

TYRANNUS, bishop of Antioch, 19th in succession. He succeeded Cyrillus A.D. 302. His episcopate synchronizes with the persecution of Diocletian, καθ' ὃν ἤκμασεν ἡ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν πολιορκία (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32), and though we know nothing further of him, in the words of Dr. Neale "his acceptance of the office in the midst of so fiery a trial is enough to stamp him at once as a Christian hero" (*Patriarchate of Antioch*, p. 60). He survived till peace was restored to the church, i.e. c. A.D. 312 (Theod. *H. E.* 1, 2). Eutychius calls him Euris, and assigns him ten years of office, placing, however, his accession too late, in the tenth year of Diocletian (p. 404). [E. V.]

TYRHTEL, the second bishop of Hereford (*M. H. B.* 621). He must have succeeded bishop Putta some time before 693, for his name is attached to a Mercian charter (K. C. D. 36), which, although undated, seems to belong to that year. He is not, however, mentioned by Bede, and the date, 688, assigned to him in a MS. addition to Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* 538) has no authority. His name occurs in the epitaph inscribed, according to William of Malmesbury, by archbishop Cuthbert on the tomb of his predecessors in the see of Hereford "Nomina sunt quorum, Walhstodus, Torthere, Tirhtil" (W. Malmesb. *G. P.* iv. § 163). [S.]

TYRL. [See **SEGRI**.]

TYSILIO (TYSSILIO, TYSSILIAW, TYSSILAV, TUSSILAV), Welsh saint and poet, son of Brochwel Ysgythrog ap Cyngen, prince of Powys, who is said to have commanded the native forces against the Saxons when the monks of Bangor were massacred. He is made by some the successor of St. Asaph as bishop, but is not accepted by Stubbs (*Reg. Sacr. Angl.* 157) and his being a bishop is doubtful. The events of his life are unknown; he belongs to the middle of the 7th century, and his feast is Nov. 8 (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 161, 277; Williams, *Em. Welsh.* 502; Rev. W. J. Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 267, 595; Rowlands, *Mon. Ant. Rest.* 155). His churches are numerous (*Camb. Quart. Mag.* i. 318 on Meivod and its antiquities; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 278-9). Of his poetry only one piece remains, in the form of a religious dialogue between two monks. (It is printed in *Myv. Arch.* i. 162 sq. and again as the *Colloquy of Llewelyn and Gwernerth*, with translation by Skene, *Four Anc. Books of Wales*, i. 590-4, ii. 237, from the *Red Book of Hergest*.) In the above collection of Welsh Archaeology (*ib.* ii. 81-390) there is the *Brut Breninodd ynys Prydain* or *Chronicle of the Kings of Britain*, which the editor has named the *Brut Tyssilio*, and given as one of the chief sources of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of Britain*; this has been translated into English "from the Welsh of Tyssilio," by the Rev. Peter Roberts (4to, London, 1811), but there is no ground for believing that Tyssilio wrote this Chronicle or other historical treatise. (Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. ii. 902; Skene, *Four An. Books of Wales*, i. 23 sq.; Stephens, *Lit. Kymry*, 315 sq. has an exhaustive account of the question and concludes wholly against the Tysilian authorship.) [J. G.]

U

UBILIGISCLUS, Arian bishop of Valencia, was one of the bishops who recanted Arianism at the third council of Toledo, A.D. 589, and were allowed to retain their sees. As in some other cases Valencia had for some time two bishops, Ubiligisclus, and the previous orthodox bishop, Celsinus. (*Esp. Sag.* viii. 164; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 226, 254.) [F. D.]

UFELWY (UFELWYNUS, UVELWYN, UBE-LUNI, UBILLWINUS), son of Cennydd ab Aneurin y Coed Aur ap Gildas, disciple of St. Dubricius and first a priest in his diocese and clerical witness (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 69); became a bishop in the see of Llandaff, probably in the district of Ergyng, and grants were made to him and the see of Llandaff during the reign of Gwrfodw, king of that district (*ib.* 151 sq. 625; Godwin, *De Præs. Angl.* 621; Stubbs, *Reg. Sacr. Angl.* 156); founded Llanufelwyn, Glamorganshire, probably near Cardiff (Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 517; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 226, 276). [J. G.]

UGNAS, bishop of Barcelona, one of the Arian bishops intruded by Leovigild, renounced Arianism at the third council of Toledo A.D. 589, the canons of which he subscribes first of all bishops who were not metropolitans, and was allowed to retain his see. He was also at the second council of Barcelona in Nov. A.D. 599. As the date of the appointment of Ugnas to Barcelona must have been c. A.D. 580, when Leovigild began to persecute, and as this date would scarcely have been sufficiently remote to give him precedence over all the bishops of Spain, Risco argues that he must have been previously bishop of some other see. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 226, 253, 692; *Esp. Sag.* xxix. 124.) [F. D.]

UHTRED, a subregulus of the Hwicci, frequently occurring in Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*. He was subject to Offa, king of Mercia (No. 178). Sometimes alone, and sometimes in conjunction with his brothers Aldred and Eanberht, he bestowed lands on two churches in Worcester, namely, St. Peter's, where their parents were buried, and St. Mary's. The charters, genuine and spurious, which convey and profess to convey these benefactions are numbers 102, 105, 117, 118, 125, 127, 128, 148. Their period is from 757 to 780, during the episcopates of Milred, Weremund, Tilhere, bishops of Worcester. The localities of the lands are marked chiefly by the rivers Stour and Salwarpe. [EANBERHT (3); HWICCI.] [C. H.]

UIBERT, bishop, subscribing a doubtful synodal act at Celchyth in 801. (Kemble, *C. D.* 1023; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 531.) [HIGBERT.] [C. H.]

ULCHED, Welsh saint of the 7th century, founder of Llachylched, in Anglesey, and commemorated Jan. 6th. (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 509.) [J. G.]

ULFILAS (ULPHILAS, URPHILAS in Philostorgius), the apostle of the Goths in the fourth century. His life and career are involved in much obscurity. Till fifty years ago we depended entirely upon the Church historians of the fifth century for our knowledge; Waitz, in 1840, discovered a manuscript of the Louvre, containing an independent account of Ulphilas, written by one of his own pupils, named Auxentius, Arian bishop of Silistria, who must therefore be regarded as an original witness. This manuscript gives us some details which shed light on the obscurity in which Ulphilas is involved. From these two sources we learn that he was born in the early years of the fourth century, probably in 311. He was consecrated bishop when thirty years of age, possibly by Eusebius of Nicomedia, at the Council of the Dedication, held at Antioch 341. In 380 he went to Constantinople, and died there that same year, or in the early days of 381. The circumstances of the life of Ulphilas raise the question of the origin of Gothic Christianity. Philostorgius tells us that, under Valerian and Gallienus in the second half of the third century, the Goths from the north of the Danube invaded the Roman territory and laid waste the province of Moesia as far as the Black Sea. They also crossed into Asia and ravaged Cappadocia and Galatia, whence they took a vast number of captives, including many Christian ecclesiastics. "These pious captives, by their intercourse with the barbarians, brought over large numbers to the true faith, and persuaded them to embrace the Christian religion in place of heathen superstitions. Of the number of these captives were the ancestors of Urphilas himself, who were of Cappadocian descent, deriving their origin from a village called Sadagolthina, near the city of Parnassus" (Philost. *H. E.* ii. 5). The Goths carried back these Christian captives into Dacia, where they were settled, and where considerable numbers embraced Christianity through their instrumentality. Ulphilas was the child of one of these Christian captives, and was trained in Christian principles. Socrates asserts that he was a disciple of a bishop, Theophilus who was present at Nice and subscribed its creed. He was at first a lector or reader in the church. The king of the Goths then sent him to Constantinople as ambassador to the emperor, about 340, when he was consecrated bishop. He returned to Dacia, laboured there for seven years, and then migrated into Moesia, driven from his original home by a persecution, probably between 347 and 350. About that period he produced his great literary work, inventing the Gothic character and translating "all the books of Scripture with the exception of the Books of Kings, which he omitted because they are a mere narrative of military exploits, and the Gothic tribes were especially fond of war, and were in more need of restraints to check their military passions than of spurs to urge them on to deeds of war" (Philost. *l.c.*). We next hear of Ulphilas as present at the synod of Constantinople A.D. 360, when the Acacian party triumphed and issued a creed which taught a middle view between that of the orthodox and Arian parties. This was the creed of the Homoean sect, headed by Acacius in the East and by Ursacius and Valens in the West. It is important to

note the exact words of this creed, as it defines the position of Ulphilas. The material part runs thus: "We do not despise the Antiochian formula of the synod in *Encoeniis*, but because the terms *ἁμοούσιος* and *ὁμοιούσιος* occasion much confusion, and because some have recently set up the *ἀνόμοιος*, we therefore reject *ἁμοούσιος* and *ὁμοιούσιος* as contrary to the Holy Scriptures; the *ἀνόμοιος*, however, we anathematize, and acknowledge that the Son is similar to the Father in accordance with the words of the Apostle, who calls him the image of the invisible God. We believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, who was begotten by Him before all ages without change, the only begotten God, Logos from God, Light, Life, Truth, and Wisdom And whoever declares anything else outside this faith has no part in the Catholic Church" (see Hefele, ii. 265, Clark's ed.; and Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 180-182). The subsequent history of Ulphilas is involved in much obscurity. Sozomen, vi. 37, intimates that Ulphilas and his converts suffered much at the hands of Athanaric, a lively picture of whose persecution, A.D. 372-375, will be found in the Acts of St. Sabas, Ruinart's *Acta Sincera*, p. 670, and of St. Nicetas, Sep. 15 (cf. *AA. SS. Boll. Sep.*), both of which documents are full of most interesting details concerning the life and manners of the Goths. Mr. C. A. Scott, of Cambridge, has lately published an interesting monograph on Ulphilas, in which he diligently collects every scrap of information and discusses his history and that of Gothic Christianity during this period at considerable length. Arianism seems to have specially flourished during the first half of the fourth century in the provinces lying along the Danube. VALENS and URSACIUS, who lived there, were the leaders of Western Arianism, and Sulpicius Severus expressly asserts (*Chron.* ii. 38) that almost all the bishops of the two Pannonias were Arians. This would sufficiently account for the Arianism of the Goths who were just then accepting Christianity. The literary fame of Ulphilas is connected with his Gothic translation of the Bible, the one great monument of that language now extant. It does not exist in a complete shape. The fragments extant are contained in (1) the Codex Argenteus, now at Upsala; (2) the Codex Carolinus; and (3) the Ambrosian fragments published by Mai. A complete bibliography of these fragments, as known till 1840, will be found in Ceillier, iv. 346, and a complete edition in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xviii. with a Life, Gothic Grammar and Glossaries. Scott, in his book, whose title is *Ulphilas, the Apostle of the Goths*, 1885, gathers together the literature since 1840, and gives a long account of the MS. of Waitz. He also discusses (p. 137) some fragments attributed to Ulphilas. The best German works on the life of Ulphilas are those of Waitz, 1840, Krafft, 1860, and Bessel, 1860. The latest works on the Gothic Bible are those of E. Bernhardt, Halle, 1875, and Stamm, Paderborn, 1878, in Germany; Bosworth's *Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels*, London, 1874, and Skeat, *Gospel of St. Mark in Gothic*, Oxford, 1883; *An Introduction, Phonological, Morphological, Syntactic, to the Gothic of Ulphilas*, by T. Le Marchant Douse, 1886.

The chief ancient sources for the life of

Ulphilas are Philostorgius, *H. E.* ii. 5; Soc. ii. 41, iv. 33; Soz. vi. 37; Theod. iv. 37.

[G. T. S.]

ULPIANUS (1), a martyr at Tyre, in the Diocletian persecution, celebrated by Eusebius in *Mart. Palaest.* c. 5. He was whipped, and then flung into the sea, tied up in a bull's hide with a serpent and a dog.

[G. T. S.]

ULPIANUS (2), a count to whom Theodoret wrote a highly complimentary letter. (Theod. *Ep.* 22.)

[E. V.]

ULTAN (1), bishop of Clogher, said to have succeeded Maccartin, A.D. 506, and been buried at Clogher near him. (Ware, *Ir. Bps.* Clogher; Cotton, *Fast. Eccl. Hib.* iii. 71; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 210.)

[J. G.]

ULTAN (2), bishop of Ardbraccan, co. Meath, son of Conchobhair. He belongs to the third class of Irish saints, and flourished in the first half of the 7th century. He was related to St. Brigida of Kildare, and may have been disciple of St. Declan of Ardmore, or at least a contemporary. At Ardbraccan he was specially the bishop of the Dal Conchobair branch of the Desi of Meath, and belonged to the southern half of the Irish Church which began early to symbolise with Rome. It is related of him (*M. Doneg.* Sept. 4) that in the plagues which were then so common his special delight was to care for and feed the motherless children of Erin. But his chief fame rests on his connection with the two great saints of Ireland, St. Patrick and St. Brigida. As master of Tirechan he gave that author the material for his *Annotations on the Life of St. Patrick* in the *Book of Armagh* [TIRECHAN]: whether he himself had previously written a *Life of St. Patrick* is uncertain. He is also said to have collected the works of St. Brigida, which his disciple Brogan Cloen put into form, and which Colgan has given as his first *Life of St. Brigida*. [BROGAN (2).] *The Alphabetical Hymn in praise of St. Brigid*, attributed to him, is of very doubtful authorship, and ascribed also to Ninnidh Laimidan and Fiacc of Sletty. It is given in its fragmentary form, with prefatory and additional notes by Dr. Todd (*Book of Hymns*, fasc. i. 54 sq.) and only the last three stanzas are extant, a fourth being added by another hand. Though Colgan (*Tr. Th.* 527 sq.) gives the *Tertia Vita S. Brigida*, as "authore, ut videtur, S. Ultano episcopo," yet in his notes (p. 542) he leaves the authorship entirely uncertain. St. Ultan died Sept. 4th, A.D. 576 (Ussher), but his age of one hundred and eighty-nine years is merely a chronological expedient to make him synchronize with SS. Patrick, Brigida, and Declan (Todd, *S. Patr.* and *Book of Hymns*; Colgan, *Acta SS.* and *Tr. Th.* pass.; *Four Mast.* by O'Don. i. 268-9; O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 343 sq. 607-8; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 87, 454. ii. 342 sq.; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 375, 534, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 657). In *Kal. Drum.* (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 23) he is simply presbyter and confessor.

[J. G.]

ULTAN (3), brother of St. Furseus, and abbat of Peronne [FURSEUS (1)]. After a long monastic probation he became a hermit, and St. Furseus lived with him a whole year in

continence, prayer, and manual labour before he set out for Gaul about A.D. 648 (Bede, *H. E.* iii. c. 19; *M. H. B.* 192-3; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 539; O'Conor, *Rer. Hib. Scrip.* iv. 185 sq.). On the death of his brother he crossed over to France, and becoming abbat of Peronne died on May 1st, about A.D. 680. He may also have been at Fosse in the interval between his leaving England and being abbat of Peronne [FULLANUS (2)], but the legend is mythical. He is also accounted the founder of St. Quentin, in the Dep. of Aisne; his relics were preserved at Peronne and Fosse. (Mabillon, *Acta SS. O. S. B.* ii. 732; Boll. *Acta SS. Mai.* i. 121; Lappenberg, *Hist. Engl.* ed. Thorpe, 1845, i. 183; Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 455-6, with the Scotch annalists.)

[J. G.]

ULTAN (4), son of Ui Cunga, abbat of Clonard, co. Meath, died A.D. 665 (*Ann. Tig.*; *Ann. Ult.*, and *Four Mast.* A.D. 664). Ultan O'Conga is included among the bishops of Meath (Cotton, *Fast. Eccl. Hib.* iii. 109; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 229).

[J. G.]

ULTAN (5), son of Cummine, bishop of Tullamain, co. Tipperary, died A.D. 711. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 710; *Four Mast.* A.D. 709.)

[J. G.]

ULTAN (6), monk of Lindisfarne, probably an Irish Scot, about the middle of the 8th century, has a short memoir by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 109) from Harpsfield and Menard, at Jan. 17, but his proper feast is Aug. 8. He had come to England for pious retirement, and was famous as a painter and decorator of the sacred books (Harpsfield, *Hist.* c. 14, p. 177; Leland, *Collect.* t. ii. 364). He may be the Ultan or Ulton who had a chapel in Valay in the Scotch Hebrides (Martin, *West Isl.*, 67, 2nd ed.), and that Ultan whose arm, enclosed in a silver shrine, was held by the O'Donnells in the island of Sanda, off the Mull of Cantire (Reeves, *S. Adamnan*, lxvii.; O'Conor, *Ep. Nun. up.* 179).

[J. G.]

UNILAS (Oñvilas, WUNNILA), a bishop ordained by Chrysostom for the Goths. He was a man of uncommon abilities, and had already accomplished great things within a brief episcopate, when in 404 news was brought to Chrysostom at Cucusus that he was dead (Chrys. *Ep.* xiv. § 5; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulphilas*, 153). [MODUARIUS.]

[C. H.]

UNWONA (UNWONO, INWONA) (*Chr. S.* 778), the sixth bishop of Leicester (*M. H. B.* 624). He succeeded bishop Eadbert some time after the year 781, and appears in charters and councils as late as 799. Werenbert, his successor, was bishop in 802. His episcopate coincides thus with the stormy period of the archbishopric of Lichfield, in the history of which he must have taken no unimportant part. He appears first among the bishops attending the legate council of 787, the decrees of which he attests as "Unuwona Legorensium episcopus," Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 461; and he attests charters during the rest of the life of Offa, being almost invariably among the witan of that king: in 788 (*K. C. D.* No. 153), in 789 (*ib.* 155, 156, 157), in 793 or 795 (*ib.* 159); and his name appears in other charters undated (*ib.* 165, 166, 167). The two charters of Egfrith, Offa's son, to which

Unwona's name is appended, are of questionable authenticity (*ib.* 172, 173); but he reappears under Kenulf in 798 (*ib.* 175) and 799 (*ib.* 176, 1020). He is mentioned in the Peterborough copy of the Chronicle as attesting a charter of Offa, printed in Kemble's *Codex*, No. 165 (Chr. S. M. H. B. 335), but under a misleading date (A.D. 777, "in the days of king Offa"); the date assigned to him in the interpolated MS. of Florence of Worcester (*M. H. B.* p. 546, note 6) is quite arbitrary. William of Malmesbury, *G. P.* iv. 176, knew only his name, which in the best charters (No. 153, 175) is written Unwono. The Charter of Caenwalha (*K. C. D.* 985), to which the attestation of *Unwana* is appended, is spurious or garbled. Unwona is mentioned by Matthew Paris as accompanying Offa at the Invention and Translation of St. Alban (*Hist. duor.* Off. p. 26), but this is fable. [S.]

URANIUS (1), Carthaginian refugee at Rome, A.D. 250. (*Cyp. Ep.* 22.) See MACARIUS (20). [E. W. B.]

URANIUS (2), a Mesopotamian bishop, who united himself to Audius, and was head of his sect after the death of its founder. (Epiph. *Haer.* lxx.; Ceill. vi. 406.) [ANTHROPOMORPHITAE.] [G. T. S.]

URANIUS (3), bishop of Tyre, one of the pronounced Arians of the Athanasian period, the associate of Acacius, Eudoxius, and George of Alexandria. We find him one of the infamous little Anomoean cabal 358, by which Eudoxius was raised to the throne of Antioch (*Soz. H. E.* iv. 12), and again at Seleucia the next year, where he was deposed along with Acacius, and the other Anomoean leaders (*Socr. H. E.* ii. 39, 40; *Soz. H. E.* iv. 22), some unspecified crime being alleged against him (*Athanas. de Synod.* pp. 880-913; Epiph. *Haer.* 73; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 805). [E. V.]

URANIUS (4), a priest who, at the request of Pacatus, who was intending to write a metrical life of Paulinus of Nola, sends him an account of the death of the saint. (*Uranii Epist.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liii. 859.) Chifflet supposes him to be the Uranius mentioned by Paulinus in his nineteenth letter written in A.D. 400. [F. D.]

URANIUS (5), bishop of Emesa, a constant friend of Theodoret, remaining faithful to him during all his troubles. He succeeded Pompeianus subsequently to 445, in which year the latter attend the synod at Antioch (*Labbe*, iv. 727). On Theodoret's deposition by the "Robbers' Synod," Uranius wrote in language which Theodoret mistaking for a counsel to conceal his real sentiments by a so-called economy (*τὴν καλουμένην οἰκονομίαν*), vigorously repudiated (*Theod. Ep.* 122). Uranius replied in a long letter, which convinced Theodoret of his mistake and exhibited such affectionate fidelity, that he was induced in his case to violate his rule of refusing the presents (*eulogiae*), which other sympathising bishops had sent him (*Ep.* 123). At the "Latrocinium" Uranius also was himself the subject of a lengthy act of accusation, intercalated in the proceedings against Domnus of Antioch, brought forward by a presbyter named Marcellus and the monks of

his convent, in which he was charged with profligacy, and the usurpation of the see to which a certain Peter had been canonically consecrated. It was alleged that his own consecration was defective, having been enforced on his consecrators by his friends among pagans, Jews, and stage players, and had been at once repudiated by those who had been compelled to perform it, who warned his clergy to hold no communion with Uranius. The moving cause of this unscrupulous attack was (as Abbé Martin has remarked) the fact that Uranius was a friend of Theodoret, and had signed the act of deposition of Eutyches (*Martin, Actes du Brigandage*, pp. 146-148). He attended the council of Chalcedon in 451 (*Labbe*, iv. 443, 451, 789), and subscribed with the other bishops of his province the reply to the encyclical of the emperor Leo (*ibid.* 922). During his episcopate the head of John the Baptist was believed to have been discovered at Emesa, for the reception of which sacred relic he caused a new church to be erected (*Acta Sanctorum*, Jun. 24; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 840). [E. V.]

URANIUS (6), bishop of Himeria in Osrhoëne. He first appears as the instigator of the cabal against his metropolitan Ibas of Edessa, and taking part in the synod held at Antioch in 445, in the matter of Athanasius of Perrha, at which Ibas was summoned to appear, but excused himself by letter (*Labbe*, iv. 728). Resolved to hunt down Ibas, Uranius followed his fellow conspirators to Constantinople to lay their complaints before the emperor and Flavian, by whom the case was remitted for trial to the East, Oct. 26, 448. Uranius was appointed, with Photius of Tyre, and Eustathius of Berytus, to hear the case at Tyre, whence to avoid popular tumults it was removed to Berytus, Feb. 1, 449. (For the details of the trial see *IBAS*, Vol. III. p. 194.) The trial ended in a compromise, from which Uranius alone dissented (*Labbe*, iv. 630-638). We next find Uranius in the violent and unscrupulous majority at the Robbers' Synod at Ephesus (*Labbe*, iv. 118). He was not present at the opening of the proceedings against Ibas (*Martin, Actes du Brigandage*, p. 43); but he took part in the deposition of his nephew, Daniel, bishop of Charrae, employing Libanius a deacon of Samosata as his spokesman, from his ignorance of Greek (*ibid.* p. 79), and with utter disregard of consistency asserted the orthodoxy of Eutyches, Eulogius, a presbyter of Edessa, speaking for him (*Labbe*, iv. 266). He followed the tide at Chalcedon, and calmly reversed his former decisions (*ibid.* 589). In consequence of a list of subscriptions of an earlier date having been carelessly appended to the acts of the council of Rome under Symmachus, A.D. 503, it has been erroneously asserted that Uranius took part in that synod half a century later than that of Chalcedon (*Le Quien, Or. Christ.* ii. 983; *Martin, Le Brigandage; Actes du Brigandage*). [E. V.]

URANIUS (7), subadjuva (see *RODANUS*), bearer of the letter of Zeno to Simplicius against JOANNES (11) TALAIJA (*Mansi*, viii. 1063), to which the 17th letter of Simplicius, written July 15th, A.D. 482 (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 56), is a reply. Simplicius praises the bearer for his fidelity and ability. He is perhaps the

same person as the Uranius sent as ambassador by Zeno in A.D. 484, to HUNNERIC, q. v. Vol. III. 180. [F. D.]

URBANENSES, a small party among the Donatists, taking their name, as Morcelli thinks, from Urbanus, bishop of Formi, but nothing is known about them. Aug. c. *Cresc.* iv. 60, 73. Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 160. [URBANUS, of Formi.] [H. W. P.]

URBANUS ASTERIUS. [ASTERIUS.]

URBANUS (1), bishop of Rome, under the emperor Alexander Severus, from A.D. 223 (or 222) to A.D. 230. The Liberian Catalogue gives Maximinus and Elianus (223) as the consuls of the year of his accession; Agricola and Clementinus (230) as those of the year of his death; but, inconsistently, eight years eleven months and eleven days as the duration of his episcopate. Eusebius also intimates A.D. 223 as the year of his accession, saying (*H. E.* vi. 21) that Callistus succeeded Zephyrinus in the first year of Elagabalus (*i.e.* 218), and after five years was succeeded by Urbanus. Lipsius, however (*Chron. der Röm. Bischöfe*), considers A.D. 222 as the probable date, thus accounting for the duration assigned to his reign. In the Felician Catalogue (A.D. 530), and also in some, considered the most authentic, MSS. of the *Lib. Pontif.*, xiv. *Kal. Jun.* (*i.e.* 19 May) is given as the day of his burial; but in other texts of the *Lib. Pontif.*, and in the Martyrologies, and in the *Acta S. Urbani*, it is said to have been 25 May, on which day he is commemorated in the Roman Calendar.

Nothing is known with certainty of the life of this pope. The *Acta S. Urbani*, accepted as genuine by the Bollandists, and by them assigned to pope Anteros (235–236), show signs of a much later date, probably not earlier than the 5th century, and cannot be at all relied on. One sufficient ground for discrediting them is that he is represented as having suffered martyrdom under Alexander Severus, whereas (in addition to the fact that there appears to have been no persecution of the Christians at Rome under this emperor) neither in the *Catalog. Felic.*, nor in the later editions of the *Lib. Pontif.*, nor in the *Acta S. Caeciliae*, in which Urban is prominently referred to (these *Acta* themselves being now thought to have been compiled not before, and probably after, the end of the 4th century), is there any mention of his martyrdom.

In the *Lib. Pontif.*, all that is said of him in connexion with any martyrdoms is, "Hic sua traditione multos convertit ad baptismum et credulitatem: Tiburtium etiam et Valerianum nobilissimum virum, sponsum sanctae Caeciliae, quos etiam usque ad martyrii palmam perduxit. Et per ejus monita et doctrinam multi martyrio coronati sunt." Nearly the same is the account of him in the *Catal. Felic.*, and what is thus said about him corresponds with what we find in the *Acta S. Caeciliae*, which seem thus to have been known to the compilers of the pontifical annals, but not the *Acta S. Urbani*, which make him out to have been himself a martyr. For the Acts of St. Caecilia give the following account of her:—She was of a noble Roman family, had believed in Christ, and vowed virginity. Espoused by her parents to Valerian, a young Roman who was not a Christian, she went through the form

of marriage with him, but afterwards acquainted him with her vow, and persuaded him to resort to Urban the pope, by whom he was converted and baptized. So also was Tiburtius, the brother of Valerian. These two, Valerian and Tiburtius, were brought before Turcius Almachius, the praefectus Urbi, and by him delivered for execution to one Maximus, who, through their exhortations, was also converted to the faith. All three were put to death, and thus received the crown of martyrdom. Soon afterwards Caecilia was sought out by the praefect Turcius, and required to sacrifice to the gods. On her refusal she also, after miraculous incidents, died a martyr, and was buried by Urban and his deacons in the cemetery of Callistus, on the Appian Way "among his fellow-bishops, where all the bishops, confessors, and martyrs were buried." Her house beyond the Tiber Urban consecrated to God as a church. For further details see CAECILIA (1) and VALERIANUS (3). Now it seems plain that, as has been said above, the notices of Urban in the *Lib. Pontif.* are founded on this story about Caecilia and her companions, whatever be the date or authenticity of the story itself. That there was a Caecilia who suffered martyrdom is open to no reasonable doubt; but the true facts about her are uncertain. According to Fortunatus of Poitiers, writing at the end of the 6th century, she suffered in Sicily under Marcus Aurelius or Commodus; the martyrology of Ado also assigns her martyrdom to the age of M. Aurelius and Commodus (161–192), though inconsistently connecting her with pope Urban; the Greek Menologies represent her as suffering at Rome in the time of Diocletian (284–305); in the Liberian *Depositiones Martyrum* she is not mentioned at all. De Rossi (having in view the ancient traditions and recent discoveries with respect to her and pope Urban's places of burial, of which more will be said below) thinks it most probable that she suffered at Rome under M. Aurelius or Commodus (as alleged by Ado), when there was really such a persecution of Christians there as her Acts speak of; that some other Urban (a bishop, otherwise unknown, who was in Rome in her day) had been associated with her, and had taken charge of her burial; and that he came to be erroneously identified in the martyrologies with the pope of the same name, a mistake all the more likely to occur from the tomb of pope Urban being found in the papal crypt of the cemetery of St. Callistus close to the crypt called that of St. Caecilia, in which the virgin martyr lay (see Brownlow and Northcote's *Roma Sotterranea*, p. 163). If this supposition be correct, the legend of pope Urban's martyrdom may have had some foundation in traditions about the earlier Urban, whom De Rossi supposes to have been really a martyr, though nothing is known about him. Lipsius (*Chron. der Röm. Bisch.*) objects to this theory of there having been an earlier bishop Urban resident at Rome as unsupported and improbable. De Rossi, however, maintains it with confidence, as explaining many difficulties; and it certainly appears tenable, though it does not seem necessary for his explanation that the supposed earlier Urban should have been a bishop.

The discovery by De Rossi in the papal crypt of the cemetery of St. Callistus of a broken stone

(apparently once the *mensa* of an altar-tomb), bearing the imperfect inscription OVPBANOC E... has raised an interest in the question of pope Urban's burial-place, and in the more general one of his alleged connexion with St. Caecilia. Adjoining the papal crypt, and communicating with it, there is another, called that of St. Caecilia, which the numerous epitaphs to Caecilii and their connexions show to have been the burial-place of the Caecilian family. On one of the walls is a painting of a richly-attired Roman lady, supposed to represent St. Caecilia, which De Rossi attributes conjecturally to the 7th century, and also one of pope Urban in pontifical robes, with his name inscribed, apparently not earlier than the 10th or 11th century. These pictures of course prove nothing beyond the belief current at the times when they were painted; viz. that St. Caecilia (if the painting is intended for her) had been buried here, and that pope Urban had been associated with her according to the legend. But, further, pope Paschal I. (acc. 817) is said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have sought for, and at length found close to where the ancient popes were buried (*i.e.* the aforesaid papal crypt), the remains of St. Caecilia, clad in rich garments embroidered with gold, with linen cloths, stained with blood, rolled up at her feet, lying in a cypress coffin, and to have translated them to the church which had been built in her honour on the supposed site of her house and martyrdom in the Trastevere. He is said also to have translated previously the remains of popes Urban and Lucius and others from a place close to that where he found St. Caecilia.^a It is to be here observed that a stone bearing the inscription ΛΟΥΚΙΚ (with others inscribed with the names of popes of the same period) have been discovered in the papal crypt as well as that, above mentioned, bearing the name of Urban. Now there seems to be no reason to doubt that the crypt called that of St. Caecilia was her original resting-place; it was likely that she would be laid in the crypt of her family, if it existed in her time; and the tradition embodied in her *Acta* that she was buried near the popes, as well as the alleged discovery by pope Paschal of her remains in proximity to theirs, with the painting on the wall of her crypt above described, supports this conclusion. There is a deep recess in the wall of this crypt which separates it from the papal crypt, capable of

^a As the story is told, the body of the saint was found whole and incorrupt as when she died; and it is said also to have been so discovered under the altar of the church of St. Caecilia in Trastevere in the time of pope Clement VIII., A.D. 1599. Baronius, the historian, was commissioned by the pope to examine and report upon it, and he states that it was so. Whatever may be thought now of the probability of the body having been preserved from decay (a circumstance alleged of other saints), there is no improbability in the story of Paschal having found and translated the remains with the gold embroidered garments, in which the saint had been buried, round them. The discovery (A.D. 1827) of the supposed remains of St. Cuthbert (another saint whose body was said to have been incorruptible) under the site of his shrine at Durham is a case in point. Only a skeleton of the body was found in 1827, but it was enveloped in gold embroidered vestments, considerable portions of which had been remarkably preserved, together with other relics. (See Raine's *St. Cuthbert*, *publ.* 1828.)

receiving a sarcophagus; and in this De Rossi concludes that she was originally laid, and that there pope Paschal found her. But there is still a doubt as to whether the Urban whose monumental stone has been discovered in the papal crypt, and whose remains were presumably translated by Paschal, was really the pope of that name. The letter E after OVPBANOC suggests ἐπίσκοπος, and the letters are said by De Rossi to be of the same general character with those of the names of other popes of the same period, whose slabs remain, and of whose burial in the crypt there is no doubt. But on the other hand we find a consentient old tradition that pope Urban was buried, not in the cemetery of Callistus, but in that of Praetextatus, which is on the opposite side of the Appian Way. So state the Felician Catalogue (530), the later editions of the *Lib. Pontif.*, the *Martyrol. Hieron. ad 25 Maii*, and Itineraries of the 7th and 8th centuries. Lipsius, relying on this testimony, inclines to the view that the Urban of the papal crypt was some other Urban, not necessarily a bishop, since the letter E after his name might have been the beginning of some other expression than ἐπίσκοπος, *e.g.* ἐν εἰρήνῃ. De Rossi, on the other hand, is decidedly of opinion that the slab in the papal crypt must have been that of the pope, who was actually buried there; and he attributes the contrary tradition to a confusion between him and the earlier Urban, whom he supposes to have been contemporary with St. Caecilia, and to have been buried in the cemetery of Praetextatus. The facts of the case he takes to have been as follows:—Caecilia was martyred (as aforesaid) under M. Aurelius or Commodus, *i.e.* some forty years before the time of pope Urban, who consequently had nothing to do with her. She was buried, through the care of the supposed earlier Urban, in the crypt of her *gens*, viz. the same as is now known as that of St. Caecilia, and which existed then. The land in which this crypt was situated was made over by the Caecilian family, which had then become a Christian one,^b to pope Zephyrinus (c. 200) for the purpose of a common Christian cemetery (see ZEPHYRINUS). Callistus, to whose care it was entrusted by Zephyrinus, extended it, adding to the original Caecilian crypt, and hence the whole cemetery came to be called his. Among such extensions was the papal crypt, adjoining the original one, which became the usual burial-place of the popes, and there pope Urban was in due time buried. The fact of his tomb being there, and thus near to St. Caecilia's, would naturally suggest in a later age the view of his having been the Urban who had been contemporary with her and buried her; and the tradition that he had laid her "inter collegas suos episcopos," &c., had this foundation of fact, that she was interred close to where he and other popes were afterwards laid, and that her remains and theirs did thus rest together.

The legend about St. Urban's martyrdom is to

^b That it was not supposed to have been a Christian one when St. Caecilia witnessed for the faith seems implied by the story of her having been espoused against her will to a heathen. If that part of her legend (in which there is nothing improbable) be true, her martyrdom may have led to the general conversion of her family.

the effect that, though Alexander Severus did not persecute the Christians, yet governors and magistrates continued to bring accusations against them; that Urban, who was hiding in the catacombs, was brought before Turcius Almachius,* the praefectus Urbi, on a charge of exciting sedition, and of having been the cause of the martyrdoms, in number five thousand, under the late emperors, and also of having received the possessions of St. Caecilia which had been confiscated to the state; that, on his replying that all these possessions had been given to the poor, he was beaten, imprisoned, and after first converting Aurelinus his jailor, was beheaded.

He is thus noticed (25 May) in the Roman Martyrology: "Romae via Nomentana natalis B. Urbani Papae et Martyris, cujus exhortatione et doctrina multi (in quibus sunt Tiburtius et Valerianus) Christi fidem susceperunt: ipse quoque in persecutione Alexandrini Severi pro ecclesia Dei multa passus tandem cervicibus abscessis martyrio coronatus est." [J. B.—y.]

URBANUS (2), Cyp. *Ep.* 51, Roman confessor, A.D. 250. See MOYSES, MAXIMUS (20). [E. W. B.]

URBANUS (3), governor of Palestine, under whom a great number suffered in the second year of the Diocletian persecution (Eus. *MM. Palaest.* cap 3). Eusebius, in cap. 7 of the same treatise, tells us of his deposition and condemnation to death by Maximinus, whose favourite and active agent in persecution he had been.

[G. T. S.]

URBANUS (4), Donatist bishop of Formi, one of two places in Numidia, of the same name but of unknown site, probably near Idicra, who was associated with Felix bishop of that place, in his scandalous behaviour. [FELIX (90) Vol. I. 491.] (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 160.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (5), Sept. 5, martyr with Theodoretus, Menedemus, and seventy-seven other ecclesiastics, at the hands of the Arians, about the year 371. The emperor Valens was displeased with them for laying a complaint before him concerning the ill-treatment suffered by the Catholic party. Modestus, the prefect, sent them to sea with secret orders to the sailors to burn their ship, which they duly effected (Socrates, *H. E.* iv. 16). [G. T. S.]

URBANUS (6), bishop of Sicca, or Sicilia Veneria, a town of proconsular Africa (Kaff) 22 m. from Musti (Ant. *Itin.* 41. 4. Shaw, *Trav.* p. 95. Aug. *Ep.* 229). Urbanus, who appears to have been a member of Augustine's monastic society at Hippo (Aug. *Ep.* 139. 34), had occasion to remove from his office for grave misconduct a presbyter named Apiarius. Perhaps, as Tillemont suggests, he had done so in a manner

* The name of Turcius Almachius (who appears also in the Acts of St. Caecilia as her persecutor) is pointed out by Lipsius as a sign of the comparative lateness of these *Acta*. For it was not (he says) till towards the end of the fourth century that the Turcian family begins to be prominent in the accounts of martyrs, as one that had remained heathen, and was peculiarly obnoxious to the Christians.

which was not quite regular. However this may be, Apiarius took upon himself to appeal to Zosimus, bishop of Rome, who, in a manner equally irregular, ordered him to be restored. In a council which met May 1, 418, the African bishops decreed that no priest, deacon, or inferior clerk, should prosecute any appeal beyond sea. Zosimus then sent a commission to Africa, consisting of Faustinus, bishop of Potenza, and two Roman presbyters, Philip and Asellus. They carried with them verbal instructions, and also a letter (commonitorium) stating four points which they were to impress on the African bishops: 1. That appeals from bishops of other churches should be made to Rome. 2. That bishops should not cross the sea unnecessarily (importune) to visit the seat of government (comitatum). 3. About settling through neighbouring bishops matters relating to priests and deacons excommunicated by their own bishops. In this letter Zosimus quotes a decree purporting to be one of the council of Nicaea, enjoining appeal to the bishop of Rome in case of bishops degraded by the bishops of their own province. 4. About excommunicating Urbanus, or at least summoning him to Rome unless he revoked his decision against Apiarius. This was in the latter part of the year 418. Though no record exists of any council held for the purpose, it is plain from the reference in the acts of the subsequent council to a "former" letter, that the African bishops must have considered these propositions, and determined that they were willing to accept provisionally the first and third, until the canons of Nicaea on which they were said to be founded, should be examined, for they were not aware of the existence among them of such rules as these. But at the end of 418 Zosimus died, and was succeeded by Boniface, and probably in consequence of the troubles connected with his accession, no further action was taken, and no meeting of bishops took place until May 419, when 217 bishops met in council at Carthage with Aurelius and Valentinus, primate of Numidia, at their head. (Hardouin, *Conc.* vol. i. p. 934; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 156, 157. d.) Faustinus and his colleagues attended the meeting, and stated the conditions proposed by Zosimus. The bishops insisted on seeing them in writing, and the documents were accordingly, but not till then, produced and read by Daniel the notary. The fourth article referred, as has been seen above, to a decree said to be one of those of the council of Nicaea. On this Alypius, bishop of Tagaste, remarked that the decree quoted by Zosimus did not appear in the Greek copies with which the African bishops were acquainted, and proposed that reference should be made to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, to obtain information as to the genuineness, and also that pope Boniface should be requested to communicate with the same bishops for the same purpose. Faustinus then proposed that the enquiry should be made by the pope alone, who should communicate its result to the African bishops, to which proposal Aurelius replied, that they would send a letter to him with a full account of their proceedings. To this, after some discussion in which Augustine took part, the council unanimously agreed, agreeing also that full submission was due to the decrees of the Nicene council, of which copies

had been brought to Africa by Caecilianus the bishop who was present at its meeting. (Hardouin, *Conc.* vol. i. pp. 934-939, and p. 1242-1250. Bruns, *Conc.* vol. i. p. 155-160.) Accordingly a letter was sent to Boniface, of which the Roman delegates were the bearers, relating the circumstances of the case, and the decisions at which the African bishops had arrived, including a request to him to consult the eastern bishops as to the decrees of the council of Nicaea (Bruns, pp. 196-198). Letters were also sent to them requesting information, and answers received from Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, and from Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, containing authentic copies of the Nicene decrees, which were by the direction of Atticus, translated into Latin for the benefit of the African church (Bruns, p. 200), in whose archives they were retained, and copies sent to Boniface in November 419. (Hefele, *Conc.* i. p. 358 German ed., p. 357 Eng. ed.) Pending the result of these consultations, the council determined that Apiarius should be allowed, under a circular letter, to exercise his office in any other place than Sica, and the letter to Boniface contained a respectful protest against arrogance (typhum) perhaps as shown on the part of Faustinus, but seeming also indirectly, by a marked expression of contrast (tua sanctitate Romanae ecclesiae presidente), to include Zosimus in this charge. No mention is made of any action taken in this matter by Boniface, who died A.D. 422, and was succeeded by Celestine I., but in 426 the question was revived by further misconduct on the part of Apiarius at Tahraca, and, when he was removed from his office by the African bishops, he again appealed to Rome. At a council summoned for the purpose Faustinus appealed again and behaved with great insolence, demanding on the part of the Roman pontiff that Apiarius should be restored, a demand which the bishops entirely refused to concede. A strenuous dispute was carried on for three days, which however was brought to an end by a confession of his own guilt by Apiarius; but the assembled bishops did not neglect the opportunity of requesting the bishop of Rome in future to be less easy in receiving appeals, and not to admit to communion persons excommunicated by them, being not only as the canons of Nicaea prescribe, clergy and lay people, but still more so bishops, lest if they have been condemned in their own province and restored by his authority he may seem to have acted hastily or unduly: all appeals ought to be terminated in the province in which they begin, or in a general council. They repeat, on the authority of the replies received from the bishops of Alexandria and Constantinople, the absence from the decrees of the Nicene council of the one alleged by Celestine's predecessor, and beg him not to send clerical messengers (legatos a latere) to execute his decrees at the request of any one, so that there may be no importation into the Church of Christ of the pretentious arrogance of the world (fumosum typhum saeculi). The alleged decree of the Nicaean council so often mentioned above was really one of the council of Sardica (Bruns, *Conc. Sard.* 3, 4, 7, i., pp. 91, 93), but, as Quesnel remarks, there is no reason to think that either of the Roman pontiffs acted in the matter with bad faith, however much

they may be thought to have overstepped their own authority, for the decrees of Sardica were no doubt accepted by the Roman church as having an oecumenical sanction, and as such might be quoted as on the same level with those of Nicaea, but it seems strange that the African bishops should have been ignorant of this fact, for one bishop at least from that region was present at the council [GRATUS (1) Vol. II. 278]. The whole matter is of great importance in the controversy respecting the supremacy of the see of Rome. Baronius, who gives a very full account of the letters and decrees of the African council, labours hard to show that the bishops attending the council made no general, but only a special and conditional objection to the Roman claim, but his reasoning is inconsistent with the plain meaning of their language, and rests both on a gratuitous assumption of his own as to the Nicaean canons, viz. that the copy of them quoted by Zosimus contained the decree on which he relied, although the Eastern copies omitted it, and also on the improbability of its being quoted by three Pontiffs in succession unless it had been originally contained in the acts of the council (Baronius, ann. 418, lxxvii.; 419, lix.-xcii, especially lxxxvii.-lxxxix.) Reference may also be made for information on the whole subject to the following: Hardouin and Bruns, as cited above, Tillemont, vol. xiii. 292, 295, 323, 775, 783, 860, 861. Fleury, *H. E.* xxiv. 6, 7, 10, 11, 35. Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 450, § 94, Eng. tr. Van Espen, *Com. in Can. Opp.* vol. iii. ed. Cologne 1727, pp. 296, 298, 301, 302, 307. He treats the subject very clearly, and points out that the African church did not admit an equality in authority between the councils of Nicaea and of Sardica, *ib.* p. 307. Robertson, *Hist. of Church*, i. 493. Morcellii, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 91, 93, 139, 114, 115. Hefele, *Concilien-Geschichte*, vol. i. p. 357, 358, p. 356 Eng. tr.; ii. p. 122, 133, 135, 138, p. 464, 476, 477, 481 Eng. tr. Rohrbacher remarks that the Sardican canons were in truth complementary to the Nicaean, and takes the same view as Baronius about the special character of the objection raised by the African bishops, and says further that some good theologians here thought that the letter purporting to come from them, and indeed the whole history of Apiarius is a forgery. (*Hist. de l'Eglise*, vol. iv. pp. 348-371.) The canons of the African church A.D. 419, are given by the Ballerini, and also remarks by Quesnel in the notes to the life of St. Leo, vol. iii. (Migne, *Patrol.* vol. 56, pp. 863-875, 920.) See also *Aug. Ep.* 157, 261; *Retract.* ii. 51, and Possidius, *Vit. Aug.* 14; also COE-LESTINUS I., Vol. II. 584. In a letter to Celestine, A.D. 423, St. Augustine discusses the subject of appeals to the Apostolic See, and of decisions pronounced by it, but makes no mention of Apiarius. Doubt has been thrown on the genuineness of this letter, but as on the one hand there can be no doubt that Augustine was present at the council A.D. 419, so on the other not much can be inferred from his silence in the subsequent letter. (*Aug. Ep.* 209, and note by editor, ed. Migne, vol. i. p. 956.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (7), a bishop, probably the same as in the last art., bearer of a letter from Darius to St. Augustine. (*Aug. Ep.* 229.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (8), called by Optatus Carisus, by Augustine, Donatus, a man at whose house the bishops met who ordained Secundus of Tigris. (Opt. i. 14; Aug. *Ep.* 53, 4.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (9), a presbyter, bearer of a letter to Augustine from Marcellinus. (Aug. *Ep.* 143. 2.) [H. W. P.]

URBANUS (10), a man of rank to whom Theodoret wrote a Festal Epistle (Theod. *Ep.* 74.) [E. V.]

URBANUS (11), former abbat of the untenanted monastery mentioned under EPIPHANIUS (45). [F. D.]

URBANUS (12), precentor (veteranus melodicus) of Toledo, is praised with FRODOARIUS bishop of Acci, and EVANTIUS (3) by Isidorus Pacensis under Era 757=A.D. 719, for his learning, wisdom, and sanctity. His death is placed by the same author with that of Evantius in Era 785=A.D. 737. The first mention of him as bishop occurs in Roderic of Toledo (c. A.D. 1240) iii. 19, who narrates that he was elected bishop on the flight of SINDERED. This testimony however seems insufficient when the silence of the contemporary Isidorus and the absence of the name of Urbanus from all ancient catalogues are taken into account. Roderic also (iv. 3) attributes to him the removal to the Asturias of the holy ark of relics, the writings of Ildefonsus and Julianus, and the vestment given by the Virgin to Ildefonsus. Urbanus and Evantius are also coupled by Cixila (*Vita Ildefonsi*, 5) as persons from whom he had heard accounts of the saint. Florez endeavours to reconcile the accounts of Isidorus and Roderic by supposing that Urban was elected bishop but never consecrated. (*Esp. Sag.* v. 318; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2) 243.) [F. D.]

URBICA (1), a widow of Figentes, a place of unknown site, but probably near Uzalis, mentioned by Evodius as having seen a vision. (Aug. *Ep.* 158. 3.) [H. W. P.]

URBICA (2), of Bordeaux, a convert of Priscillian. On account of her religious opinions she was stoned to death in a tumult of the populace (Prosper, *Chron.* p. 2.) [M. B. C.]

URBICIUS (1), persecutor. [PTOLEMAEUS (2).]

URBICIUS (2), a monk, a correspondent of Basil, who writes in A.D. 373 reproaching him for not visiting him and affording him his advice and consolation when he was afflicted by the calamities then affecting the church (Basil, *Ep.* 123 [345]). At a later period, A.D. 377, Basil begs him to lay aside all bashfulness and write frequently to him, and inform him who are sound in the faith that he may encourage them by his letters to persevere. Having heard that some members of the church to which he belonged entertained the false view that Christ did not take our common humanity inherited from Adam, but by His almighty power changed His Deity into Flesh, Basil confutes the error, and shows that it robs the Incarnation of its value for us (*Ep.* 262 [344]). [E. V.]

URBICIUS (3), a bishop of an unnamed see, whom Chrysostom had formerly known at Antioch, to whom he wrote a letter of friendship from Cucusus (Chrys. *Ep.* 108.) [E. V.]

URBICUS (1), 8th bishop of Riez, was present at the council of Valence, held in 584, and the 2nd of Mâcon in 585. He was also one of the 10 prelates who signed the letter on the subject of the rebellious nuns of Poitiers (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ix. 41; CHRODIELDIS). Dynamius, the patrician, dedicated to him the life of his predecessor, St. Maximus of Riez, for which he supplied some ancient records (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx., 31 seqq.; *Gall. Christ.* i. 394.) [S. A. B.]

URBICIUS (2) Q. LOLLIUS M. F., Cos. Suff. about 132. Prefect of the city under Antoninus Pius from about A.D. 152. The date of this magistrate has been much disputed, as upon it depends the date of Justin's Second Apology in which his name occurs (cap. ii.). Borghesi (*Oeuvres Complètes*, t. ix. p. 295, cf. viii. 545) discusses the question. He fixes with Valesius the date of the martyrdom of St. Ptolemaeus there mentioned to the closing years of Antoninus Pius in opposition to Tillemont (*Mém.* ii. 653) who assigns it to Marcus Aurelius. Borghesi, *l. c.* gives several new inscriptions from Africa, where we find his *cursus honorum* and details of his family history. He served with distinction in Britain, Germany, and against Barcochba before he became city prefect. (Remer's *Ins. Rom. de l'Algérie*, No. 2319; *Corp. Ins. Lat.* vi. 10707; vii. 1125; viii. 6705; cf. Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, t. i. p. 493, and JUSTINUS MART. Vol. III. p. 564 of this DICTIONARY.) [G. T. S.]

URBICIUS (3), April 3rd, second bishop of Clermont, said by Greg. Tur. (*Hist. Franc.* i. 39 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 181) to have succeeded Austremonius (Stremonius). He was a senator and married, when raised to the episcopate: but he seems to have abdicated, and to have died c. 312. (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 226; *Boll. AA. SS.* Apr. i. 251-2.) [J. G.]

URBICIUS (4). Gregory the Great in A.D. 591 directed the sub-deacon Anthimus to give his widow Palatina twenty solidi and three hundred bushels of wheat, and afterwards to allow her annually thirty solidi. (*Epp.* i. 39, 59.) [F. D.]

URBICIUS (5), defensor of the church property in Sabina and at Carseoli, died so largely indebted to the church, that his whole property would have been insufficient to make up the deficiency. Gregory the Great, however, in March, A.D. 593, compassionately granted his estate, free from debt, to his three children. (*Epp.* iii. 21.) [F. D.]

URBICIUS (6), prior, and afterwards (A.D. 594) abbat of the monastery of St. Hermes at Palermo, one of the six monasteries founded in Sicily by Gregory the Great. At his request Gregory asked the bishop of Palermo to ordain one of the monks priest, in order to celebrate mass within the monastery. He seems to have exercised a general supervision over Gregory's Sicilian monasteries. On one occasion he man-

aged the choice of an abbat so badly, that each of two candidates claimed to be elected. Gregory rebukes him sharply for his indecision. In A.D. 603 he was proposed by one party for the vacant see of Palermo, but JOANNES (284) was eventually chosen. (*Epp.* v. 6; vi. 42, 48; xi. 48, 49; xiii. 15.) [F. D.]

URBITIUS, bishop of Dyrrachium, is, with other bishops, addressed in two circular letters of Gregory the Great. (*Epp.* viii. 5, ix. 68.) [F. D.]

URSA, wife of FORTUNIUS (2), *q. v.* She was carried into captivity by the Goths, and during her absence her husband married again. [F. D.]

URSACIUS (1), bishop of Singidunum (Belgrade). He and Valens, bishop of Mursa, appear at every synod and council, from 330 till about 370, as leaders of the Arian party, both in the East and West. They seem to have imbibed their Arian views from Arius himself during the period of his exile into Illyricum immediately after the council of Nice. They are described by Athanasius *Ad Episc. Aegypt.* 7, p. 218, as the disciples of Arius. They could scarcely have been taught by him at Alexandria, but may easily have come in contact with Arius during the period of his exile, which seems to have been very fruitful in spreading his views, as almost all the bishops of the Danubian provinces, together with Ulfilas and the Gothic converts, appear as Arians immediately afterwards (cf. Sulp. Sever. *Chron.* ii. 38). Ursacius must have been born, at latest, about A.D. 300, as we find him a bishop, actively engaged in conspiracy against Athanasius at the time of the recall of Arius, about 332. From Socrates we may gather the leading events of his life. In *H. E.* I. 27, we find him united with Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, and Valens in getting up a case against Athanasius, and fabricating those scandalous charges of theft, sacrilege, and murder, which were investigated at the council of Tyre in 335, when Ursacius and Valens were also present. They must have been very active and influential members of the party even at that early period, for they were sent to Egypt, as deputies of the synod, to investigate the charge on the spot, notwithstanding the protests of Athanasius (*l. c.* i. 31). In 342 they appeared at Constantinople, when they assisted at the consecration of Macedonius as Patriarch. [MACEDONIUS.] Upon the triumph of Athanasius in 346, they made their peace with Julius, bishop of Rome, accepted the Nicene formula, and wrote to Athanasius, professing their readiness to hold communion with him. At the synod of Sirmium in 359, they again appeared as active members of the Homoean party, who drew up the Dated Creed, May 22, 359. Ursacius and Valens duly presented the creed to the council of Ariminum a few weeks later, which promptly rejected it, and deposed Ursacius and Valens from their sees, "as well for their present conspiracy to introduce heresy, as for the confusion they had caused in all the churches by their repeated changes of faith." Ursacius and Valens at once sought the emperor's presence and gained him over to their side. The

council also sent a long epistle to the emperor, which Socrates (ii. 37) inserts. The emperor refused to see the deputies of the council, and sent them to wait his leisure at Hadrianople first, and then at Nice in Thrace; where Ursacius and Valens displayed their power of managing men, by inducing these same deputies to sign, on Oct. 10, 359, a revised version of the creed, which the council had rejected. Socrates tells us that Nice, in Thrace, was chosen in order that it might impress the ignorant, who would confound it with Nice in Bithynia, where the orthodox symbol had been framed; cf. *Soz. H. E.* iv. 19; Hieron. *Adv. Lucif.* p. 189; Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* ii. 44; and Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, pp. 157-178, for the history of this troubled period, during which Ursacius and Valens were the acknowledged leaders of the Anti-Athanasian party. They seem to have remained influential with the court till the end of life, for the last notice of either of them in history tells, how Valens obtained the recall of the Arian Eunomius from exile, in 367 (*Philostorg. H. E.* ix. 8. [EUNOMIUS (3).] Most of the original authorities have been already mentioned. The writings of Athanasius and Hilary have frequent notices of Ursacius and Valens. Mr. Gwatkin's book is very full of information, and Hefele's *Councils* (t. ii., Clark's trans. s. v. Valens and Ursacius) give abundant references to the synods in which they took part; see also Till. *Mém.* vi. [G. T. S.]

URSACIUS (2), friend of RUFINUS, was with him when he took refuge in Sicily, A.D. 410, and it was at his instigation that he translated the *Homilies* of Origen on Numbers. Ursacius assisted him as a copyist in the work. (Rufinus, *Prologus* in Origenis *Op.* ii. 275 in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xii. 583.) [F. D.]

URSACIUS (3), a Roman officer (*dux*), employed under Leontius, count of Africa in the time of Constantine and also Constans, to repress the excesses of the Donatists, in doing which some of them lost their lives, and the name of Ursacius, like that of Taurinus and others, was branded by them as that of a persecutor (*Opt.* iii. 4, 10.) It is mentioned in this way in the speech of a Donatist about A.D. 430 (*M. V. D.* xxvii. 2, p. 219, ed. Oberthür), and in that of Habetdeus at the conference A.D. 411. (*Carth. Coll.* iii. 253.) Silvanus of Cirta was to have been banished for refusing to communicate with him and Zenophilus. He must therefore have been a Christian by profession. (*Aug. c. Cresc.* iii. 30, 34.) Petilian said that having been wounded in battle with barbarians, the birds of prey and dogs tore him in pieces, a death which he regarded as an instance of divine vengeance on him for his former behaviour, but Augustine seems to doubt the truth of this story. (*Aug. c. Petil.* ii. 92, 202, 208, 209.) [H. W. P.]

URSEIUS, abbat of a monastery at the Pinetum near Ravenna, where RUFINUS sojourned on his return from one of his journeys to the east, and to whom he dedicated his translation of the rule of St. Basil. (*Praefatio* in *Reg.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* ciii. 485.) [F. D.]

URSICINUS (1), June 19, physician and martyr at Ravenna. His martyrdom, with that

of Vitalis, is related in a letter once ascribed to St. Ambrose (*Ep.* 2 al. 53, §§ 7, 8 in *Pat. Lat.* xvii. 744). He is mentioned in the *Ancient Roman Mart.*, the *Rom. Mart.*, Usuard, and Ado. The period is said to have been the reign of Nero (Tillem. ii. 75, 496). [C. H.]

URSCINUS (2), July 24th, ninth bishop of Sens, succeeded Simplicius, and seems to have been one of the Catholic bishops exiled at the council of Béziers A.D. 356, but he is not mentioned in Hilary's account of the council (*Opp.* ii. 563 in *P. L.* x. 579). Returning in 360, he founded c. 386 the monastery of St. Gervasius and St. Protasius, and in it he was interred. (*Boll. A. SS.* Jul. v. 545-6; Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 195 ed. 1732; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 4.) [J. G.]

URSCINUS (3), bishop, bearer in A.D. 493 of a letter of pope Gelasius to the bishops of Dardania to announce his election, and to exhort them to abandon the Eutychian heresy (Gelasii *Epist.* 3 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 25). Three fragments of a letter alleged to be addressed to him by pope Anastasius, the successor of Gelasius (Mansi, viii. 193), are merely extracts from the letter of Gelasius to Laurentius, bishop of Lychnidus. [F. D.]

URSCINUS (4), 9th bishop of Cahors, between Maurilio and Eusebius, towards the close of the sixth century, was originally referendarius to queen Ultrogottha, wife of Childbert. Maurilio, in his last illness, nominated him as his successor, and begged that he might be consecrated before his own death. He was liberal in the dispensing of alms, very learned in the Holy Scriptures, a just judge, and a zealous champion of the poor of his church (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 43). His episcopate was troubled first by a hot dispute with Innocentius, bishop of Rodez, as to the jurisdiction over certain parishes, which was finally settled in Ursicinus' favour by an assembly of bishops convoked at Clermont by the metropolitan, said to be Sulpicius of Bourges (*ibid.* vi. 38), and secondly by the appearance in France of the pretender, Gundovald, in 582, with whom he sided, a proceeding which caused his suspension for three years by the second council of Mâcon, held in 585 (*ibid.* viii. 20; Mansi, ix. 958). In the *Gallia Christiana* he has the prefix of saint, but it does not appear on what authority (i. 119). [S. A. B.]

URSCINUS (5) wrote to Constantius, bishop of Milan, against Joannes, bishop of Ravenna. (Gregorius, *Epp.* iv. 39.) [F. D.]

URSCINUS (6), bishop of Turin. The Franks, under Guntram, having conquered the outlying parts of his diocese, formed them into the diocese of St. Jean de Maurienne and Susa, as Turin itself was in the hands of their enemies, the Lombards. Ursicinus naturally objected to his diocese being thus diminished, and complained to Gregory the Great, who wrote to Theoderic and Theodebert, the kings of the Franks, asking that the severed districts might be restored to Ursicinus, and also complaining of his imprisonment. Gregory further wrote to Syagrius, bishop of Autun, asking him to use his influence with the kings for the same object. (*Epist.* lib. ix. ind. ii. 116, 115, in Migne, *Patr.*

Lat. 1047, 1045.) Gregory's intervention was fruitless, and St. Jean de Maurienne has remained a separate diocese to the present day. [F. D.]

URSINUS (1) ST., first bishop of Bourges. According to the *De Gloria Confessorum* of Gregory of Tours, Bourges first received the Gospel from St. Ursinus, who was ordained bishop by the disciples of the Apostles and sent into Gaul. He first founded and ruled the church at Bourges, and when he died, was buried outside the city (cap. 80). But the same author in his *Historia Francorum*, after enumerating various Saints who, he says, came to Gaul in the middle of the 3rd century (i. 28), goes on to relate that some disciple of these came to Bourges and announced Christ to the people, of whom many believed and were ordained as clergy. He further relates the difficulty experienced by the congregation in obtaining a church, till a rich senator Leocadius gave his house, which became the first church of Bourges, and was made illustrious by relics of Stephen the protomartyr (i. 29). These two accounts, probably representing distinct traditions, heard by Gregory at different times, are quite irreconcilable, and we have no further knowledge on the subject to assist us. Ursinus is commemorated Nov. 9 and Dec. 29. About the year 558, Germanus, bishop of Paris, visiting Bourges, was warned in sleep that he should cause the body, whose resting-place was now forgotten, to be removed to a more decent grave. Miraculously (it is said) guided to the spot, then occupied by a vineyard, he exhumed and transferred it to the church of St. Symphorian, which afterwards took Ursinus's name (*De Glor. Conf.* *ibid.*). In 1239, the remains were enclosed in a silver coffin, which in 1475 was opened in the presence of Louis XI., and in 1562 was carried off by Calvinists (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 4).

[S. A. B.]

URSINUS (2) (URCINUS), anti-pope, elected after the death of Liberius in the September of the year 366, in opposition to Damasus. The conflicts during the life of Liberius between his adherents and those of Felix, who had been intruded into the see by the emperor Constantius, are spoken of under LIBERIUS (4) and FELIX (2). To the existence of these two parties at Rome the election of an anti-pope was due, Damasus being set up by the party of Felix, Ursinus by that of Liberius. The virulence of the contest that ensued, and the fact that the party of Damasus triumphed, seem to show that Felix had had a larger and more influential following than extant accounts would have led us to suppose. Conflicting evidence is before us as to the circumstances of the election and ordination of the two rivals, and as to which was most to blame for the disgraceful and even bloody conflicts that, according to all accounts, arose. On the one hand, S. Jerome (*Chron.*), Rufinus (l. ii. c. 10), and Socrates (l. iv. c. 24), agree in saying that Damasus was elected first, and lay the blame on Ursinus, who after this election is said to have got hold with his followers of the church of Scinius (or Scininus), and to have been ordained. Rufinus says that Damasus had already been not only elected but ordained, and that the consecrator of Ursinus was a certain "imperitus et agrestis episcopus," whom he persuaded to

perform the ceremony, accompanied by a band of seditious and turbulent people. Socrates tells us that he had been a candidate when Damasus was elected, and that, disappointed by his failure, he got some obscure bishops to ordain him at the above-named church, not, however, openly in the church itself, but in a secret place connected with it. The church called that of Sicinus, but by Marcellinus and Faustus (in their account, to be mentioned below) that of Liberius, is supposed to be that of St. Maria Maggiore on the Esquiline, the foundation of which is attributed to pope Liberius. Sozomen (l. vi. c. 22) and Nicephorus (l. xi. c. 30) give similar accounts. Further, a council at Rome twelve years afterwards, and an influential one at Aquileia, A.D. 381, in which St. Ambrose took a prominent part, both declared Ursinus to be a usurper, and addressed letters to the emperors Gratian and Valentinian against him. [See *Epist. Concil. Roman. ad Grat. et Valentin.*; Labbe, t. ii. p. 1187; and *Ep. I. Conc. Aquil. ad Grat. imp.*; ib. p. 1183.] Further, St. Ambrose (*Ep. 11*) speaks of Damasus having been elected by the judgment of God. The emperors also, and the civil authorities at Rome, throughout the contest, supported Damasus as being the lawful pope. On the other hand, a different account of things is given by Marcellinus and Faustus, two Luciferian priests, who, having been expelled from Rome under Damasus, presented a petition (*libellus precum*) to the emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius (c. A.D. 383). They had been supporters of Ursinus, and in the preface to their *libellus precum* they assert that he was elected before Damasus by the people who had been in communion with Liberius in the church of Julius, beyond the Tiber, and was ordained by Paul, bishop of Tivoli; and that Damasus had subsequently, with a mob of charioteers and other low fellows, broken into the church of Julius, massacred many persons there, and, after seven days, had, with his bribed followers, got possession of the Lateran Basilica, and been there ordained. Thus, as to priority of election and consecration, the evidence is conflicting. The most important witnesses, Jerome on the one side and Marcellinus and Faustus on the other, were both likely to be personally cognizant of the events, but also to be prejudiced; the former as being the close friend of Damasus, the latter as having been supporters of Ursinus, and being sore from persecution under Damasus after his success. The verdicts of the two councils above named, having been given after Damasus had carried the day, are not conclusive: and it is to be observed that, while the contest was going on, certain Italian bishops, who had assembled at Rome on the occasion of the birthday of Damasus, are said by Marcellinus and Faustus to have refused at that stage of the proceedings to concur in condemning Ursinus, saying "We have come for a birthday, not to condemn a man unheard." However, the balance of evidence appears to be decidedly in favour of Damasus, the only witnesses against him being the two Luciferian presbyters, who were likely to be prejudiced partizans, and whose veracity we have no means of testing. Still their clear statement of what they allege to be facts—together with the fact that the impartial Ammianus Marcellinus (see below) de-

cides in favour of neither party,—may suggest the possibility that there was more to be said for Ursinus and his party than is allowed by writers who sided with the triumphant one, and got their accounts from it. After the two elections all accounts agree that the two parties disturbed Rome by continual conflicts, in which lives were lost. At length Juventius, the praefectus urbi, and Julianus, the praefectus annonae, concurred in banishing Ursinus with his two deacons, Amantius and Lupus. According to Marcellinus and Faustus, they had been bribed by Damasus to do so. But the disturbances continued. The same complainants allege further that Damasus afterwards armed his followers with clubs, swords, and other weapons; that seven presbyters of the party of Ursinus, having been seized by them, were rescued by their own party and carried in triumph to the basilica of Liberius; that Damasus in person, with an armed force of clergy as well as laity, attacked the church, set fire to it in places, uncovered the roof and threw tiles down on those within, killed 160 persons, men and women, and wounded others, none of the party of Damasus having lost their lives in the conflict. This attack on the church is said to have been made at 8 A.M. on the 25th of October, A.D. 366. There is other sufficient evidence that such an attack was made with such disastrous consequences, though we cannot well believe without further proof that Damasus headed it in person. Even Jerome allows that, Ursinus and his friends having got possession of the church of Sicinus, the partizans of Damasus attacked them there, and that "most cruel slaughter of both sexes was perpetrated." Rufinus says generally that the illegal election of Ursinus caused civil war among the people, so that places of prayer were filled with blood. Further, we have the important testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus, the historian, who, though not a Christian, writes of the Christians in a friendly spirit, and shows no bias on one side or the other of the contest between Damasus and Ursinus. In the following passage (which is given at length for the light it throws on the state of things in the Roman church at the time, and on the view taken of it by an intelligent and impartial heathen) it will be observed that he alludes definitely to the massacre in the church of Sicinus, and implies that it was perpetrated by the party of Damasus. "The prefecture of Juventius was accompanied with peace and plenty; but the tranquillity of his government was soon disturbed by a bloody sedition of the distracted people. The ardour of Damasus and Ursinus to seize the episcopal seat surpassed the ordinary measure of human ambition. They contended with the rage of party; the quarrel was maintained by the wounds and death of their followers; and the prefect, unable to resist or to appease the tumult, was constrained by superior violence to retire into the suburbs. Damasus prevailed: the well-disputed victory remained on the side of his faction: one-hundred-and-thirty-seven dead bodies were found in the Basilica of Sicinus, where the Christians hold their religious assemblies; and it was long before the angry minds of the people resumed their accustomed tranquillity. When I consider the splendour of the capital, I am not astonished that so valuable a prize should inflame the desires

of ambitious men, and should produce the fiercest and most obstinate contests. The successful candidate is secure that he will be enriched by the offerings of matrons; that, as soon as his dress is composed with becoming care and elegance, he may proceed in his chariot through the streets of Rome; and that the sumptuousness of the imperial table will not equal the profuse and delicate entertainment provided by the taste and at the expense of the Roman pontiffs. How much more rationally would those pontiffs consult their true happiness, if, instead of alleging the greatness of the city as an excuse for their manners, they would imitate the exemplary life of some provincial bishops, whose temperance and sobriety, whose mean apparel and downcast looks, recommended their pure and modest virtue to the Deity and his true worshippers (*Perpetuo Numini, verisque ejus cultoribus!*)" [Ammian. 27, 3:—Gibbon's translation, c. xxv.]

In the following year, Praetextatus* having succeeded Juventius as praefectus urbi, the emperor Valentinian, who had heard from Damasus that the adherents of Ursinus retained still one basilica in their hands, sent a Rescript to Praetextatus, ordering it to be restored to the pope, but at the same time permitting those who had been banished by Juventius to live where they chose, except in Rome itself. In a second Rescript he removed even this embargo, allowing all to return to the city on condition of their keeping quiet, but threatening severe punishment in case of renewed disturbance. (Baronius, *ad ann.* 368, ii. iii. iv., gives extracts from these Rescripts.) Ursinus thereupon returned, and is said to have been received by his followers on the 15th of September (467) with great joy (*Lib. precum*); but he was again banished by order of the emperor (16th Nov.), with seven of his adherents, into Gaul. Marcellinus and Faustinus again accuse Damasus of having procured the sentence by bribery, saying that he bribed "all the palace," so that the emperor was kept in ignorance of the facts. It was probably necessitated by renewed disturbances. Still peace was not thus at once restored. The followers of Ursinus continued to assemble in cemeteries, and got possession of the church of St. Agnes without the walls. Thence they were dislodged,—the two presbyters say by Damasus himself with his satellites, and they add, with great slaughter. We may again doubt the allegation of the pope's personal complicity. After this, Praetextatus banished more of the party of Ursinus, and the two presbyters allege cruel persecution, having been themselves among the sufferers.

Rescripts of the emperors Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian (A.D. 371) to Ampelius, then the Praefectus Urbi, and to Maximinus the Vicarius, again release Ursinus and his friends from their confinement in Gaul, allowing them to live at large, so long as they keep away from Rome and the suburbicarian regions. (Given by Baron. *ad ann.* 371, i. ii. iii.) Advantage was probably taken of this licence; for to Maximinus, who was afterwards Praefectus (spoken of by

* It was this Praetextatus (reported of very favourably by Ammianus Marcellinus) of whom Jerome tells us that he said pleasantly to Damasus, "Facite me Romanae urbis episcopum; et ero protinus Christianus."

Ammianus Marcellinus as a violent and cruel man), Rufinus and other Christian historians attribute severe and cruel measures which unjustly brought odium upon Damasus.

After the death of Valentinian I. (A.D. 375), a Roman council (A.D. 378) addressed a letter to the emperors Gratian and Valentinian II., in which it is represented that Ursinus and his followers continued their machinations secretly, encouraging other bishops who had been deposed by Damasus to resist his authority; and that one of their schemes had been to suborn one Isaac, a Jew at Rome, to accuse the pope of crime before the civil tribunal, by which Damasus had been acquitted, and Isaac banished to Spain. The emperors consequently sent a Rescript to Aquilinus, the then vicarius urbis, reproving him for remissness in carrying out orders previously given for the repression of Ursinus and his followers, and assigning in general terms to Damasus as pope the power of deciding, in the last instance, on the affairs of all bishops implicated in the schism that had ensued, saving only the rights of metropolitans in the provinces. (Labbe, tom. ii. p. 1187-1192.)

After this we find Ursinus himself at Milan, where he is said to have joined the Arian party, who promised him their support (Ambrose, *Ep.* 4). But St. Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, having informed the emperor Gratian of what was going on, the latter banished Ursinus from Italy, and confined him to Cologne (*Epist. I. Concil. Aquil. ad Gratian.*; Labbe, tom. ii. p. 1183). No more is heard of Ursinus till after the death of Damasus (Dec. 384), when he again came forward in opposition to Siricius, who, having been one of the supporters of Damasus against him, was elected with the general consent of the Roman people. Ursinus does not appear to have had any sufficient party in Rome at that time to cause conflict and disturbance. The election of Siricius was confirmed, with allusion to the unanimity of the electors, by Valentinian II. [J. B.-y.]

URSINUS (3) (URSICINUS), an Irish monk of Luxeuil, founder of the monastery of St. Ursanne in Franche-Comté. He left Luxeuil with St. Columbanus and first founded a monastery on the shore of Lake Bienné and then at St. Ursanne, where he died. He belongs to the beginning of the 7th century. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 21 Feb. iii. 523, praet.; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, ii. 488 sq.) [J. G.]

URSINUS (4), a prior or abbat of Locociacum (Ligugé), near Poitiers, who wrote a life of St. Leodegarius (Léger), whose contemporary he was. This and the anonymous biography of the same saint, are most valuable sources of the history of a time, of which there are very few records. For the editions of the work and remarks on it, see LEODEGARIUS (2).

[S. A. B.]

URSMARUS, ST., 3rd abbat of Lobbes or Laubes, in the diocese of Cambrai (A.D. 691-713). His life was written by Anso, a later abbat of Lobbes (A.D. 776-800), about 60 years after his death. Though founded on an earlier narrative (see *Praefatio*), it contains little of historical worth, but we gather from it and

other records of the abbey that he was born near Avesnes, where an oratory was afterwards dedicated to him. As abbat he dedicated the church of the monastery, as yet unconsecrated, and built another for the brethren's cemetery on the hill overlooking Lobbes. He is also said to have preached to the heathen of Flanders, and to have founded two small cells. The records call him episcopus; but his see, if he ever had one, is unknown. His day is April 18. Anso's life was amplified and rewritten in the 10th and 11th centuries by Ratherius, Fulcuinus and Herigerus, abbats of Lobbes. Everything that is known of Ursinarus and a mass of posthumous miracles, may be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. ii. 557 sqq.; Mabillon, *AA. SS. Ord. S. Bened.* 1733, saec. iii., pars i. p. 241, sqq.; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 80; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 203-4, vi. 352. [S. A. B.]

URSULA, Oct. 21, a famous British virgin and martyr, celebrated as having suffered with eleven thousand other virgins at Cologne. Her notice in the Roman martyrology is simple enough. It runs thus:—"At Cologne, the natal day of SS. Ursula and her companions, who, being slain by the Huns for their Christianity and their virginal constancy, terminated their life by martyrdom. Very many of their bodies were discovered at Cologne." On this simple foundation the new Bollandists have raised a prodigious edifice of 230 folio pages, where they discuss (*AA. SS. Boll.* Oct. t. ix. pp. 73-303) every conceivable fact, topic, or hypothesis concerning these problematical martyrs. Nothing escapes them; they bestow elaborate pains upon the fortunes and history of the church and monastery at Cologne, called after them, and give a list of the names of the 11,000, so far as they have been recovered or imagined. Their story, which is purely mediaeval, is briefly thus. Ursula was daughter of Dionoc, king of Cornwall. She was sent by him with her numerous companions to Conan, a British prince, who had followed the tyrant Maximus into Gaul, about the year 383. They were somehow carried up the Rhine to Cologne by mistake, where the Huns murdered them all. The whole legend, with its manifold historical blunders, including an apocryphal pope Cyriacus, has been also discussed by Ussher in *Antiq. Brit. Eccles.* pp. 107, 108, cf. *Opp.* ed. Elrington, t. vi., pp. 153-155, 169, 171, 556. Ursula was the patroness of the Sorbonne in Paris, Ussher, *l. c. t. v.*, p. 244, and of the Ursulines and teaching order of the Roman church, founded in 1537 (*Ursulinus* in Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*). The enormous number of St. Ursula's companions has been since explained as originally in a mistake of the early copyists, who found some such entry as—"Ursula et xi. M. V.," which, taking M. for millia, not for martyrs, they read as Ursula and eleven thousand virgins instead of Ursula and eleven thousand virgins. Such mistakes frequently occurred in the ancient martyrologies. Polthart's *Bibliotheca*, i. 917, gives a full account of the manuscript traditions of Ursula's acts. The earliest document which the industry of the Bollandists has discovered bearing on her history is a sermon for her natal day, which they date between 750 and 850. Geoffrey of Monmouth, a writer of the twelfth century,

gives the English version of her story, which is, however, too late for genuine history. It has been also celebrated by the visions and ravings of the twelfth century prophetess Elizabeth of Schonauers, and by the writings of Siebert of Gemblou. [G. T. S.]

URSUS (1), a Roman officer, accountant general or superintendent of the imperial finances in Africa (*Rationalis Africae*), to whom Constantine gave in charge to distribute his gift of 3000 *folles* for the church expenses of the ministers of the church, with directions that if more were needed, the deficiency should be supplied from the imperial estates, A.D. 313. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* x. p. 191, ed. Oberthür. Euseb. *H. E.* x. 6. Böcking, *Not. Dign.* i. xi. p. 52.) [H. W. P.]

URSUS (2), a lay friend to whom Gregory Nazianzen wrote by a young friend Anysius, to excuse himself for declining his invitation to visit him, which it would be very delightful to do, but it would lay him open to suspicions of inconsistency (*Greg. Naz. Ep.* 122). [E. V.]

URSUS (3), an officer (*ducenarius*), perhaps a retired, military man, employed by the President of the Conference, A.D. 411. (*Carth. Coll.* i. 1, ii. 1, iii. 1. Böcking, *Not. Dig.* i. 185, 277.) [H. W. P.]

URSUS (4), a Gallic bishop, who was illegally consecrated by Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, to some church dependent on Patroclus, the metropolitan of Arles, whose jurisdiction was thereby infringed. The pope, Coelestinus I., in a letter written Sept. 22, 417, to the bishops of Africa, Gaul and Spain, declares him, and one Tuentius who was in like case, accursed, and deprives them of the communion. It seems that Ursus had already been deprived of the priesthood for some crime at the council of Turin (*Epist.* iv., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 661; Ceillier, vii. 534). [S. A. B.]

URSUS (5), a tribune and procurator of the imperial palace, in A.D. 421, caused the famous temple of the heavenly goddess (*Caelestis*) at Carthage to be levelled to the ground, and the site converted into a cemetery. He also detected some Manichaeans at Carthage, and caused them to be examined by the bishops, among whom was St. Augustine [*EUSEBIA* (2)]. (*Liber de Promissionibus*, iii. 38; Possidius, *Vita S. Augustini*, 16; *Augustini De Haer.* 46, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* li. 835, xxxii. 46, xlii. 36.) [F. D.]

URSUS (6) ST., 7th bishop of Troyes, is said to have died on the 25th of July, 426, at a spot near Meaux, where his body was buried in a marble sarcophagus. Part of his relics was afterwards brought to Troyes and divided between the cathedral and collegiate church of St. Stephen. His day is July 25, but the feast has been kept on the following day (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 485; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. vi. 167.) [S. A. B.]

URSUS (7), bishop of Nomentum. [*FLORENTIUS* (16)]. [F. D.]

URSUS (8) ST., founder and abbat of several monasteries in the districts of Bourges and

Tours, lived in the latter half of the 5th century. A native of Cahors, he visited Bourges, and founded monasteries at Tausiriacum (perhaps Toiselay), Onia (la Forêt d'Heugne), and Britiniacum. Leaving these under the care of priors, he repaired to Tours and built an oratory and another monastery at Senaparia (Sénevière). Over this he set St. Leobatus as prior, and founded yet another monastery, Loccis (Loches), which he ruled in person, the community winning their bread from the earth by the sweat of their brows. Gregory of Tours gives a story of the miraculous punishment of one of Alaric's Goths, who coveted the monastery mill and persecuted the brethren. Ursus' tomb became famous for the cures performed at it. His death is placed about 510. He is commemorated Jul. 28 (Greg. Tur. *Vitae Patr.* xviii.; Boll. *Actae SS.* Jul. vi. 563). [S. A. B.]

URSUS (9), monk, died at the same moment as JOANNES (510), q. v.

USAILLE (AUXILIUS), son of Ua Baird, bishop of Killashee or Killosoy, co. Kildare, and associate of SS. Patrick and Isserninus, died A.D. 460. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 459; *Four Mast.* A.D. 454; *Ussher, Wks.* vi. 384, A.D. 460; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 658, and *Tr. Th.* pass.) [J. G.]

USIA (Οὔσια), a female recluse at the monastery of Hesyca (Ἡσυχᾶ) near the sea, visited by Palladius, who describes her as in all points most worthy of veneration (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* cap. 129 in *Pat. Gr.* xxxiv. 1232, *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 1205; Tillem. xi. 280). [C. H.]

USTHAZANES, April 21, a Persian eunuch, and favourite of Sapor. He was a Christian, and suffered with Symeon, bishop of Seleucia, about A.D. 343. Sozomen (*H. E.* ii. 9) gives a long account of his martyrdom. [G. T. S.]

UTEL (URTOL, UTTEL), the twelfth bishop of Hereford in the ancient lists (*M. H. B.* p. 621). He was the successor of Ceolmund, who was alive in 793, and himself attests charters of the years 798 and 799, after which Wulfhard succeeds. (Kemble, *C. D.* 175, 1020.)

He was probably the same person with the abbat Uttel, who appeared at the legatine council in 786, with other Mercian abbats (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 461), and who as abbat attests charters of 788-790 (Kemb. *C. D.* No. 156, 159). [S.]

UTTA, a Northumbrian priest of high character, and of good repute among the princes of his time. He was selected to bring from the Kentish court Eanfleda, the daughter of Edwin, to be the bride of Oswy, king of Northumbria. Utta told Cynimund, a friend of Beda, how, before he went, he sought the prayers of bishop Aidan, who gave him some consecrated oil to calm the stormy sea over which he was to journey. The predicted storm burst upon the voyager, who describes the results of the oil as miraculous (Beda, iii. 15). Utta afterwards became the abbat of the monastery called Ad Caprae Caput, the modern Gateshead, on the Durham bank of the Tyne (*Id.* iii. 21). The name, perhaps, indicated in the first instance the sign-board of a hostelry which was haunted by

the herdsmen who tended the flocks of goats which pastured on Gateshead Fell, and its vicinity, and it was afterwards assigned to the village which grew up around the inn. Utta was the brother of Adda, one of the four priests who were sent as missionaries into Mid-Anglia after the baptism, in the north, of Peada, son of Penda (Beda, iii. 21). [J. R.]

V

[Names commencing with V will sometimes be found under the initial W.]

VADIANI (Aug. *Haer.* 50), heretics, also called AUDIANI. [AUDIUS.] [C. H.]

VALENS (1), a presbyter of Philippi mentioned by St. Polycarp (*Ad Philip.* § 11) as having caused a scandal in his church through some sin of covetousness. [C. H.]

VALENS (2), the twenty-eighth bishop of Jerusalem, the eleventh of the Gentile succession. The beginning of his episcopate is placed in the first year of Caracalla, A.D. 211. He succeeded Capito, and was succeeded by Dulichianus. Eutychius (376) assigns him three years of office. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12; Epiph. *Haer.* lxxvi. 20, *Chron. Armen.*) [E. V.]

VALENS (3), June 1, martyr at Caesarea, a deacon of the church of Aelia (Jerusalem). He was eminent for his knowledge of the scriptures. He suffered with Pamphilus in the Diocletian persecution (Euseb. *Mart. Palaest.* cap. xi.) [G. T. S.]

VALENS (4), Arian bishop of Mursa in Pannonia, and, together with Ursacius, the leading western opponent of Athanasius. He must have been born about A.D. 300, as we find him a most influential bishop from the year 332 (cf. Soc. *H. E.* i. 27). He was a disciple of Arius, probably during the period of Arius's exile in Illyricum after the council of Nice. This exile seems to have resulted in the wholesale adhesion of the bishops of Pannonia to the Arian view (cf. Sulp. Severus, *Chron.* ii. 38), and may have had a great deal to do with the subsequent Arianism of the Gothic tribes [UL-FILAS]. Valens remained ever firm in his Arian views, though, like the majority of his sect, he proved very shifty, ever striving to keep in favour with the party in power. He was bitterly hostile to Athanasius, being one of his chief opponents from the time of the council of Tyre in 335. He was not a scrupulous opponent. Thus, he brought charges against Athanasius, which he retracted as false before pope Julius in 347 (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxviii. 9) [ATHANASIAS, JULIUS (5) in Vol. III. p. 532]. Valens and Ursacius were ever changing. At a conference of western bishops at Sirmium in 357, they put forward a creed which avowed Anomoean doctrine as to Christ's person. In 359, Valens signed, with a reservation, the dated creed of Sirmium, but withdrew his reservation