii. 15, 27; *c. Gaud.* i. 16, 17; *c. Cresc.* iii. 27, 30.) At what time this had taken place is not mentioned, but it was brought up against him by way of retort at the council of Cirta, A.D. 305, at which he taxed Secundus, bishop of Tigisis, the president, with tradition, a charge which Secundus endeavoured to evade, but which was pressed upon him with characteristic violence by Purpurius, who taunted him with cowardice and criminal leniency towards the bishops who were guilty of "tradition." (*Aug. c. Gaud.* i. 37, 47; *Ep.* 43; 3, 6.) In order also to terrify Secundus, he threatened with the other bishops present to leave him, and thus place him in the position of a heretic standing alone against the rest. (*C. Cresc.* iii. 27, 30.) But Purpurius was not only violent but dishonest. For the money distributed by Lucilla in bribes (A.D. 311), he had a share amounting to 100 *folles* [LUCILLA, Vol. III. 751]. At some time not mentioned, but perhaps soon after A.D. 313, when Christian worship was made legal, and heathenism became unpopular, advantage appears to have been taken by some of the "baser sort" of Christians to plunder the heathen temples, and among these Purpurius carried off some cups from the temple of Serapis, probably of Carthage. This theft was brought to light at the inquiry held by Zenophilus, A.D. 320, at which also two letters written by Purpurius were produced, one addressed to Silvanus, Donatist bishop of Cirta, and intended to bring about a reconciliation with him, the other to the clergy and seniors of the same place, mentioning that Mundinurius was aware of the cause of quarrel between himself and Silvanus, which no doubt came out of the bribery of Lucilla. But what the result of the inquiry was we know not, as the MS. is imperfect. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. pp. 172, 173; ed. Oberthür.) [FERTES (2), Vol. II. p. 550; MUNDINARIUS DONATISM, Vol. I. p. 882.] [H. W. P.]

PUSA, the name assigned to the fourth abbat of Medeshamstede (*Mon. Angl.* i. 346). According to the Peterborough copy of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Pusa was abbat in the days of Offa, succeeding abbat Beonna, and was a great friend of the king. The mention of him occurs under the year 778, which may therefore be regarded as the conjectural date; and in connexion with the confirmation of a grant made by the ealdorman Brorda, of the monastery called Wocingas, to Medeshamstede and its abbat Pusa (*M.H.B.* 335). The Black Book of Peterborough however contains a charter which, whether genuine or not, is inconsistent with this story, and represents an earlier tradition. According to this (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 168) Pusa was abbat of Woking, in Surrey, and had a grant from King Offa at a place called Freoricburna, which Kemble dates in 796, but which has no date of its own. The Black Book contains likewise a privilege of pope Constantine (708-715) to abbat Hedda, in which certain rights are conferred on the abbey of Woking and Bermundsey, both in Wessex, and both dedicated to St. Peter (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 276). These charters somehow found their way into the possession of the monks of Peterborough, and were the foundation of the story that Hedda and Pusa were abbats there. The Peterborough annalist, and after him Hugo Candidus, the historian of Peterborough, used these to fill up a vacant space in the traditional history of the abbey; for there is no connexion historically between Woking or Bermundsey and Peterborough. Subsequent antiquaries have tried to identify Wocingas with Wicken, and Vermundesei with Wermington; but the charters place both in Surrey. Pusa thus disappears from the Peterborough Fasti. The abbat who ruled at the time assigned to him was Bothwin, 758-789; after whom came Beonna, 789-805. (Birch, *Saxon Abbots*, pp. 50, 51; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 462; and Kemble, *C. D.* n. 156, 193, &c.) [S.]

PUSILLUS, bishop of Lamasba (Lamasva) in Numidia, not far from Lambesae with which Fell confuses it apparently (*Suffr.* 75. *Syn. Carth.* sub Cyp. vii.). [E. W. B.]

PUSINNA, ST., a virgin, in Champagne, in the 5th century. According to her *Acta*, as published by the Bollandists (April iii. 166 sqq.), she was born in the Pertois, and, together with six sisters, also famed for their sanctity, was educated first by pious parents, and then by Eugenius, a priest. She received the veil from Alpinus or Albinus, bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, and after a life of good deeds, died, and was buried at Banson, where her tomb became celebrated for miracles. In the year 860 her remains, or supposed remains, were translated to the nunnery at Hervordia (Herford), in Westphalia (*ibid.* p. 170, sqq.). Her day is April 23. [S. A. B.]

PUTTA, the sixth bishop of Rochester and first bishop of Hereford (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 2, 5, 12). Bede describes him as a man "instructed in ecclesiastical discipline and contented with simplicity of life rather than strenuous in the affairs of the world;" and as especially skilled

in church music, which he had learned, after the Roman method, from the disciples of St. Gregory. He was ordained priest by Wilfrid whilst he was in Kent, before Theodore's arrival (Edd. v. Wilfr. c. 14). He was made bishop of Rochester by Theodore in the place of bishop Damian, after a long vacancy in the see, about 669, and was present at the council of Hertford in the year 673 as "episcopus castelli Cantuariorum quod dicitur Hrofescaestir." In the year 676 Ethelred of Mercia invaded Kent and sacked Rochester, whereupon Putta retired under the protection of the Mercian bishop Saxulf, taking no trouble about recovering his see or restoring the church of Rochester, but contenting himself with a church and a small estate, on which he resided continually, only occasionally leaving it to give instruction in the songs of the church. This new home of Putta is identified, although not by Bede himself, with Hereford, and Putta ranks as the first bishop of that see (*M.H.B.* 621; *W. Malmesb. G.P.* iv. § 163). Although there is little direct authority for this, there does not seem much reason to question it, as probably the creation of the diocese of Hereford was, like that of the other new dioceses of Mercia, an immediate result of the measures taken by Theodore in 679 (*Councils, &c.*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 130). Putta's death is dated, on the very questionable evidence of a MS. of Florence of Worcester, in 688 (*M.H.B.* 538). His successor Tyrhtel attests a charter of 693 (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 36). [S.]

PUTUBASTES (PUTUBATES, Πουτουβάστης, Πουτουβάστης), an Egyptian solitary in the time of Antony (Soz. iii. 14, vi. 30). [C. H.]

PYNUPHIUS (PINUFIOUS), presbyter and governor of a large coenobium near Panephris, in the east of Lower Egypt, in the 4th century. Finding the position he held unfavourable to the cultivation of humility, he withdrew by stealth, and proceeded alone to the coenobium of Tabenna in Thebais, where his person but not his fame was unknown, and where having obtained admission as a novice he was set to the performance of the meanest offices. After three years, through a travelling monk of his former monastery, it was discovered who he was; he was at once treated with the utmost deference and induced to return. He fled again, and embarking for Palestine, where he believed his very name was unknown, was received in the coenobium of Bethlehem, where Cassian then was. Here, too, some Egyptian monks discovered and brought him back. Cassian, on visiting Egypt, c. 390, called at his monastery, and it was there with him that his twentieth conference, *De Poenitentiae Fine*, was held. (Cassian, *Inst.* iv. 30-32, *Collat.* xx. 1; Tillem. xiv. 160, 165, 166.) [C. H.]

PYRAMUS, said to have been one of the British bishops of York. Geoffrey tells us that he was king Arthur's chaplain, that he was appointed by Arthur to the see after the expulsion of Sanxo, and that he restored the churches, etc., which had been destroyed (*Hist. Brit.* ix. 8). The chroniclers of the Arthurian school repeat this, and there is no other evidence for the assertion. [J. R.]

PYRRHUS, patriarch of Constantinople, succeeded his friend SERGIUS at the end of A.D. 638, or beginning of A.D. 639. He had previously been abbat at Chrysopolis. He was, like his predecessor, a Monothelite. Soon after his consecration he convened a synod in which he confirmed the ECTHESIS. (Mansi, x. 674, 1002, 1014; Maximus, *Disput.* 194, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xci. 352.) He also wrote to pope Joannes in support of Monothelism, referring to the forgery purporting to be by MENNAS. (*Max. Disp.* 181; Agatho, *Epp.* i. in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 1205). He was a friend of Heraclius, who before his death deposited large sums with him for the use of the empress Martina, in case her stepson CONSTANTINUS III. should expel her from the palace. This money Constantine obliged him to give up. Theophanes accuses him and Martina of poisoning Constantine, on whose death Pyrrhus, to appease the people, swore on the true Cross that neither through him nor through any one else, should Constantine's sons suffer any injury, but he was compelled by them to crown CONSTANTINUS IV., the eldest. The people were still incensed against him, invaded the church, tore the altar cloth, and carried off the keys. Pyrrhus fearing further violence, entered the church the following night, and laid his omophorion on the altar with the words, "I do not resign my bishopric, but I yield to the disbelieving people." This happened in September or October, A.D. 641. Sheltered for a time in a pious woman's house, he took a favourable opportunity of escaping to Carthage, PAULUS being appointed patriarch in his place. Pope Theodore while condemning the heresy of Pyrrhus, asserted that he should have been canonically deposed. [PAULUS (19).] Pyrrhus in Africa encountered MAXIMUS (23) his successor as abbat, with whom, in July A.D. 645, he held his celebrated Disputation. He was convinced by his arguments, and going to Rome presented a libellus, in which he condemned the heretical opinions of himself and his predecessors, and was received into communion by the pope, and treated as the legitimate patriarch, while on the other hand he was excommunicated by PAULUS. For the details of his reception see MARTINUS (3), Vol. III. 856. The exarch Plato sent to Rome and induced Pyrrhus to go to Ravenna, where he was persuaded to recant his recantation. Pope Theodore then pronounced a sentence of excommunication against him with unusual solemnity. [PAULUS.] Pyrrhus returned to the East, and on the death of Paulus on December 26th, A.D. 654, managed to get himself reappointed Patriarch, but died between four and five months afterwards. (*Lib. Pont., Vitae Martini et Theodori*; Theophanes, 275, 276, 282, 283, 286; Nicephorus; *Passio S. Martini*, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 117; Mansi, x. 878; *AA. SS.* Aug. i. 78*.) [F. D.]

Q

QUADRAGESIMUS, subdeacon of Buxentum, Gregory the Great's authority for his account of the miraculous restoration of a dead man to life by a monk (*Dial.* iii. 17). [F. D.]