

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. Leobadius 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

at the command of the emperor Constantius. In 359, he formed the Homoian party, which ruled the eastern church during the following twenty years, till the accession of Theodosius gave the victory to the Nicene or catholic party. He probably retained, however, his Anomoean views to the end, as we find him interfering with the emperor Valens in behalf of Eunomius, the leader of that party, when condemned to exile in 366 (*Philost. H. E. ix. 8*). The activity and influence of Valens was confined to the east. The west was always hostile to him, and frequently excommunicated him, the last occasion being at a council held at Rome in 369. He probably died some time prior to 375. The authorities for Valens are very numerous. Hilary of Poitiers and Athanasius, and Socrates in his *History*, frequently mention him. Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, and Hefele's *Councils*, t. ii. (Clark's translation) give full references for his manifold intrigues. [G. T. S.]

VALENS (5), emperor, A.D. 364-378. He was brother of Valentinian I., and was born about 328. His wife was named Albia Dominica, by whom he had a son Galates, and two daughters, Anastasia and Carosa. He was made emperor of the East in March 364, and immediately displayed his sympathy with Arian doctrines, which showed itself in active hostility to the Athanasian party. His secular history will be found in the *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, we shall here confine ourselves to his church action. He was baptized in 368, by the Arian Eudoxius, patriarch of C. P. In 370 he is credited by all the historians, Socrates iv. 16, Sozomen vi. 14, Theodoret iv. 24, with an act of atrocious cruelty. Eighty ecclesiastics, led by Urbanus, Theodorus, and Mememus, were sent by the orthodox party of C. P. to protest against the conduct of the Arians in that city. Valens is said to have sent them all to sea, ordering the sailors to set fire to the ship and then to abandon it. They all perished off the coast of Bithynia, and are celebrated as martyrs on Sept. 5. (*Mart. Rom.*) In 371 he made a tour through his Asiatic province. At Caesarea in Cappadocia, he came into conflict with St. Basil, whose letters, Migne, *P. G. t. xxxii.*, afford us a very lively picture of the persecution of Valens. He proposed to send St. Basil into exile. Just at that moment his only son fell sick. Valens had recourse to the saint, who promised to heal him if he received orthodox baptism. The Arians were however allowed to baptize the young prince, who thereupon died. Basil and the orthodox naturally attributed his death to the judgment of heaven on the imperial obstinacy. In 374 Valens raised a persecution against the Neo-platonic philosophers, and put to death several of their leaders, among others MAXIMUS (25) of Ephesus, the tutor and friend of the emperor Julian, Hilarius, Simonides and Andronicus. His anger was excited at this period against magical practices, by a conspiracy which he discovered at Antioch. The story is told at length in *Soc. H. E. iv. 19*, and *Soz. vi. 35*. The pagan party wished to secure the succession to the throne of Theodorus, one of Valens' principal court officials. They resorted to magical incantations with a tripod of laurel-wood and the letters of the alphabet, just like

modern spiritualism. The table spelled out the four letters $\theta, \epsilon, \alpha, \delta$, whence they concluded that Theodorus would certainly succeed. The séance came to the ears of Valens, who put Theodore to death and every one else whose name began with the unfortunate letters, the emperor absurdly supposing, as the historian well remarks, that he could put his successor to death. The father of Theodosius the Great is supposed to have suffered in consequence of the suspicion of Valens. St. Chrysostom too, as is told in the article on him, had a narrow escape at the same time. It would extend this article to undue limits to enumerate and describe all the acts of persecution at Edessa, Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople attributed by the historians to Valens, in all of which MODESTUS (3), the praetorian prefect, was his most active agent, save in Egypt, where Lucius, the Arian successor of Athanasius, endeavoured in vain to terrify the monks into conformity. The last year of Valens' life was marked by a striking manifestation of monkish courage. In the year 378 Valens was leaving Constantinople for his fatal struggle with the Goths at Adrianople. As he rode out of the city an anchorite, Isaac, who lived there, met the emperor and boldly predicted his death. The emperor ordered him to be kept in prison till his return when he would punish him; a threat at which the monk only laughed. Clinton's *Fasts*, i. 476, ii. 119, should be consulted for the chronology of Valens. Till. *Emp. t. v.* and De Broglie's *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain*, t. v., give good connected accounts of the career and violence of Valens. The names and narratives of the contemporary church historians have been already mentioned. [G. T. S.]

VALENS (6), a deacon in Augustine's clerical community, intending to devote his property, like the subdeacon Patricius, to its maintenance (*Aug. Sermon. 356, § 3*). [PATRICIUS (6).]

[C. H.]

VALENTIANUS, Roman curator of Russica, who compelled Victor, bishop of that place, to burn the book of the four gospels which he had in his possession at the time of the persecution under Diocletian. (*Aug. c. Cresc. iii. c. 27, § 30*.) [H. W. P.]

VALENTINA, July 25, virgin of Caesarea and martyr in Palestine under FIRMILIANUS (2), the successor of Urbanus as governor of that province. She protested against the tortures inflicted on another woman, and kicked over the altar which stood in front of Firmilianus. She was then tortured and condemned to die by fire. (*Euseb. Mart. Palaest. viii.*) [G. T. S.]

VALENTINIANUS (1) I. was a native of Cibalis in Pannonia. He entered the army, and having served with distinction, was captain of the guards during the reign of Julian, when he boldly confessed Christ. Theodoret tells us (*H. E. iii. 16*) that when Julian was one day entering the temple of Fortune with great pomp, Valentinian was marching in the procession before him. Two priests had stationed themselves at the gate, to sprinkle all who entered with lustral water. Some of it fell upon Valentinian's robe, whereupon he struck the

priest and cried out that he was defiled, not purified. Julian banished him for this act to a desert fortress. Upon the death of Jovian, Valentinian was elected emperor, Feb. 26, 364, and reigned till his death, Nov. 17, 375, a period of twelve years all but one hundred days. An exhaustive account of the civil history of his reign will be found in the *DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY*; we now confine ourselves to the ecclesiastical history of that period. Valentinian presents the rare phenomenon of an emperor who was a sincere adherent of orthodoxy, and yet generously tolerant of the Arians and all other heretical sects. He published an edict at the very beginning of his reign, giving a complete toleration in religious matters. To this fact we have the most opposite testimonies. The emperor himself refers to it in *Cod. Theod.* ix. 16. 9, in a law directed against the practices of the Haruspices. Ammianus Marcellinus, xxx. 9, praises him for it, and St. Ambrose, in his oration, *de Obitu Valent. Junioris* implicitly censures it (cf. Hilar. Pictav. *Cont. Auxent. Opp.* t. iii. p. 64); yet his toleration was only directed towards religious opinions, permitting men to be orthodox, Arians or Pagans, as they pleased. It did not extend to practices. Thus in September of 364 he issued a law (*C. T.* ix. 16. 7) prohibiting nocturnal sacrifices and magical incantations, a law which was further enforced by legg. viii. and ix. of the same title. These edicts, however, seem to have been issued more from a moral and social than religious point of view. They were directed against immorality, not against paganism, as is evident from the fact, which Ambrose (*l. c.*) laments, that he tolerated the public profession and practices of paganism in the Roman senate house. One circumstance alone demonstrates his tolerance towards the followers of the ancient religion. There is not a single edict in the Theodosian code, lib. xvi. tit. x.—the celebrated title *De Paganis*, which is filled with persecuting laws—dating from any year between 356 and 381; while the same remark will also apply with one exception to the titles *De Haereticis* and *De Judaeis*, lib. xvi. tit. v. and viii. The one exception is the Manichean heresy, which he strictly prohibited by a law of A.D. 372 (*C. T.* xvi. v. 3), which orders the punishment of their teachers and the confiscation of the houses where they instructed their pupils in the city of Rome: for Manicheism seems at that time to have assumed the character of a philosophy rather than of a religion. This tolerant spirit of the emperor seems to have been helpful rather than the contrary to true religion. This appears from the fact that, under Valentinian, heathenism began first to be called by the name of the peasant's religion (paganismus). The name *religio paganorum*, applied to heathenism, first occurs in a law of the year 368 (*C. T.* xvi. ii. 18). Valentinian legislated also for the clergy (*Theod. Cod.* xv. ii. 17-22), restraining the tendency of rich men to take holy orders in order to escape civil duties, legg. 17, 18, 19; and rendering illegal, bequests to the clergy and to monks from widows and virgins, by a celebrated law (leg. 20 same title) addressed in 370 to Damasus, bishop of Rome, under the description "*De Vita, Honestate, Conversatione Ecclesiasticorum et Continentium*," which has been the model of much subsequent

legislation. (Cf. on this celebrated law and its restrictions upon the clergy, the commentary of Godefroy, *Theod. Cod.* t. vi. p. 54, where all the notices of it in the works of contemporary writers are collected.) The legislative activity of Valentinian in every direction was very great, as can be seen by an inspection of the Theodosian Code. Though not directly bearing on ecclesiastical history, we may note his laws "*de Medicis et Professoribus*" in lib. xiii. tit. iii. legg. vi.-x., organizing the profession of medicine and education. Lex viii. of this title with Godefroy's commentary is especially deserving of attention as appointing physicians to attend the poor at the public expense, one for each region of the city of Rome, offering thus in the year 368 the first instance of that system of medical relief for the poor which modern legislation has brought to perfection. He also issued, in 370, an edict regulating the schools of Rome (*C. T.* xiv. ix. 1), upon which Godefroy's commentary is an exhaustive handbook concerning ancient education.

The reign of Valentinian was marked on the whole by a tolerant spirit. It is possible, however, that he would have changed in this respect had he lived. The influence of St. Ambrose would have been injurious to him. St. Ambrose was essentially intolerant. A synod was held in Illyria in 375, convoked as Theodoret, says *H. E.* iv. 7-10, by Valentinian, to interfere in favour of the orthodox who were depressed under the Arian rule of Valens. Valentinian was at that time wholly under the influence of St. Ambrose. Theodoret (*l. c.*) gives us the decree in favour of the orthodox which Valentinian then issued to the bishops of Asia. Death, however, overtook him before he could make any substantial change in his policy. Socrates tells a curious story (*H. E.* iv. 31) concerning his domestic relations. His wife Severa had a female friend Justina, to whom she was deeply attached. She praised her beauty so much to the emperor that he fell in love with her, and then considered how he could espouse Justina without repudiating Severa. He accordingly published a law permitting men to have two lawful wives, and then married Justina, by whom he had Valentinian II. and three daughters, Justa, Grata and Galla, the last of whom married Theodosius the Great. This story is, however, vigorously contested by Tillemont (*Hist. des Emp.* v. 682), and by Bonamy in the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Ins.* for 1760, t. xxx. p. 394-405 [JUSTINA]. We have already cited the contemporary authorities. We need only add to the moderns quoted, Clinton's *Fasti*, i. 460, and appendix, p. 110-119, where is an exhaustive statement of all his legislation, together with notices of medals, coins, &c., bearing on his reign, and De Broglie's *L'Église et l'Empire Romain*, part iii. ch. i. [G. T. S.]

VALENTINIANUS (2) II., emperor, A.D. 375-392, son of Valentinian I. and of Justina his second wife. The narrative of his secular life will be found in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, we shall therefore deal merely with his life so far as it touches on ecclesiastical matters. His name is celebrated in church history in connection with two events. The first is the attempt made in 384 by the Roman senate to restore the altar of victory and the

ancient pagan rites connected with the senate. We possess the documents connected with this attempt in the *Relatio Symmachi Urbis praefecti* on the one side, and the Epistles xvii. and xviii. of St. Ambrose to Valentinian on the other (cf. St. Amb. opp. Migne, *P. L.* t. xvi. col. 962-982). As might naturally have been expected St. Ambrose carried the day, and the senatorial petition was rejected. The document drawn up by the younger Symmachus is marked by grace and dignity; the Epistles of St. Ambrose by a spirit of intolerance, natural enough however in the professors of a triumphant creed smarting under the remembrance of recent sufferings. The senate made a similar attempt in 391, but were again refused (see Till. *Emp.* v. 244, 300, 349). The other celebrated point connected with Valentinian regards the necessity of baptism. He died, or more probably was murdered by his general Arbogastes, at Vienne in Gaul. He was then about twenty, and as yet only a catechumen. He was anxious to receive baptism however, and had sent for St. Ambrose to baptize him. Before the sacrament could be administered he was found dead. St. Ambrose's treatise, *De obitu Valentiniani Consolatio*, §§ 51-56, is most interesting on this point, showing how Ambrose rose superior to any hard mechanical view of the sacraments and recognised the sincere will and desire as equivalent to the deed (cf. Till. *Emp.* v. 356; De Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire*, part iii. chs. v. and viii.). At one time Valentinian was inclined to support the Arian party at Milan, influenced by his mother Justina, who was bitterly hostile to St. Ambrose. It is difficult, however, to arrive at a true view of the facts, as we have practically only one side of the story. Thus Sozomen, *H. E.* vii. 13, followed by Ceillier, v. 386, represents Valentinian and the empress as persecuting St. Ambrose and the Catholics of Milan in 386, but when we turn to the *Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. i. leg. iv., to which they refer, we find that the persecution simply resolves itself into a permission to the Arians to meet for worship as freely as the Catholics, and a prohibition of the Catholics from molesting them in so doing. [AMBROSIUS; JUSTINA.]

[G. T. S.]

VALENTINIANUS (3) III., emperor, A.D. 425-455. He was the son of Constantius III. (CONST. III. in *Dict. G. AND R. BIOG.*) by Galla Placidia, daughter of Theodosius the Great and consequently great-grandson of Valentinian I. [GALLA (5) PLACIDIA]. The civil history of Valentinian will be found at length in the *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*. He was managed by his mother till her death in 450. His character was weak and vicious, and after her death he plunged from one crime to another, till in 455 he was assassinated by the friends of a lady whom he had outraged. His reign was signalised by several laws bearing on church matters. At the very beginning of it, on July 17, 425, he issued at Aquileia or rather there was issued in his name by his mother Placidia, a decree (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. v. l. 62), whereby all heretics and schismatics were expelled from Rome. A special provision was inserted, whereby the adherents of Eulalius, elected anti-pope in 419, were ordered to be removed to the hundredth milestone from the

city. This law has been illustrated at great length by Gothofred, t. vi. 204. Identical laws were at the same time issued for the other cities of Italy and for Africa, which are numbered 63 and 64 in the same title. In the same year he issued edicts (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. ii. l. 46 and 47) renewing clerical privileges and reserving clerical offenders to the tribunal of the bishops alone, a rule which, as we shall see, he abrogated in later life. In tit. vii. of the same 16th book of the Theodosian Code we find a law against apostates dated at Ravenna April 7, 426, whereby they are deprived of all testamentary power. On the very next day April 8, 426, a law was enacted (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. viii. l. 28), whereby Jews were prevented disinheriting their children who became Christians. The most interesting portion, however, of his ecclesiastical legislation will be found in his Novels embodied in Ritter's Appendix to Gothofred's great work. *Lip.*, 1743, t. vi. pars ii. p. 105-133. Thus tit. ii. p. 106, A.D. 445, treats of the Manicheans and gives us various particulars about the action of pope Leo the Great against them. Tit. v. p. 111, A.D. 447, treats of the violations of sepulchres, and enacts severe penalties against such crimes; from this law we learn that the clergy themselves were frequently guilty of such offences. Tit. xii. p. 127, A.D. 452, is his most celebrated law, and is an anticipation of mediaeval legislation. It withdraws the clergy from the episcopal courts and subjects them to the lay judges. Baronius in his *Annals*, A.D. 451, heartily abuses Valentinian for this impious law, and considers Attila's invasion a direct and immediate expression of Heaven's anger. Many of the remaining Novels deal with testamentary law, and are of importance for the history of that branch of forensic science. [G. T. S.]

VALENTINIANUS (4), surnamed Galates, only son of the emperor Valens, was born in January A.D. 366, was consul in A.D. 369 (*Fasti Idatiani*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* h. 910), and died in January A.D. 372. For the circumstances of his death, see BASILIUS OF CAESAREA, Vol. I. 289. [F. D.]

VALENTINIANUS (5), a relation of Gregory Nazianzen who, having, it appears, met with a serious accident when making use of a vehicle belonging to the state, by which the horses were killed and he himself injured, Gregory wrote in his behalf to Nemesius the governor of Cappadocia for a remission of the penalty incurred (*Greg. Naz. Ep.* 183). Valentinian caused grievous offence to Gregory by settling with the female members of his family near Carballa, where Gregory, towards the close of his life, had found a temporary resting-place in the vicinity of a martyr. The proximity of a number of women, whose character was not above suspicion, was very offensive to Gregory, and he wrote an indignant letter to Valentinian, charging him with driving him from paradise by an Eve (*Greg. Naz. Ep.* 196). [E. V.]

VALENTINIANUS (6), a presbyter of Rome, one of the Western deputation charged with the letters of Honorius, Innocent, and the Italian bishop to Constantinople. (*Pallad.* 31.) [E. V.]

VALENTINIANUS (7), monk in Gregory the Great's monastery, one of the monks whose death was foreshadowed by the vision that appeared to the monk Gerontius. (*Dial.* iv. 26.)

[F. D.]

VALENTINIANUS (8), abbat of the Lateran monastery, where the Benedictines took refuge after the destruction of M. Cassino. After a rule of many years, he died some time before the date of the Dialogues of Gregory the Great. He was one of his four authorities for the life of St. Benedict. (*Dial.* ii. *Praef.*)

[F. D.]

VALENTINUS (1), (Ὀυαλεντίνος), founder of one of the Gnostic sects which originated in the first half of the second century.

I. *Biography.*—According to the tradition of the Valentinian School witnessed to by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* vii. 17, 106, p. 898, Potter), Valentinus had been a disciple of Theodas, who himself, it is said, had been acquainted with the apostle St. Paul (ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ουαλεντίνον Θεοδάδι ἀκηκοέναι φέρουσιν· γνώριμος δ' οὗτος γεγόνει Παύλῳ). The latter half of this statement is very improbable. Valentinus cannot have begun to disseminate his Gnostic doctrines for which he is said to have alleged Theodas as a witness, till towards the end of the reign of Hadrian. Before this he is said to have been a catholic Christian. It must have been, therefore, at that very time, or only shortly before his appearance as the head of a Gnostic sect, that Valentinus became a hearer of Theodas and received, as he said, his doctrines from him. Now we know that the gnostics were fond of deriving their secret doctrines from apostolic tradition, and to trace them back to disciples of the apostles. As such a disciple of the apostles themselves we must suppose this otherwise unknown Theodas to have been described. To him the Valentinians appealed as an authority in much the same way as Basilides was said to have been a disciple of Glaucias, and he to have been an "interpreter of Peter." If with Bentley we read Θεοδᾶ διακηκοέναι (instead of Θεοδάδι ἀκηκοέναι) it seems obvious to find in Θεοδᾶς or Θεουδᾶς a contraction from Θεόδωρος, or as Ussher had assumed from Θεόδοτος. In the latter case there would be something very attractive in Zahn's conjecture (*Forschungen*, iii. 125), that Theodas was one and the same person with that Theodotus from whose teaching Clemens Alexandrinus has elsewhere preserved some fragments (*excerpta ex scriptis Theodoti*). But this after all remains a mere possibility which receives no confirmation from the terms of the superscription prefixed to those *Excerpta* (ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας κατὰ τοὺς Ουαλεντίνου χρόνους ἐπιτομαί). For "the Anatolic school" we know, on the testimony of other witnesses, to have been a branch of the Valentinians, though it must have stood nearer to the original teaching of Valentinus himself. At any rate this Ἀνατολικὴ διδασκαλία, said to have existed κατὰ τοὺς Ουαλεντίνου χρόνους, and to have had, as would seem, this Theodotus at its head, cannot be meant to designate a doctrine which was disseminated before Valentinus and adopted by him as an external authority, but rather an

opinion widely received among his disciples, as is clearly proved by the designation, so frequent in the excerpts, οἱ ἀπὸ Ουαλεντίνου or οἱ Ουαλεντινιανοί. If then that Theodotus was really one and the same person with Valentinus's alleged teacher Θεοδᾶς, we must at any rate assume, not indeed that Clemens made his excerpts from a book disseminated in the name of Theodas, but only that in the writings of those Anatolic Valentinians from which Clemens excerpted, Theodotus was cited as an older authority. But whether such citations were actually made, as Zahn would have it, from a book bearing the name of either Theodotus or Theodas, must be left to stand as a mere conjecture.

Irenaeus (i. 11, 1) speaks of Valentinus as the first who transformed the doctrines of the Gnostic "Heresy" to a peculiar doctrinal system of his own (εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου). The meaning of these words cannot possibly be that Valentinus was the first among all heretics to be the founder of an independent school called after his own name. For Irenaeus would thereby set himself in opposition to his own statements concerning Simon, Menander, Saturninus, Basilides. The only alternative is to take the expression γνωστικῆ αἵρεσις in the narrower sense, and to understand it as designating a party which called themselves "Gnostics." These self-styled "Gnostics" we may recognize in the so-called Ophites whose opinions are described by Irenaeus (i. 30). For, at the conclusion of his description of them, Irenaeus himself remarks that the Valentinian school originated from those unnamed heretics as from the many-headed Lernaeian Hydra (i. 30, 15: a quibus velut Lernaeae hydra multiplex capitibus fera de Valentini schola generata est). The same statement is repeated in somewhat different words further on (i. 31, 3: a talibus matribus et patribus et proavis eos qui a Valentino sunt . . . necessarium fuit manifeste arguere). The only remaining difficulty is found in the circumstance that we do not know whether the words in *Haer.* i. 11, 1 (which, moreover, have been handed down to us with a variation of text), are Irenaeus's own words or a quotation from an older authority. The old Latin text renders them thus: "Qui enim est primus ab ea quae dicitur gnostica haeresis antiquas in suum characterem doctrinas transferens, Valentinus sic definit." Eriphanus reads, on the other hand: ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης γνωστικῆς αἵρέσεως τὰς ἀρχαίας εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου μεταμόσας Ουαλεντίνος οὕτως ἔξηροφόρησεν (ἐληρολόγησεν). Similar expressions recur i. 24, 7 (illorum enim theorematum accipientes, in suum characterem doctrinae transtulerunt), and i. 28, 1 (proprium characterem doctrinae constituit). Hereby it seems that the original reading in i. 11, 1, must also have been τὰς ἀρχαίας εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλίας, and also to be proved that the words in question are Irenaeus's own, to whose peculiar diction they appear to belong. Irenaeus then informs us that Valentinus transformed the already existing doctrines of those nameless (Ophitic) Gnostics in a way peculiar to himself, and so became the founder of a new form of doctrine. The correctness of this statement will appear further

en when we come to a detailed description of the Valentinian system. Concerning the home and locality of these so-called "Gnostics" Irenaeus tells us nothing. But we know from other sources that those Ophite parties to whom he refers had their homes both in Egypt and Syria.

Concerning the fatherland of Valentinus himself Epiphanius is the first to give us accurate information, which, however, he derived not from any older writer, but simply, it appears, from oral tradition (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxi. 2). According to this his native home was on the coast of Egypt, and he received instruction in Greek literature and science at Alexandria (αὐτὸν γεγενησθαι Φρεβωνίτην τῆς Αἰγύπτου παραλίωτον ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ δὲ πεπαιδευθαι τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων παιδείαν). This statement appears to have been derived from an Egyptian local tradition. Whether the name assigned to the district is correct or not, seems impossible to determine. (For *Φρεβωνίτην* or *Φρεβωνίτην* some have proposed to substitute *Φθενοσίτην* *Πτενοσίτην* *Φαρβαθίτην*.) In various parts of Egypt (ἐν τῷ Ἀθριβίτῃ καὶ Προσωπίτῃ καὶ Ἀρσενοίτῃ καὶ Θηβαίδι, καὶ τοῖς κάτω μέρεσι τῆς παραλίας, καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείοπολίτῃ) there were found, in the time of Epiphanius himself (*Haer.* xxxi. 17) scattered relics of the Valentinian sect. The statement, that the birthplace of Valentinus was in Egypt, was probably derived from the traditional reports of these Egyptian Valentinians of the fourth century.

It may, on the other hand, appear doubtful in what place or country Valentinus first came forward with his Gnostic doctrines. Epiphanius, who makes him begin to teach in Egypt, relates further that he also went to Rome, and appeared as a religious teacher there, but that, both in Egypt and at Rome, he was regarded as orthodox, and first made shipwreck of faith in Cyprus, and began to disseminate heretical opinions (*l. c.* Ἐποίησατο δὲ οὗτος τὸ κήρυγμα καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀνελθὼν κεκήρυχεν. εἰς Κύπρον δὲ ἐληλυθὼς, ὡς ναυάγιον ὑποστάς φύσει σωματικῶς, τῆς πίστεως ἐξέστη, καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἐξέτραπή. Ἐνομίζετο γὰρ πρὸ τούτου μέρος ἔχειν εὐσεβείας ἐν τοῖς προεξημένοις τόποις ἐν δὲ τῇ Κύπρῳ λοιπὸν εἰς ἔσχατον ἀσεβείας ἐλήλακε. κ. τ. λ.). But this statement rests merely on a confused combination of different accounts. According to Irenaeus, Valentinus "flourished" at Rome in the times of Pius and Anicetus (ἤκμασε ἐπὶ Πίου καὶ παρέμεινεν ἕως Ἀνικητῶν. *Haer.* iii. 4, 3). Epiphanius, on the other hand, read (as we learn from Philaster, *Haer.* 38) in the *σύνταγμα* of Hippolytus, that Valentinus stood once in the communion of the church, but being drawn by overweening pride into apostasy had, during his residence in Cyprus, propounded his heretical doctrine. (Et in primis quidem fuit in Ecclesia. Elatior autem factus postmodum errore non parvo deceptus est, degensque in Cypri provincia coepit hoc definire.) Epiphanius, we see, combining the different accounts and traditions which in various ways had reached him, drew the conclusion that, after teaching orthodox doctrine in Egypt and Rome, he propounded his gnostic system first in Cyprus. But we cannot doubt that when Irenaeus speaks of Valentinus's flourishing at Rome during the times of Pius

and Anicetus, he refers to the fact, that his chief activity as a religious teacher was then displayed, and that under Anicetus he stood at the head of his own Gnostic school. With this there will be no difficulty in reconciling Tertullian's statement, that Valentinus no more than Marcion separated himself from the Church on his arrival at Rome (*Praescript. Haeret.* 36). For the Gnostics, for the very sake of disseminating their doctrines the more freely, made a great point of remaining in the Catholic church, and made use for that end of a twofold mode of teaching, one exoteric for the simpler sort of Believers, the other esoteric for the Initiated. The proof of this is found in the fragments which have come down to us, the most part of which purposely keep the peculiarly Gnostic doctrines in the background. Tertullian, in another place (*adv. Valent.* 4), gives, as the occasion of Valentinus's apostasy from the church, his having been a candidate for the Episcopal dignity as being a man of intellectual ability and eloquence, and his having been passed over in favour of another who had the higher claim (*praerogativa*) of having been a Martyr, *i. e.* a Confessor. This narrative, it must be allowed, is, like so many other imputations of unworthy motives laid by the Fathers to the charge of their heretical opponents, subject to the suspicion of having been a malicious invention.

In the other place in which Tertullian relates the origin of the false doctrines of Valentinus and Marcion, he tells us that they both, after more than one excommunication (*semel et iterum*) on account of the injury they were doing to the brethren by their unruly search after novelties, had been finally cast out, and then spread abroad their poisonous teaching. It may, nevertheless, be quite true that Valentinus was once a candidate for the episcopal dignity. His philosophical training (for which we have abundant evidence—Tertullian, *Praescript. Haer.* 30; Philast., *Haer.* 38; *Philosoph.* vi., 37, p. 197 et passim), his ability and his eloquence may well have given him claims in the eyes of others as well as in his own, to the bishop's chair. But whether this candidature was at Rome or Cyprus must remain uncertain. If we assume the former alternative it seems a probable conjecture of Hilgenfeld's that the Roman confessor for whose sake he was passed over, was the bishop Pius, and that Pius's "Martyrium" was contemporaneous with the martyr death of Telesphorus (Irenaeus, *Haer.* iii. 3, 3). But neither of Pius nor of Hyginus, his immediate predecessor, is it elsewhere recorded that he had attained the glory of a Confessor; for statements to that effect in the *Liber Pontificalis*, which makes out nearly all the first bishops of Rome to have been martyrs, deserve no consideration.

We may confidently place Valentinus's residence in Cyprus before his journey to Rome. According to the express statement of Irenaeus (iii. 4, 3), Valentinus came to Rome in the time of Hyginus, flourished under Pius, and remained there till Anicetus. According to this the residence at Rome must have occupied the period between A.D. 138 and A.D. 160. With this agrees the statement of Clemens Alexandrinus, who, in a passage (*Strom.* vii. 17, 106, p. 898) of some obscurity, but evidently intended to

be chronological, reckons Valentinus among heretical leaders in the time of Hadrian, and places him between Basilides and Marcion. Tertullian (*Praescr. Haer.* 30) puts him along with Marcion in the time of Antoninus Pius; but when he states further (*l. c.*) that Valentinus was still an orthodox member of the Catholic church under the episcopate of the blessed Eleutherus (since 175 or 176) he is evidently confusing Eleutherus either with Hyginus or with Pius. Elsewhere (*de Carne Christi*, i.) he designates Valentinus as Marcion's *Condiscipulus* and *Condesertor*, who, like him, was at first a disciple of the catholic verity, but in like manner had afterwards fallen away. Later writers, as Eusebius (*Chronicon ad Ann. Abrah.* 2153 and 2159; *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 11), Hieronymus (*Chronicon ad Ann. Abrah.* 2156 and 2159), Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 7), and others, merely repeat the statements of Irenaeus.

Following the above authorities we may conclude that Valentinus, towards the end of Hadrian's reign (cir. A.D. 130), appeared as a teacher in Egypt and in Cyprus, and that after this, about the commencement of the reign of Antoninus Pius, or in the early years of that emperor, he came to Rome, and during the long reign of Antoninus worked as a teacher in the eternal city. It is probable that he had developed and secretly prepared his theological system before he came to Rome. His removal thither was doubtless occasioned by the same motive as that which led other leaders of sects, like Cerdo and Marcion, to go to Rome; he hoped to find a wider field for his activity as a teacher. From a similar motive he attached himself at first to the communion of the Catholic church.

II. *History of the Sect.*—Valentinus had numerous adherents. They divided themselves, we are told, into two schools—the anatomic or oriental, and the Italian school (Pseudorig. *Philosoph.* vi. 35, p. 195, Miller, cf. Tertullian, *adv. Valentinian.* c. 11, and the title prefixed to the excerpts of Clemens 'Εκ τοῦ Θεοδοῦτου καὶ τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας). The former of these schools was spread through Egypt and Syria, the latter in Rome, Italy, and Southern Gaul. Among his disciples, Secundus appears to have been one of the earliest. Tertullian (*adv. Valentinian.* 4) and the epitomators of Hippolytus mention him after Ptolemaeus (Pseudotertull. *Haer.* 13; Philast. *Haer.* 40); the older work, on the other hand, excerpted by Irenaeus is apparently correct in naming him first as Valentinus's earliest disciple (*Haer.* i. 11, 2). Then follows, in the same original work as quoted by Irenaeus (*Haer.* i. 11, 3), another illustrious teacher (ἄλλος ἐπιφανὴς διδάσκαλος), of whom a misunderstanding of later heresiologists has made a Valentinian leader, named Epiphane; who this illustrious teacher was is matter of dispute. Certainly not the much later Heracleon, whose views as known to us from other sources by no means coincide with the statements of Irenaeus. A much more probable conjecture is with Neander (*Gnostische Systeme*, p. 169), and Salmon [MARCUS (17)] to suppose it was Marcus whose first Tetrad exactly corresponds to that of this unnamed teacher (cf. *Haer.* i. 15, 1, καθ' ἃ προερίηται). That Irenaeus does not name him here is easily ex-

plained by the supposition, that no name was given in the source from which he was quoting, and that the agreement of the views there described with those of Marcus escaped his attention. Harvey and Hilgenfeld suggest the name of Colarbasus or Kolarbasos (Irenaeus i. 14, 1, cf. Tertull. *adv. Valentinian.* 4). The name itself Hilgenfeld has shown to be Egyptian (Κολάρβασος, *Inscr. Gr.* 6585; Kolorbasios Nilus, *Épp.* iii. 52). Meanwhile, however, the historical reality of the alleged heretic Colarbasus is not hereby established, but only the ease with which the misunderstanding may have arisen [KOLARBASUS]. The agreement between Hippolytus (ap. Pseudotertull. 15, Philast. 43; cf. *Philos.* vi. 5, p. 161, and vi. 55, p. 222), and Tertullian (*adv. Valentinian.* 4, where instead of "colabroso" we must read "Colarbaso"), makes it a very probable conjecture that Irenaeus himself may have been guilty of the misunderstanding of the Aramaic

קול ארבע כל ארבע. Meanwhile the words Οὗτος οὐδ' ὁ Μάρκος μήτηραν καὶ ἐκδοχείου τῆς Κολαρβάσου Σιγῆς ἐαυτὸν μονώτατον γεγενέσθαι λέγων (Iren. *Haer.* i. 14, 1) can only mean what is more plainly expressed immediately afterwards, that the highest Tetrad had itself descended upon Marcus in female guise because the world would have been unable to bear its manhood (τὸ ἄρβεν αὐτῆς), and that it had made known to him only what till then had not been revealed to any whether gods or men. This Σιγή, then of Marcus, to which Irenaeus elsewhere refers in a tone of irony, is none other than the female form of the masculine Tetrad, which for all except only the μονώτατος Μάρκος has remained a Σιγή σεσωπημένη. In this way the expression ἡ Κολαρβάσου Σιγῆ explains itself as one already used by Marcus himself. Κολάρβασος is τὸ ἄρβεν τῆς Τετραδος, and Σιγῆ the highest female principle which has revealed to Marcus alone the mysteries of the Tetrad (cf. Iren. *Haer.* i. 14, 2, 3, 7, and 15, 1, 5). As this Σιγῆ is introduced by Irenaeus as the speaking authority for the doctrines of Marcus (ἡ Μάρκου Σιγῆ ἐδογματίσθη—ὡς φησι ἡ Μάρκου Σιγῆ—οὕτως ἀπαγγέλλει ἡ πάνσοφος αὐτῆ Σιγῆ), one is led to the conjecture, that Irenaeus may have made his citations from a writing of Marcus which bore the title ἡ Κολαρβάσου Σιγῆ. Quite impossible on the other hand is the attempt of Hilgenfeld to amend τῆς Κολαρβάσου Σιγῆς into τῆς Κολαρβάσου γνώσεως (*Ketzergeschichte*, p. 288). Hippolytus (*ll. cc.*) made this supposed Colarbasus into a disciple of Marcus, while Hilgenfeld regards him as his teacher. Marcus himself will, in any case, belong to the eldest of Valentinus's disciples (Lipsius, *Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*, p. 33). His labours in Asia were probably contemporaneous with Valentinus's residence and activity at Rome, and there a "godly elder and herald of the truth" whom Irenaeus quotes from as an older authority made him the subject of metrical objurgation as the "forerunner of anti-Christian malice" (Iren. *Haer.* i. 15, 6).

Ptolemaeus, on the other hand, was a contemporary of Irenaeus himself [PTOLEMAEUS], and one of the leaders of the Italian school (Iren. *Haer. Praef.* 2, Pseudorig. *Philos.* vi. 35), whom

Hippolytus in the syntagma, and probably on the basis of an arbitrary combination of Iren. i. 8, 5, with 11, 2, puts at the head of all other disciples of Valentinus. Heracleon was still younger than Ptolemaeus [HERACLEON], and the second head of the Italian school. His doctrinal system appears to be that mainly kept in view in the *Philosophumena* (cf. vi. 29, 35). Irenaeus names him as it were in passing (*Huer.* ii. 4, 1), while Tertullian designates his relation to his predecessors with the words, Valentinus showed the way, Ptolemaeus walked along it, Heracleon struck out some side paths (*Adv. Valentinian.* 4). He makes also the like remark concerning Secundus and Marcus. Clemens speaks of Heracleon (cir. A.D. 193) as the most distinguished among the disciples of Valentinus (*Strom.* iv. 9, 73, p. 595). He means of course among those of his own time. Origen's statement, therefore, that he had a personal acquaintance with Valentinus (Origen. *in Joann.* tom. ii. 8) is to be received with caution. In part contemporaneously with him appear to have worked the heads of the anatolian (oriental) school Axionikos and Bardesanes (*Ἀρθησιάνης*, Philos. vi. 35), who both lived into the first decennia of the third century.

Axionikos was still working at Antioch when Tertullian composed his book against the Valentinians, and therefore circa A.D. 218 (Tertull. *l. c.*). We cannot here enter into the inquiry how far the celebrated Edessene Gnostic Bardesanes (*ob.* 223) may be rightly accounted a Valentinian. Tertullian indicates Axionikos as the only one who in his day still represented the original teaching of Valentinus. Theotimus, therefore, who is previously mentioned by Tertullian, and seems to have occupied himself much with the "Figures of the Law," was, it appears, an older teacher. The same was also probably the case with Alexander, the Valentinian whose syllogisms Tertullian had in his hands (*de Carne Christi*, c. 16 sqq.).

Concerning the later history of the Valentinian sect we have but meagre information. Tertullian, writing about A.D. 218, speaks of the Valentinians in his book against them as the "*frequentissimum collegium inter haereticos.*" This is confirmed by what is told us of the local extension of the sect. From Egypt it seems to have spread to Syria, Asia Minor, and to Rome. Its division into an oriental and an Italian school shows that the party had its adherents even after the death of its founder, in both the east (Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia) and the west (specially at Rome). In Asia Minor the Valentinian doctrine appears to have been mainly disseminated by Marcus, who was so vigorously attacked (cir. A.D. 150) by the "godly elder," quoted by Irenaeus (*Haer.* i. 15, 6). Disciples of Marcus were found by Irenaeus in the Rhone districts (*Haer.* i. 13, 7), and in the same parts the bishop of Lyons appears to have met with adherents of Ptolemaeus (*Haer. Praef.* 2). In Rome, about A.D. 223, an important work of the Italian school came into the hands of the writer of the *Philosophumena*, who speaks of both schools as being in existence in his time (*Philos.* vi. 35, p. 195). Tertullian also mentions the *duae scholae* and *duae cathedrae*, between which the party was divided in his time (*Adv. Valentinian.* 11). Remains of the sect were still found

in Egypt, as we have seen, in the time of Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 7). Theodoret, on the other hand (*H. f. Praef.*), can only speak of the Valentinians as of other Gnostic sects (whom he deals with in his first book) as belonging to the past—*παλαιὰς αἰρέσεις*—of whom he possesses a mere historical knowledge.

III. *Writings.*—The fragments of the writings of Valentinus have been collected by Grabe (*Spicilegium*, ii. 45-48), and more completely by Hilgenfeld (*Ketzergeschichte*, p. 93-207). These consist of fragments of letters and homilies preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* ii. 8, 36, p. 448; ii. 20, 114, p. 488 sq.; iii. 7, 59, p. 538; iv. 13, 91, p. 603; vi. 6, 52, p. 767), and of two pieces contained in the *Philosophumena*, the narrative of a vision (*δραμα*) seen by Valentinus (*Philos.* vi. 42, p. 203), and the fragment of a psalm composed by him (*Philos.* vi. 37, p. 197 sq.). Psalms of Valentinus's authorship are mentioned by Tertullian (*de carne Christi*, 17, 20). On the other hand, the opinion that he was the author of a gospel (Pseudotertull. *adv. Haeres.* 12) rests on a misunderstanding, as does also Grabe's assumption (*Spicil.* ii. p. 49) founded on Tertullian (*adv. Valentinian.* 2) that he had composed a peculiar work entitled "Sophia." Grabe was moreover in error when he placed the piece taken from the *Dialogus de recta in Deum fide*, sect. iv. (Origen. *Opp.* i. 840 sq. de la Rue) and superscribed τὸ δόγμα Οὐαλεντινίου among the fragments of Valentinus. The same piece is found in a more complete form in Methodius *περὶ τοῦ ἀντεξουσίου* (ed. A. Jahn, p. 54 sqq.), as part of a dialogue in which a Valentinian takes part. Its source was probably the writing of Maximus, *περὶ τῆς ἑλῆς*, from which a considerable piece in the fourth section of the dialogue *de recta fide* can be shown to have been derived (cf. Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* vii. 22).

Remains of the writings of the school of Valentinus are more abundantly forthcoming. Beside the numerous fragments and quotations in Irenaeus and the *Philosophumena*, and in the excerpts from Theodotus, and the anatolic school, which seem yet to need a closer investigation, may be mentioned here: The letter of Ptolemaeus to Flora (ap. Epiphanius. *Haer.* xxxiii. 3-7), numerous fragments from the commentaries (*δπομνήματα*) of Heracleon on S. Luke (ap. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 9, 73 sq, p. 595 sq.; excerpt. ex prophet. § 25, p. 995), and on S. John (ap. Origen *in Joann. passim*), collected by Grabe (*Spicil.* i. 80-117) and Hilgenfeld (*Ketzergeschichte*, 472-498); lastly, a rather large piece out of an otherwise unknown Valentinian writing preserved by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 5 and 6).

IV. *Accounts given by the Fathers.*—Statements concerning Valentinus and his school are very numerous in the writings of doctors of the church. But many of these are so contradictory that it is difficult to make out what was the original doctrine of Valentinus in distinction from later developments. Even in his day Tertullian made the complaint (*adv. Valentinian.* 4), "Ita nunquam jam Valentinus, et tamen Valentiniani, qui per Valentinum." Among those who before him had controverted the Valentinians, Tertullian enumerates (*l. c.* 5): Justin Martyr, Miltiades, Irenaeus, and the Montanist Proculus. Of the writings of these four men on this sub-

ject one only has been preserved, the great work of Irenaeus in five books, entitled *Ἐλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*, which has come down to us, alas! in great part, only in the ancient Latin version. This work was written, as we learn from a notice near the commencement of the third book (iii. 3, 3) in the time of the Roman bishop Eleutherus, cir. A.D. 180-185. The greater part of the first book (cc. 1-21, according to Massuet's division), which Epiphanius has preserved to us almost completely (*Haer.* xxxi. 8-32; xxxii. 1, 5, 7; xxxiii. 1, 2; xxxiv. 1-20; xxxv. 1; xxxvi. 3), and in part Pseudorigenes also (*Philos.* vi. 38, 39, 42-55) occupies itself exclusively with the Valentinians; and the refutations contained in the following books are principally concerned with them. The lengthened descriptions of Valentinian doctrine fall into four main groups. The first seven chapters give a connected account of the whole system, to which cc. 8 and 9 add a description and confutation of the Valentinian method of interpreting Scripture, followed in c. 10 by a concluding summary of the Christian faith. Chapters 11 and 12 give, by way of appendix, brief statements concerning the different opinions of Valentinus and his chief disciples, with interspersed polemical observations. Chapters 13-18 treat of the Valentinian Marcus and his followers, the Marcosians. Finally, cc. 19-21 form an appendix to the whole description, as is evident from the introductory words (19, 1), and yet more from the contrast between the subjects treated of in these chapters and those of the preceding section (cc. 13-18). Again, cc. 19 and 20 give further examples of the Valentinian (here chiefly the Marcosian) method of scriptural interpretation; c. 21 contains a collection of Gnostic customs and formulas which are expressly referred back to various groups and divisions of the sect. The Aramaic forms of prayer, for instance, belong probably not to the Marcosian group but to the Syrian branch of the Valentinians, concerning whose later theories Epiphanius has some further information to give us, derived from the above mentioned original source to which he had access (*Haer.* xxxi. 5 and 6, cf. cap. 2-4).

Isolated notices serving to complete the whole representation are found in the following books of Irenaeus (e.g. the notice concerning Horus in ii. 12, 7). The sources from which Irenaeus derived his accounts are of sufficient variety. In the preface to the first book (c. 2) he refers to the writings of those who call themselves disciples of Valentinus, adding that he had met some of them himself, and heard their opinions from their own mouths (*ἐντυχὼν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι τῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν, Οὐαλεντίνου μαθητῶν, ἐνίοις δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ συμβαλῶν καὶ καταλαβόμενος τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν*). Immediately afterwards he indicates that the contemporary Valentinians, whose doctrine he promises to describe, are those of the school of Ptolemaeus (*καὶ καθὼς δύναμις ἡμῖν, τὴν τε γνώμην αὐτῶν τῶν νῦν παραδιδασκόντων, λέγω δὴ τῶν περὶ Πτολεμαίου, ἀπάνθισμα οὖσαν τῆς Οὐαλεντίνου σχολῆς, συντόμως καὶ σαφῶς ἀναγγελοῦμεν*). According to this we may venture to assume, that Irenaeus had read writings proceeding from Ptolemaeus and members of his school, and that information thus obtained he had completed by

means of oral communications. In the first book (c. 8, 5) he introduces into a detailed description of the Valentinian method of interpreting Scripture a large fragment which undertakes to prove the truth of the higher Ogdoad of the Valentinian Pleroma from the prologue of the Gospel of St. John. The concluding notice (found only in the Latin text) expressly ascribes the authorship of this fragment to Ptolemaeus. In like manner with regard to the doctrine and practices of the Marcosians, Irenaeus has obtained his information partly from a written source, partly from oral communications. We can hardly assume that Marcus was still alive when Irenaeus wrote. As proof of this we cannot admit either his occasional use of the present tense in his account of Marcus, nor his occasionally addressing him in the second person, as Tertullian does Marcion. Still less can we assume with S. Jerome (*in Jes.* 64) that Marcus himself worked in Gaul and Spain. This assumption rests on a misunderstanding of a passage in Irenaeus (*Haer.* i. 13, 7), whereas another (i. 13, 5) plainly intimates that he lived in Asia Minor, and there also we must look for the "godly elder," from whose iambs against Marcus Irenaeus quotes a few verses (i. 15, 6). It is, however, not unlikely that adherents of Marcus may have appeared in the Rhone districts in the time of Irenaeus [MARCUS]. The section which specially treats of Marcus (i. 12-15) appears to have been derived from a written source. But what he brings to light for the first time (cc. 16-18) concerning the mysteries celebrated by the adherents of Marcus is founded on oral information.

A written source of information forms also the basis of cc. 11 and 12, or at least of c. 11, 1-3. My conjecture (Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanius*, p. 159), that the account (c. 11, 1) of Valentinus's own doctrine, was taken from the same heresiological writing which Irenaeus made use of in his summary review (cc. 22-27) of all the heretical parties, has been extended to the whole section (*Haer.* i. cc. 11 and 12) by Heinrici (*Die Valentinianische Gnosis und die Heilige Schrift*, p. 40), and I have myself been inclined to agree with him (*Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*, p. 60). But this view has been opposed by Lüdemann (*Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland*, 1876, col. 348), and by Hilgenfeld (*l. c.* p. 53-56) [IRENÆUS]. And, in fact, it remains only a mere possibility, that the same writing, from which Irenaeus made extracts to furnish out his description of the doctrine of Valentinus, as well as that of his two oldest disciples, Secundus and the unnamed, *ἄλλος ἐπιφανῆς διδάσκαλος* (interspersing at 11, 4 observations of his own)—should also be the source from which he derives his later statements (11, 5 and 12, 1 and 3) concerning subsequent developments of the school. At 12, 2 Irenaeus is again himself the speaker, and we must also regard the good bishop of Lyons as responsible for what is stated at 12, 4 concerning differences of teaching among the Valentinians about the soter. It remains, therefore, the safest course to restrict to I. 11, 1-3, the assumed use by Irenaeus of his old written authority, and to regard the statements at 1, 11, 5, and those at 12, 1, 3 and 4 as additional notices obtained by him from other

quarters. The words (11, 5) ἵνα τελείων τελειότεροι φανῶσιν ὄντες καὶ γνωστικῶν γνωστικώτεροι betray the same writer as those at 12, 1, οἱ δὲ περὶ τῶν Πτολεμαίων γνωστικώτεροι (Epiphanius, ἐμπειρότεροι), and at 12, 3 "qui autem prudentiores putantur illorum esse." If indeed (as at one time I was disposed to assume, *Quellen der ält. Ketzergesch.* p. 206) Ptolemaeus and his whole party are meant (at 12, 1) to be seriously designated as "the more prudent or experienced ones," such a description would by no means agree with the first seven chapters in which Irenaeus sets himself, especially to describe the doctrine of the Ptolemaic school, nor with the fragment 8, 5. But neither would this discrepancy be any proof that 12, 1 was derived from the same older source as 11, 1-3; on the contrary, it remains undeniable that the hand of Irenaeus is to be traced in every part of this twelfth chapter. But he has here probably in view (as indeed Tertullian understood him, *Adv. Valentiniān.* 33), not Ptolemaeus himself but the "emendatores Ptolemaei," with whose views he could hardly have become acquainted in any other way than by oral communication. Assuming, then, that the use made by Irenaeus of the old written authority must be restricted to 11, 1-3, the main difficulty is removed for regarding that document as identical with the syntagma against all heresies of Justin-Martyr. A second difficulty which still remains is also capable of a like solution [IRENÆUS]. But yet more difficult is it to determine from what sources Irenaeus drew his main description (i. 1-8). That several accounts must have lain before him has already been rightly discerned by Heinrici. Twice is our attention specially directed to the transition made from one authority to another by the expressions ἐνιοι δὲ αὐτῶν (2, 3), and εἰσι δὲ οἱ λέγοντες (7, 2). But for the most part, Irenaeus is content to introduce the Valentinians whom he means to controvert, without quoting any particular authority, and simply with the word λέγουσι or φασί. That his statements differ among themselves in certain particulars is no sure proof of his having used different written authorities. One such source may have gathered and combined a variety of statements. The concluding notice at the end of 8, 5, "et Ptolemaeus quidem ita" proves only that the piece immediately preceding was derived from a book of Ptolemaeus' authorship, and does not even warrant our inferring that 8, 1-4 consist of statements from the same authority. Our footing becomes firmer when we come to the observation, that Irenaeus has sometimes drawn from the same source as Clemens Alexandrinus in the excerpts from Theodotus. The agreements between them are sometimes literal. They begin at 4, 5 and extend to 6, 1, and again re-appear at 7, 1 and 5. What lies between is partly drawn from another source (6, 2; 7, 2-4), and partly added by Irenaeus himself (6, 3 and 4). The corresponding section of the excerpts extends from 43 to 65. The authority thus made use of belonged not to the oriental but to the Italian school. No single utterance in the whole section over which the common use extends can be traced back to Theodotus himself. Heinrici's assumption that the description in Clemens Alexandrinus, if not the direct source of that

given by Irenaeus, is, at any rate, the more original of the two (*l. c.* p. 92) proves on a closer comparison to be untenable. The truth is rather that sometimes Irenaeus, sometimes Clemens, has made the fuller use of the original document. Nor can we any longer determine with certainty how much of what he has written Irenaeus actually read in this particular authority. For in many instances his description seems to have combined two separate accounts; as, for instance, is evident from the numerous repetitions. In regard to section i. 1-4, 4, we can prove that he made use of different sources. i. 1-2, 2 forms a connected whole (A). At 2, 3 with ἐνιοι δὲ αὐτῶν begins another account (B), which, according to Lüdemann (*l. c.*), extends to the words μεταγωγέα καλοῦσι (in 2, 4), and gets mixed up with the former account in 3, 1. The second authority had, according to Lüdemann, maintained the unity of the Sophia, and "according to all appearance" (?) the identity of Horos with "Christus" and "Soter." The origination of the world is here derived from the sufferings (πάθη) of the Sophia by which she is seized on beholding the οὐσία ἄμορφος to which she has given birth. To the same source (B) must we refer the conception of Βυθός as sexless. Irenaeus, on the other hand, appears to have gone back (2, 4) to the former account (beginning at the words διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ὄρου τοῦτου φασί), and to this authority he continues to adhere through 2, 5 and 6. With regard to the section 3, 1-6, which gives, for the most part, mere allegorical interpretations, we might be in some doubt as to its origin; but here again there does not appear to be any mixture of the two sources; the dogmatic form is really identical with that of A. From the same source A was at any rate derived the account given at 4, 1 and 2 of the formation of the world.

4, 3 and 4 contain additions made by Irenaeus himself.

With 4, 5 begins the authority common to Irenaeus and Clement (C) whose description is frequently completed by means of A, or interrupted by parallel accounts from that source. From all this the relation of the sources appears to be as follows:—From A are derived 1, 1-2, 2; 2, 4 (from διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ὄρου τοῦτου on) to 2, 6, 4, 1 and 2; 4, 4 from the words τὴν τε Ἀχαμῶθ ἐκτὸς πάθους γενομένην, and on to the end of 5, 1; 5, 3 some clauses (from ταύτην δὲ τὴν μητέρα to συντελείας); 5, 4 from the words διὰ τοῦτο ἄτονότερον to the words ἐν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς κόσμῳ; 5, 6; 6, 1 the greater part apparently; 6, 2-4 entirely; and 7, 2-5. From B are taken 2, 3-4 (as far as to διὰ δὲ τοῦ Ὄρου). From C: 4, 5 and 6 (for the most part) to the words δεδημιουργηκέναι φάσκουσι; 5, 2-4 (for the most part) to θηρίων καὶ ἀνθρώπων, and from ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἐκπλήξεως onwards to the end; 5, 5 entire; some things in 6, 1 (?); and 7, 1.

It seems certain that A and C were written sources. The brief account, which we have entitled B, is probably to be traced back to various occasional notices derived from oral tradition (2, 4; 2, 1; 5, 1. 3). The here, so-called, ἐνιοι will be the same as those whom Irenaeus speaks of in the preface (c. 2). Of the two main sources, A and C, the former, which Irenaeus follows with only a few interruptions down to 4, and to which he afterwards re-

peatedly returns, seems to have originated in the Ptolemaic school, if not to have been the work of Ptolemaeus himself. Source C presents what is, at least in all essential points, the same form of doctrine. The extract 8, 5 is certainly made from an exegetical work of Ptolemaeus; from which may also have been taken the examples of allegorical interpretation at 8, 1-4, unless they be derived from the same source as the examples at 3, 1-5. But, inasmuch as in one case, at any rate (the symbolical indication of the suffering of the twelfth Aeon by the suffering of Jesus in the twelfth month), the same example recurs in both sections, we may perhaps, from hence, conclude that a borrowing took place from both sources.

Next in importance to the statements of Irenaeus, as a source of information concerning Valentinus himself and his school, are the fragments preserved among the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, and bearing the title *Ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας ἐπιτομαί*. These are found in the Florentine MS., fol. 358^a, with this superscription, after the so-called viiiith Book of the *Stromateis*; they are immediately followed, fol. 374^b, by *ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν ἐκλογαί*. They appear also to have occupied the same position in the now lost *Codex Augustinus*, which is occasionally cited by Sylburg in his edition of Clemens (p. 385 sq.). The text of these excerpts is come down to us in a somewhat forlorn condition. The only useable edition (along with the older editions of Sylburg and Potter) is that of Bunsen, in the first volume of the *Analecta Antinicaena* (London, 1854), p. 205-278. The Greek text is furnished with a Latin translation by Jakob Bernays, to whom we are also indebted for numerous happy emendations of the original Greek. The Oxford edition of W. Dindorf (vol. iii. p. 424-435) gives merely the old text without taking any notice of the labours of Bernays and Bunsen. The edition by Klotz (vol. iv. p. 1-31) distinguishes itself in these excerpts, as everywhere else, by negligence and untrustworthiness. The general character of these excerpts is similar to that of the like cases in other writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, and does not justify the assumption, that the abrupt fragmentary form in which they have reached us proceeded from Clemens himself. Still less can we discern in these excerpts, "A youthful work of Clemens belonging to the time in which he was laboriously striving for the first time to emancipate himself from the influence of Gnostic authority." (Heinrici, *l. c.* p. 13, 89.) The kindred relation in which Clemens stands to Gnostic opinions is not greater in these excerpts than in his other writings. These sections, which have reached us only as mere extracts, constituted formerly one of the greatest works of Clemens. Zahn (*Forschungen*, iii. 122) would assign them to the viiiith Book of the *Stromateis*, because he found the *eclog. proph.* sometimes assigned to that book in the quotations of later Church writers (*l. c.* p. 29, 119 sq.). But no such citation can be alleged on behalf of the *Excerpt. ex Theod.*, and internal evidence (cf. *Strom.* iv. 1-3) would rather refer them to the writing *περὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ θεολογίας*, or to the Hypotyposes, whose first book they may possibly have formed. The title

of the excerpta is not exact. For only a portion of them is, in fact, derived from the Valentinian sources made use of; another and not smaller portion of the work consists of counter-observations and independent discussions by Clemens himself. With respect to the fragmentary character of the extracts themselves, and the near relationship between the opinions of Clemens and those of some Gnostics, it may in some cases be doubtful what origin to assign to this or that piece. Discussions belonging to Clemens himself, are: § 1, τὸ ἐκλεκτὸν σπέρμα . . . εἰς πίστιν. §§ 4, 5, ὁ κύριος διὰ πολλῆν . . . νομοδιδασκάλων ἀγωγῆν, §§ 8-15, ἡμεῖς δὲ — καὶ ταῖς οὐσίαις; § 17, from ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ on to § 20 τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ; § 23 from τάχα δὲ τὸ πρόσσπον on to the end ἀγνωστὸν ἐστὶ τοῦ πατρὸς; § 24 from ἀγνωστοὶ δὲ το παλαιὰν διαθήκην; § 27 (the whole piece); § 34 ἐστὶν οὖν ὁ λόγος το καρποὶ αὐτοῦ. With respect to the last sections from § 66 on, and especially, § 82-86, the judgment may remain doubtful. It is evident that the excerptor himself regarded what is there given as Valentinian opinion, and sometimes even in these sections we find a φησί or φασί (§§ 67, 75, 78, 79, 81); §§ 66-68, are isolated additions made to a preceding exposition, the Gnostic origin of which is indubitable. §§ 69-81, form a connected discussion concerning the εἰμαρμένη. At the same time, the violent way in which these excerpts have been dislocated and their original coherence broken up, renders it almost impossible to arrive at a fixed judgment. The title which they now bear is, further, inexact on another account. Theodotus is actually cited as authority in these excerpts only five times (§§ 22, 26, 30, 32, 35). The circumstance, that in a few places, φησί is used instead of φασί cannot prove that the writer here meant is Theodotus, and not the Valentinians (οἱ ἀπὸ Οὐαλαντίνου or οἱ Οὐαλεντιανοί): for φησί and φασί are perpetually interchanged in MSS. (φησί stands § 1, 22, and before that in § 21, we have φασίν οἱ Οὐαλεντιανοί, but immediately afterwards, we have again φασίν; § 41 φησίν, immediately afterwards φασίν; § 43 φησί, and after that, λέγουσιν, § 67 φησίν—on which, see Zahn, *l. c.* p. 123). Heinrici thinks himself able to trace back yet more sections to Theodotus, and attributes to him a series of passages which are certainly not of his authorship; e.g. (§ 58) the statement about the bodily nature of Christ and the whole of § 67. The first remark to be made on this is that, in the passages parallel with Irenaeus, the name of Theodotus nowhere meets us. But even such sections as substantially agree with what can be expressly traced back to Theodotus are (excepting only in § 1, the interpretation of Luke xxiii. 46, cf. § 26) not with any certainty to be referred to him. So at § 23, the very same doctrine concerning Christ, for which at § 32 Theodotus is cited as authority, is ascribed to the Valentinians; and Zahn remarks with right (p. 123), that statements from and concerning Theodotus are wont insensibly to pass over into utterances concerning Valentinian doctrine generally. According to this, our previous inference will be confirmed that Clemens made use of a Valentinian writing, which appealed to Theodotus as its chief authority. A third inaccuracy in the title given

to these excerpts, is that of ascribing them to the Oriental school (ἐκ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς λεγομένης διδασκαλίας). For it is only the first portion of the Valentian fragments which belong to that school (§§ 1-42); the second portion, on the other hand (§§ 43-65), expound the teaching of the Italian school. The writing made use of for the latter exposition had also served, as remarked above, as one of the sources made use of by Irenaeus. It distinguishes the upper Sophia from the Achamoth, contains a Christology differing from that of the first portion, and assigns to Christ, not a pneumatic, but a merely psychical body. Heinrici (*l. c.* p. 90) distinguishes three groups in these excerpts: (1) Exegetical pieces (§§ 1-7; §§ 21-27); (2) A well-connected exposition of doctrine (§§ 29-65), and (3) another well-connected piece (§§ 69-85). True it is that the first of these groups, which is frequently interrupted by counter-observations and detailed expositions on the part of Clemens, is almost exclusively occupied with interpretation of passages of Scripture. It belongs to the Anatolic school, and presents the same type of doctrine as §§ 29-42.

The passages treated of point for the most part to allegorical interpretations of Genesis (§§ 2, 21), and the prologue of St. John (§§ 6, 7), and passages (generally) from the Gospel of St. John (§ 26), though other passages of Scripture are also dealt with (§ 1, St. Luke xxiii. 46; § 16, St. Luke iii. 33; § 22, 1 Cor. xv. 29; § 28, Numb. xiv. 18). The fragments given are not sufficient to enable us to form a satisfactory judgment as to the writings from which they are taken. The main group, §§ 29-65, was already regarded by Bunsen as forming a connected whole. But inasmuch as here also there are not a few expositions of Scripture texts, we shall hardly be warranted in classing the supposed sources made use of as works of exegesis on the one hand, and of systematic theology on the other. §§ 6 and 7 give a connected account of the Pleroma and its aeons and treat specially of the position of the *Μονογενῆς* and the *Λόγος*, which latter appear to have been identified by Theodotus with Jesus. §§ 2, 21 treat of the origin of pneumatic souls, and the difference of the seed, male and female. §§ 1, 3, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 26, treat of the coming down of the Logos as Jesus, and the redemption of pneumatic souls. All these pieces fit in readily into the connection of §§ 29-42. This latter section gives a complete outline of the system, beginning with the suffering within the Pleroma caused by the xiith Aeon, the Sophia, and ending with the Redemption by Jesus of the pneumatic souls. It is here related how Christos, an Emanation from the Sophia, forsakes his Mother and mounts to the Pleroma, and how then she, in her longing after the escaped one, produces the *Τόπος*, the *Ἀρχὴ τῆς οἰκουμένης*, and then how those of the Right and the Left, and, further, the *Πνευματικοὶ* (σπέρματα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, the *ἐκλογή*), the *Ψυχικοὶ* (δίκαιοι or κλήσις), and the unrighteous go forth. On the intercession of Christos, the Aeons of the Pleroma, emanate Jesus, who, clothed with the Sophia and the *Ἐκκλησία*, and accompanied by the *ἀγγελοὶ ἀρρενικοὶ*, comes down, and takes his place beside the fiery *Τόπος*,

in order to appease him and to raise up the pneumatic seed by the sign of the Cross to that Upper World to which from the beginning it has belonged. Immediately connected with this exposition there now follows upon it the Second Piece (§§ 43-65), belonging to the Italian school, which relates first the coming down of the Soter in order to impart to the Sophia the *μόρφωσις κατὰ γῶσιν*, and then describes in detail the formation of the natural world and its constituent parts out of the *πάθη* of the Sophia. It dwells with special predilection on the origination of the different classes of men and of the constituent parts of human nature, and then once more describes the Redemption accomplished by the (second) coming down of the Soter with the Angels. Among the discrepancies between this Piece and that which preceded it must be reckoned (besides what has just been noticed) the notion of the psychical Christos of the Demiurge and the different conception of the Demiurge himself, who appears here no longer as a terrible but simply as an inferior restricted Being. The terminology is also different. The peculiar way in which this Piece is connected with that which precedes it seems not to be explicable by the supposition that this younger (Italian) writer had the older (Anatolic) account before him, and has here developed it in his own way, but simply to be due to Clemens himself.

With the former (Anatolic) account, Irenaeus (if we except a superficial resemblance between *l. iv.* 5 and § 23 of the *Excerpt. ex Theodot.*) betrays no acquaintance; Clemens, on the other hand, repeatedly refers in the *Stromateis* to Valentian opinions which recur in that account (compare § 32 with *Strom.* iv. 13, 92; v. 1, 3; *III.* 1, 1; with § 41 comp. *Strom.* ii. 3, 10). We also find in the *Stromateis* (iii. 17, 102) the same view of the psychical Body of Jesus as in the second (Italian) account in the Excerpts. The division between the two pieces is to be drawn (§ 43) after the sentence beginning *λέγουσιν ὅδιν ὅτι αἱ δεξιά*, and ending with *δύναμιν*. That sentence still treats of the redemption of the Pneumatici, whereas what follows is part of a description of the descent of the Soter to effect the *μόρφωσις κατὰ γῶσιν* of the lower Sophia. (In accordance with this observation should be corrected my remark in the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1872, col. 179 sq.) Hilgenfeld moreover is wrong in his determination of the relationship between the two Valentian sources when he regards §§ 43-47 only as a piece of "Western Valentianism," and refers all the rest to the Anatolic school (cf. Hilgenfeld, *l. c.* p. 507).

Very little is to be obtained from the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus, which is preserved to us in the excerpts of Pseudotertullian (*Haer.* 12), and by Philaster (*Haer.* 38), as also in part by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 8; cf. *Quellen der ält. Ketzergeschichte*, p. 166). My former assumption that Hippolytus is here quite independent of Irenaeus (*Quellenkritik der Epiphanius*, p. 152; *Quellen der ält. Ketzergesch.* p. 166). I can no longer maintain against the arguments of Heinrici (*l. c.* p. 158), and more especially those of Lüdemann (*l. c.* col. 349). We must rather conclude that Hippolytus has here combined Irenaeus (cc. 1-7) with some other

authority belonging to the older Anatolic system. This is most evidently the case in the somewhat detailed excerpt in Pseudotertullian. The doctrine concerning the Aeons is derived from Irenaeus, i. 1-3; the precedence given to the twelve emanations from "Ἀνθρώπος and Ἐκκλησία, and their being placed before the ten derived from Λόγος and Ζωή, appears to find its explanation in Hippolytus's method of making his extracts. Having mentioned "Ἀνθρώπος and Ἐκκλησία, he at once proceeds to name the twelve Aeons which emanate from them, and then by way of supplement adds the ten earlier emanations from Λόγος and Ζωή. It must be allowed that the same transposition recurs in the authority excerpted by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 5).

But here, as well as in the system of the *prudenciores* referred to by Irenaeus (I. xii. 3, cf. Epiphanius *Haer.* xxxv. 1), the arrangement is a consistent one; the Syzygy of "Ἀνθρώπος and Ἐκκλησία precedes that of Λόγος and Ζωή, which in Hippolytus is not the case. When Philaster, after mentioning the twelve and then the ten Aeons adds, "*de Intellectu autem et Veritate octo aeternae*," this rests on a mere misunderstanding of the words of Irenaeus, 1, 1, καὶ εἶναι ταύτην ἀρχέγονον Ὁγδοάδα ῥίζαν καὶ ὑπόστασιν τῶν πάντων (this Ogdoad being Βυθός and Σιγή, Νοῦς and Ἀλήθεια, Λόγος and Ζωή, "Ἀνθρώπος and Ἐκκλησία). The doctrine of the Aeons is immediately followed in Hippolytus by the narrative of the Sophia's fall, and her re-establishment by means of Horus ("Ὅρος) cf. Iren. 2, 2; 3, 1. Here the words *et saepe dissolutum esse nisi* and *saepae perditum* point clearly back to Irenaeus (ἀναλελυθῆναι—εἰ μή, Iren. 2, 2; μετὰ (or κατὰ) μικρὸν ἀπωλότος, Iren. 3, 1). To this attaches itself the notice in Iren. 4, 1 that Horus hinders the lower Sophia from forcing her way into the Pleroma by the utterance of the word Ἰαώ. Hippolytus who had read in his former authority of only one Sophia, makes this narrative refer to her and her establishment in the Pleroma, against the original sense of the words. But having thus identified the Sophia of his former authority with the Achamoth of Irenaeus, he goes on to relate (following Irenaeus 4, 1) the origination of the world and its various parts from the longing and the πάθη of the Sophia, and proceeds with the words *quoniam quidem ipse fuerit de deceptione (ἀπορία) conceptus atque prolatus* to adopt and make completely his own the conception of Irenaeus who had made the world to originate entirely in the sufferings of Achamoth, the lower Sophia. The excerpt goes on in a very abrupt manner, and with a perfectly unintelligible *hunc* to speak of the active part taken by the Soter in the creation of the world (cf. Iren. 4, 5). And here Hippolytus makes another mistake; misunderstanding an ironical expression of Irenaeus about the sweat of Achamoth (4, 4), he derives the elements of the universe not merely (as Irenaeus's authority 4, 2 had done) from the fear and grief (φόβος καὶ λύπη), but also from the sweat of Achamoth. After this, Hippolytus returns to his former authority with the words—*Christum autem missum ab illo Propatore*. According to that authority Christus had been endowed by Bythos with a pneumatic body, and so had passed

through Mary as through a channel. This authority followed by Hippolytus is not (as I once assumed) identical with that which Irenaeus made use of (c. 11), nor again (as Lüdemann conjectures) with that followed by Irenaeus at 2, 3 and 4. The concluding remarks concerning the denial by Valentinus of the bodily resurrection, and concerning his relation to the Old and New Testament may have been drawn from the same source as that from which he derived his Christological statements. Philaster, who leaves out all that has been said above about the origination of the world from the πάθη of Achamoth, agrees pretty exactly with the accounts of Valentinus's Christology and his denial of a bodily resurrection as given by Pseudotertullian, but omits the concluding notice about Valentinus's relation to the canon of Scripture. This last point is also wanting in Epiphanius, who takes (*Haer.* xxxi. 8) from Hippolytus along with some particulars concerning the biography of Valentinus, the accounts of his Christology, and the statements concerning the resurrection of the σῶμα πνευματικόν. To these he adds some particulars about the pneumatici, the psychici, and the hylici, but falls into the mistake of introducing the psychical souls into the pleroma, and there espousing them to the angels of the Χριστός. In the following sections which treat of the disciples of Valentinus (Pseudotertullian, *Haer.* 13, 14; Philaster, *Haer.* 39-41) Hippolytus appears to have also combined the accounts given by Irenaeus (cc. 11 and 12) with notices derived from another source. From Irenaeus (11, 2) appears also to have been derived the statement (Pseudotertull. 13) that the fallen Aeon does not belong to the thirty. For Hippolytus, who, resting on his other authority, had assumed, though not with perfect consistency, the unity of the Sophia, this statement must have seemed to be specially important. What he relates concerning the two-fold Tetrad (which Ptolemaeus had made to precede his Triacontad), is connected with Iren. 11, 5 (comp. 11, 2); while his statements concerning Heracleon are connected with the doctrines of the ἄλλος ἐπιφανῆς διδάσκαλος of Iren. 11, 3. What is here peculiar is that Irenaeus neither attributes the latter of these views to Heracleon, nor the former to Ptolemaeus, and that on the other hand just those doctrines which Irenaeus does attribute to Secundus and Ptolemaeus (e.g. 11, 2 the τετράς δεξιά and ἀριστερά; 12, 1, the doctrine of the two σύζυγοι of Bythos which are assigned him by the *περὶ τῶν Πτολεμαίων γνωστικώτεροι*) are not so attributed by Hippolytus. Moreover in contradiction to the order observed by Irenaeus (cc. 11 and 12), Hippolytus puts Ptolemaeus before Secundus. And even if this last-mentioned transposition be explained by a reference to Irenaeus 8, 5, we must yet probably refer the other discrepancies to the influence of another authority, which I can now no longer identify as I did formerly (*Quellen der ält. Ketzerg.* p. 169) with that which is supposed to have formed the basis of Irenaeus, i. 11 and 12. A trace of this authority appears to be found in the introductory words as given by Philaster: *post istum Valentinus quidam surrexit, Pythagoricus magis quam Christianus, vanam quendam ac perniciosam doctrinam*

eructans et velut arithmetica[m] id est numerositatis notitiam, fallaciam prœdicans. In perfect accordance with this are the statements in the *Philosophumena* that Valentinus derived his doctrines from Pythagoras and Plato, and that his whole system ended in arithmetic (*Philos.* vi. 21, 29, 34). The following sentences from *Philos.* vi. 29, p. 184 sq., are almost literally identical with what we find in Philaster (*ἡ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος δόξα*) ἀφ' ἧς Οὐαλεντίνος . . . δικαίως Πυθαγορικὸς καὶ Πλατωνικός, οὐ Χριστιανὸς λογισθείη. Οὐαλεντίνος τοίνυν καὶ Ἡρακλέων καὶ Πτολεμαῖος καὶ πᾶσα ἡ τούτων σχολή, οἱ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος μαθηταί, ἀκολουθήσαντες τοῖς καθηγησαμένοις ἀριθμητικὴν τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν κατεβάλλοντο. The assumption, that all this is due to some common authority from which these judgments concerning Valentinus were taken, is not established. If the author of the *σύνταγμα* and of the *Philosophumena* be not identical, we may yet assume that the former work was made use of by the writer of the latter. Moreover, Irenaeus himself more than once points out the relationship between the Valentinian system and Pythagorean ideas (i. 1, 1, and especially ii. 14, 6).

PSEUDORIGENES, or as is now almost universally assumed, HIPOLYTUS, gives us in the *Philosophumena* (the larger *Ἐλεγχος κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων*) a quite peculiar account of the Valentinian system, one more uniform and synoptical than that of Irenaeus. The original authority on which this description is based cannot have been the same as that in the *Syntagma*, because whereas the latter belonged to the Anatolic school, the former was a product of the Western or Italian. The doctrinal system reproduced by Pseudorigenes is in a general way akin to the Ptolemaic system as presented by Irenaeus. But the representation of his original authority is entirely independent of the sources made use of by Irenaeus. It has, to begin with, a different terminology. The first principle is called *Μονάς* and most frequently *Πατήρ* instead of *Βυθός*, the lower Sophia is never called *Ἀχαμάθ*, but *ἡ ἔξω Σοφία*, *ἡμέρα κ. τ. λ.*, the Soter (Jesus) is never called *Παρόκλητος*, the *κοσμοκράτωρ* is *Βεελζεβούλ* and so on. The form of doctrine moreover is (in some particulars at any rate) a different one. The *Βυθός* is a simple Unity (*Μονάς*), and therefore sexless without *Syzygy*, which Irenaeus reports to have been the opinion of "some"; the original number of Aeons is therefore here reduced to 28. The subsequent addition to this number of *Χριστός* and *Πνεῦμα Ἄγιον* makes up finally the full *Triacontad*. The series of Aeons are also differently determined. Whereas according to Irenaeus *Λόγος* and *Ζωή* emanate *ten*, *Ἄνθρωπος* and *Ἐκκλησία* twelve Aeons, there proceed, *here*, from *Nous* and *Ἀλήθεια* (after the emanation of *Λόγος* and *Ζωή*), a (perfect) *Decad* of further Aeons, while the (imperfect) *Docecad* of Aeons issue (after the appearance of *Ἄνθρωπος* and *Ἐκκλησία*, not from this Pair but) from *Λόγος* and *Ζωή*. The Fall of the Sophia also and her restoration, the formation of the lower world out of the *ἐκτρωμα* to which she had given birth (the external—*ἡ ἔξω*—Sophia) are in many particulars differently related. That the form of doctrine belongs to the Italian school is evident

from its Christology. The Soter (the common fruit of the Pleroma), who after the redemption of the *ἔξω Σοφία* remains with her as *σύζυγος*, is distinguished here (as in Irenaeus' Source C) from the Son of Mary, who is produced by the power of the Sophia herself for the redemption of the psychical world. Numerous literal citations are inserted from the original authority made use of—each of these being introduced with a *φησί*. Some have thought that this *φησί* points to Valentinus himself as the actual speaker from whose words the citation is made. But it is evident from the form of doctrine propounded in the *Philosophumena* that this is impossible, for that is demonstrably a younger development of the Italian school. I have myself offered the suggestion, that we have here the form of teaching which was prevalent in the school of Heracleon (*Quellenkritik des Epiphon.* p. 171). Heinrici (*l. c.* p. 38) and Hilgenfeld (*l. c.* p. 472) have expressed agreement with me. Dr. Salmon [HERACLEON] objects that the grounds alleged for this view in the *Quellenkr. des Epiphon.* are not strong enough to prove it. And certainly, the fact that Pseudorigenes twice mentions Heracleon (*Philos.* vi. 29, p. 185; vi. 35, p. 195) without furnishing a special article concerning this celebrated Gnostic teacher, is no proof that the main exposition which he gives us of Gnostic doctrine is taken from a writing of Heracleon's. To which must be added that we know otherwise only of exegetical writings of Heracleon, and not of any strictly systematic treatise. But Hilgenfeld (*l. c.* p. 499 sqq.) has shewn that the *Fragments of Heracleon* contain, with some discrepancies, yet also many points of agreement with the account given in the *Philosophumena*, and thinks it to be therefore "a less important (?) description of the system taught in the school of Heracleon."—To the main body of this description Pseudorigenes adds a series of his own observations, which inform us of various differences of teaching in the Valentinian school. So he mentions, for example, at vi. 30, p. 187, the genealogy of the Aeons given by Irenaeus as the teaching of "others," and supplies from Irenaeus the names of individual Aeons; vi. 31, p. 188, he mentions (again following Irenaeus) that *τινές* would give the Father (*Πατήρ*) for his companion the *Σιγή*, and then reckon both these in the *triacontad* of Aeons. Other particulars of information he has obtained in other ways. So, vi. 31, p. 189, he gives (varying from the statements in Irenaeus) different appellations for the *Σταυρός* ("Όρος and *Μετοχεύς*), different appellations of the Demiurge (*Τόπος*, *Ἐβδομάς*, *Παλαιὸς τῶν ἡμερῶν*) and (vi. 35, p. 195) the doctrinal differences of the Anatolic and Italian schools. In conclusion, he gives the fragment of a Psalm of Valentinus (vi. 37, p. 198), of which it remains a question whether it was derived from an original source or from elsewhere at second-hand. This probably was the case also with the notice (vi. 40, p. 203) of a vision which Valentinus is said to have had. It occurs in the section about Marcus, and introduces a narrative taken from Irenaeus about another vision which Marcus had. The section (vi. 38) which treats of the disciples of Valentinus is taken bodily from Irenaeus. The same is the case with the large section about Marcus

(vi. 40-54). It is the introductory sentences only (vi. 39), which are derived from another source.

Tertullian's tractate *Adversus Valentinianos* cannot be considered as an independent authority. Apart from a few personal notices concerning him and his disciples which he may have taken from the lost work of Proculus (c. 4, cf. c. 11), his whole account is a paraphrase of Irenaeus, whom he follows almost word for word, and more or less faithfully from cap. 7 onwards.

Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 9-32) has incorporated the whole long section of Irenaeus (i. 1-10) in his Panarion. *Haer.* xxxii. and xxxiv. (Secundus, Marcus) are simply taken from Irenaeus. He follows Irenaeus also in his somewhat arbitrary way in what he says about Ptolemaeus, Colarbasus, Heracleon (*Haer.* xxxiii, xxxv, xxxvi).

On the other hand, *Haer.* xxxi. 7 and 8, is taken from the Syntagma of Hippolytus; *Haer.* xxxiii. 3-7, contains the important letter of Ptolemaeus to Flora. [PTOLEMAEUS.] *Haer.* xxxi. 5 and 6, gives us a fragment of an unknown Valentinian writing, from which the statements in cap. 2 are also in part derived. This writing, with its barbarous names for the Aeons, and its mixture of Valentinian and Basilidian doctrines, betrays an already degenerate development of Anatolic Valentinianism. Matter, who (*Histoire critique du Gnosticisme*, II. ii. 5) endeavours to interpret these names from Hebrew, is wrong in attributing the authorship of this work to Valentinus himself. The names of the Aeons and their order differ in several respects from the older tradition; and beside this, under the influence, as appears, of the Marcosian symbolism of numbers in regard to the upper Ogdoad, a second is placed at its side, which is named merely after the numbers of those composing it. This writing has also preserved several older elements, e.g. the identity of Horus and Jesus.

Later heresiologists, such as Theodoret, who (*Haer. Fab.* i. 7-9) simply follows Irenaeus and Epiphanius, cannot be regarded in any way as independent authorities.

V. *The System.*—A review of the accounts given by the Fathers confirms the judgment that, with the means at our command, it is very difficult to distinguish between the original doctrine of Valentinus himself, and the later developments made by his disciples. A description of his system must start from the Fragments, against the authenticity of which (apart from the so-called *ῥπος Οθαλεντίνου* in *Dial. de recta fide*) no doubts have been started. But from the nature of these Fragments we cannot expect to be able to reconstruct the whole system out of them. From an abundant literature a few relics only have been preserved. And in addition to this the kinds of literature to which these Fragments belong—Letters, Homilies, Hymns—show us only the outer side of the system, while its secret Gnostic doctrine is passed over and concealed, or only indicated in the obscurest manner. The modes of expression in these Fragments are brought as near as possible to those in ordinary church use. We see therein the evident desire and effort of Valentinus to remain in the fellowship of the Catholic church. Of specific Gnostic doctrines two only appear in their genuine undisguised

shape, that of the celestial origin of the spiritual man (the Pneumatics), and that of the Demiurge; for the docetic Christology was not then, as is clear from Clemens Alexandrinus, exclusively peculiar to the Gnostics. All the more emphatically is the Anthropological and ethical side of the system insisted on in these Fragments.

As the world is an image of the living Aeon (τοῦ ζώντος αἰώνος), so is man an image of the pre-existent man of the ἀνθρώπος προῶν. Valentinus, according to Clemens Alexandrinus (*Valentini homil. ap. Clem. Strom.* iv. 13, 92), spoke of the Sophia as an artist (ζωγράφος) making this visible lower world a picture of the glorious Archetype, but the hearer or reader would as readily understand the heavenly wisdom of the Book of Proverbs to be meant by this Sophia, as the 12th and fallen Aeon. Under her (according to Valentinus) stand the world-creative angels, whose head is the Demiurge. Her formation (πλάσμα) is Adam created in the name of the "Ἀνθρώπος προῶν. In him thus made a higher power puts the seed of the heavenly pneumatic essence (σπέρμα τῆς ἄνωθεν οὐσίας). Thus furnished with higher insight, Adam excites the fears of the angels; for even as κοσμικοὶ ἄνθρωποι are seized with fear of the images made by their own hands to bear the name of God, i.e. the idols, so these angels cause the images they have made to disappear (*Ep. ad amicos ap. Clem. Alex. Strom.* ii. 8, 36). The pneumatic seed (πνεῦμα διαφέρον or γένος διαφέρον) nevertheless remains in the world, as a race by nature capable of being saved (φύσει σωζόμενον γένος), and which has come down from a higher sphere in order to put an end to the reign of death. Death originates from the Demiurge, to whom the word (Ἐξοδ. xxxiii. 20) refers that no one can see the face of God without dying. The members of the pneumatic church are from the first immortal, and children of eternal life. They have only assumed mortality in order to overcome death in themselves and by themselves. They shall dissolve the world without themselves suffering dissolution, and be lords over the creation and over all transitory things (*Valent. hom. ap. Clem. Strom.* iv. 13, 91 sq.). But without the help of the only good Father the heart even of the spiritual man (the pneumatics) cannot be cleansed from the many evil spirits which make their abode in him, and each accomplishes his own desire. But when the only good Father visits the soul, it is hallowed and enlightened, and is called blessed because one day it shall see God. This cleansing and illumination is a consequence of the revelation of the Son (*Valent. Epist. ap. Clem. Strom.* ii. 20, 114).

We learn from the Fragments only (*Valent. Epist. ad Agathopoda ap. Clem. Strom.* iv. 7, 59) that Jesus by steadfastness and abstinence earned for Himself Deity (πάντα ὑπομείνας ἐγκρατῆς ἦν, τὴν θεότητα Ἰησοῦς εἰργάσατο), and that by virtue of his abstinence he did not even suffer to be corrupted the food which he received (i.e. it did not undergo the natural process of digestion), because he himself was not subject to corruption (ἦσθιεν καὶ ἐπιεν ἰδίως, οὐκ ἀποδοιδούς τὰ βρώματα· τασάντη ἦν αὐτῷ τῆς ἐγκρατείας δύναμις, ὥστε καὶ μὴ φθαρῆναι τὴν τροφήν ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐπεὶ τὸ φθεῖρεσθαι αὐτὸς οὐκ εἶχεν). It must remain undetermined how Valentinus defined the rela-

tion of Jesus to the *viós*. If the text of the passage quoted above be sound, Jesus must be thought to have put himself in possession of Godhead by his own abstinence, a notion which we should rather expect to find in Ebionitic than in Gnostic circles. But it may be that the true reading is *eikázero* (not *eipázero*), and in that case the meaning will be that by an extraordinary asceticism Jesus avoided every kind of material pollution, and so became himself the image of the incorruptible and imperishable Godhead. At any rate this Fragment does not tell us whether, according to the teaching of Valentinus, the body of Jesus was pneumatic or psychical. According to another Fragment attributed to Valentinus, and preserved by Eulogius of Alexandria (ap. Photium, *Bibl. Cod.* 230), he appears to have treated with ridicule the opinion of the "Galileans" that Christ had two natures, and to have maintained that He had but one nature composed of the visible and the invisible. Hilgenfeld (*l. c.* p. 302 sq.) supposes the Valentinus of this Fragment to be the Gnostic, while others take him to have been the Apollinarian. But we have no other instance of any Gnostic giving to Catholic Christians (like the emperor Julian of later times) the epithet "Galilean." And further, although Tertullian (*adv. Prax.* 29) and Origen (*de Princip.* i. 2, 1) may have spoken of two natures or two substances in Christ, we can hardly imagine Valentinus pronouncing a doctrine ridiculous, which, under such circumstances, could hardly have found acceptance in his own school. For so we find the Occidental Valentinians actually teaching in very similar terms, that Soter, the common product of the whole Pleroma, united himself with the Christus of the Demiurge the Man Jesus. Could we otherwise assume that the Fragment is genuine, it would serve to prove that the doctrine of the oriental school concerning the pneumatic body of Christ was in fact the original teaching of Valentinus. How Valentinus thought concerning the origin of matter and of evil cannot be made out from existing Fragments. When however we find him designating the Demiurge as author of death, we can hardly suppose that he derived the transitory nature and other imperfections of the terrestrial universe from an originally evil material substance. The view moreover which underlies the psalm of Valentinus, of which the *Philosophumena* have preserved a Fragment (*Philos.* vi. 37, p. 197 sq.) is decidedly monastic. He there sees in the spirit how "all things are hanging (*κρεμάμενα*) and are upborne (*ὑποσώμενα*), the flesh hanging on the soul, the soul upborne by the air, the air hanging on the aether, from Bythos fruits produced and from the womb the child." An interpretation of these sayings current in the Valentinian school is appended. According to this interpretation, flesh is the *ἕλη* which depends upon the soul (the psychical nature) of the Demiurge. Again the Demiurge hangs from the spirit which is outside the Pleroma, *i. e.* the Sophia in the kingdom of the Midst, the Sophia from Horus and from the Pleroma, and finally the world of Aeons in the Pleroma from the abyss, *i. e.* their Father. If this interpretation be, as we may assume it to be, correct, Valentinus must have conceived the whole universe as forming a grand

scale of being, beginning with the abysmal ground of all spiritual life, and thence descending lower and lower down to matter. The whole scale then is a descent from the perfect to ever more and more imperfect images; according to the principle expressly laid down by Valentinus, that the cosmos is as inferior to the living Aeon as the image is inferior to the living countenance (*ap. Clem. Strom.* iv. 13, 92). It is clear that this view of the nature of the universe exhibits a much nearer relationship to Platonic philosophy, than to the oriental dualism which underlay the older Gnostic systems; and Hippolytus is therefore completely in the right, when dealing with the psalm of Valentinus, to speak of *Platonising* Gnostics (*Philos.* vi. 37, p. 197).

The Fragments do not suffice to give us any detailed acquaintance with the doctrine of Valentinus concerning the Aeons. The *Πατήρ* or *Βυθός* stands at their head; but what place in the Valentinian Pleroma was assigned to the *Ἀνθρωπος προών* in whose name Adam was created, is difficult to determine. Valentinus's connection with the ordinary Syrian Gnosis, for which we have the express testimony of Irenaeus (i. 11, 1), makes the assumption highly probable, that the *Ἀνθρωπος προών* was one of the highest Aeons, either *Βυθός* himself or one of his earliest emanations. The Gnostics in Irenaeus (i. 30, 6) designate the *Pater Omnium* as *primus Anthropos* from whom as second masculine principle proceeds *Anthropos filius Anthropi*. The Naassenes moreover of the *Philosophumena* (*Philos.* v. 6, p. 95; 7, p. 96 sq.; p. 104; 8, p. 109; x. 9, p. 314) designated by the names *Ἀνθρωπος* and also *Ἀρχάνθρωπος*, and *Ἀδάμας*, the First Principle (*τὴν πρώτην τῶν πάντων ἀρχήν*), to whom, like Valentinus, they also gave the predicates *ὁ προών* (*Philos.* v. 7, p. 98; 9, p. 117), and *ὁ μόνος ἀγαθός* (*Philos.* v. 7, p. 102; 8, p. 116). With him again is occasionally identified (*Philos.* x. 9, p. 314) the second Masculine Principle, who is also described (v. 6, p. 95) as male-female (*ἀρσενόθηλος*) *Ἀνθρωπος*. We have it also as a tradition from some of the Valentinians themselves that with them (just as it was with the Ophite parties) the First Father or First Principle bore the name *Ἀνθρωπος* (*Iren. Haer.* i. 12, 4), and so also a work quoted by Epiphanius (xxxi. 5) as belonging to the Valentinian school, gives the same name to the *Πατήρ τῆς Ἀληθείας*, the second Masculine Principle, called also *Νοῦς* or *Μονογενής*, who is designated here as *ἀντίτυπος τοῦ προόντος ἀγεννήτου*, and is expressly distinguished from the *σύζυγος* of *Ἐκκλησία*, who is also called *Ἀνθρωπος*. Among the Marcosians also the First Principle of Revelation, *πηγή παντός λόγου*, who seems to be identical with the *πατήρ τῆς ἀληθείας*—is called *Ἀνθρωπος* (*Iren.* i. 14, 3); and Heraclion calls the upper Christ *viós τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου*, and transfers the same appellation *πατρωνυμικῶς* to the Soter also (*ap. Origen. in Joann.* tom. xiii. 58). But further—if the *Ἀνθρωπος προών* of Valentinus is not to be identified with the like-named Aeon of the Fourth Syzygy, just as little is the *Λόγος* of Valentinus to be identified with the Aeon of the Third Syzygy which bears the same name. The *Logos* which appeared to Valentinus in the form of a new-born child (*Philos.* vi. 42, p. 203) is

probably to be identified with the Soter who elsewhere also in the older Valentinian school bears the name of Logos (*Exc. ex Theodot.* § 1, cf. § 26, § 2, 25). He and not the Sophia, is probably meant, by the *higher Power* which secretly infuses the Seed of the higher Essence into the formation of the angels (*Exc. ex Theod.* § 2).

These Fragments give us no more information about the history of the Sophia, and the processes by which the present world came into existence, than they do about Valentinus's world of Aeons. Of a two-fold Sophia, a higher and a lower, we read nothing. Sophia is the artist (*ζωγράφος*) who forms the world after the archetype of the living Aeon, in order to be honoured by his name. And the world as formed obtains credit and stability through the invisible nature of God (*Strom.* iv. 13, 92). The *ὄνομα* (after whose type this world has been formed to be its image, solid indeed but yet imperfect), is in the teaching of the Anatolic school sometimes designated as the name of archetypal being (*ὄνομα ἀνωμόμαστον*), sometimes as the *νῦς* whose shadow is the *κένωμα γνώσεως* produced by the twelfth Aeon in its *ἀγνωσία* and *ἀμορφία* (*excerpt. ex Theod.* § 31, cf. § 22); and here we are expressly met with the thought, that that only is perfect which proceeds from a Syzygy, but that what proceeds from a single Principle is merely an imperfect Image (*ὅσα ἐκ συζυγίας προέρχεται πληρώματά ἐστιν, ὅσα δὲ ἀπὸ ἐνὸς εἰκόνας*, Clem. *Strom.* iv. 13, 92, cf. *Excerpt. ex Theodot.* § 31). It seems natural to understand under the word *ὄνομα* here the *νῦς*, i.e. the *χριστός* who has mounted upwards to the realm of the Aeons, and after whose image the Sophia has formed this lower world (*Excerpt. ex Theod.* § 33). After the type of Christus she first forms the Demiurge, the head of the psychical creation, from whom again Death and Mutability and the perishing material substance have their origin. The Fragment however does not itself clearly intimate what is meant by the *ὄνομα* after which the *κόσμος* and the Demiurge are formed. Adam was, according to another Fragment, formed *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πρόντος Ἀνθρώπου*. As Clemens interprets the words which have been already discussed, the Demiurge himself is identical with the typical *κόσμος*, and his Archetype is not *χριστός* but *ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός*, the supreme Father, whence he is also himself called *θεὸς καὶ πατήρ*. This would agree with what has been already remarked concerning Adam. The following words of Clemens seem meant to explain the condition of the pneumatic seed. Because, says he, the visible manifestation of the Invisible is not the soul which proceeds from the Midst (i.e. the Demiurge), therefore the "excellent" comes, and that is the inspiration of the excellent spirit (*ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ φαινόμενον αὐτοῦ [i.e. τοῦ ἀοράτου] οὐκ ἐστὶν ἢ ἐκ μεσότητος ψυχῆς, ἔρχεται τὸ διαφέρον, καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τὸ ἐμφύσημα τοῦ διαφέροντος πνεύματος*). The *πνεῦμα διαφέρον* according to a *usus loquendi* of repeated occurrence in the *Excerpt. ex Theod.* is the pneumatic seed. This seed as Clemens relates further on, without expressly saying that it is the teaching of Valentinus himself, has been without her knowledge imparted to the soul, by a process

which is typically represented in Genesis by the inbreathing into Adam of the breath of life. The inbreathing of this *πνεῦμα διαφέρον* is made by the Soter or Logos into that which has been formed by the Demiurge and his angels, i.e. into the psychical Adam, who, as in the doctrine of the Óphites (*Iren.* i. 30, 6-8) is by them cast down and set aside because he had alarmed them by his higher knowledge. The preservation of the pneumatic Seed in the world, was probably represented by Valentinus likewise in a similar way to that of the Óphites, according to whom this was provided for by the Sophia without the knowledge of the Demiurge (*Iren.* i. 30, 9).

To what authority Valentinus made appeal as the source of his doctrine cannot be made out from the Fragments. From the *Homily to the Friends*, Clemens Alexandrinus has preserved a sentence which defines "many of the things written in the public books" (*δημοσίοις βίβλοις*: he means doubtless the writings of the Old Testament) as "found written in the Church of God"—"for," he adds, "those things which are common" (i.e. not merely found in books—read, with *Heinrici κοινά* instead of *κενά*) "are words from the heart": and proceeds: "The law written in the heart is the People of the Beloved One, both loved and loving" (Grabe was wrong in proposing to emend *λαός* into *λόγος*). The meaning is that this "People" is in virtue of the inward revelation of the Logos a Law unto itself (cf. *Rom.* ii. 14). But this inward revelation has reference only to "that which is common" (*τὰ κοινά*) i.e. to the universal ethical truths written in the heart which "the Church of God" needs not first to learn from "the public books." But this passage tells us nothing about the sources whence Valentinus derived his Gnosis. For these we must go back to the statement of Clemens (*Strom.* vii. 17, 106) already referred to, according to which the Valentinians spoke of their leader as having learned of a certain Theodas, a disciple of St. Paul. But the actual statement of Irenaeus is more to be depended on, that Valentinus was the first who transformed the old doctrines of "the Gnostics" into a system of his own (*Haer.* i. 11, 1; cf. Tertullian, *adv. Valentinian.* 4). The Fragments, moreover, give us a series of points of contact with the opinions of these older "Gnostics." We may therefore regard as an axiom to be adhered to in our investigations that of any two Valentinian doctrines, that is the older and more originally which approaches more closely to the older and vulgar Gnosis (*Iren.* i. 30). Yet herewith we do not mean to deny that the system of Valentinus had a peculiar character of its own. He was the first to breathe a really philosophic spirit into the old vulgar Gnosis, by making use of Plato's world of thought to infuse a deeper meaning into the old Gnostic myths. Baur therefore was quite right in emphasizing the Platonism of Valentinus (*Christliche Gnosis*, p. 124 sq.), to which the *Philosophumena* had already called attention (*Philos.* vi. 21 sqq.).

The section of Irenaeus, in which he finds the origin of Valentinus's system in the *λεγομένη γνωστικὴ αἵρεσις*, is then, as already remarked, the first independent description of his doctrine. It commences with the words;

ἴθωμεν νῦν καὶ τὴν τούτων ἕσφατον (ἀσύστατον, Harvey) γνώμην, δύο που καὶ τριῶν ὄντων, πῶς περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐναντία ἀποφαίνονται. That Irenaeus simply borrowed these words from the older authority which he was following (Lipsius, *Alt. Quellen der Ketzerg.* p. 53 sq.) is a conjecture which I no longer maintain. The τούτων of the sentence just quoted refers to the διδάσκαλοι of whom shortly before Irenaeus has been speaking as having fallen away from the truth, and whose ἕσφατος γνώμη is about to be contrasted with the unity of Catholic teaching throughout the world. At the utmost we may find in the words δύο που καὶ τριῶν ὄντων a reminiscence of the authority made use of, since they are not well applicable to the much greater number of Valentinian parties who are introduced in the following cc. 11 and 12. But all the more certain is it that at 11, 1 Irenaeus really means to give the opinion of Valentinus himself in contradistinction to the doctrinal aberrations of the numerous adherents of his school. He expressly closes the short article devoted to Valentinus with a *haec quidem ille*, and then passes on at once to the doctrine of his disciple Secundus. But even so we must remark—first that Irenaeus may not have been rightly informed as to all the statements made by him concerning Valentinus, and secondly that in this particular section he may not have been able to withstand his inclination to allege a variety of inconsistent doctrines, of which one or the other might not really have proceeded from Valentinus himself.

Irenaeus, in the first place, completes the information afforded by the Fragments concerning Valentinus's doctrine of the Aeons. At the head of them stands a *δυὰς ἀνονόμαστος*, the Ἄβρητος (called also Βυθὸς and Πατὴρ ἀγέννητος) and his σύζυγος the Σιγή. From this Dyad proceeds a second Dyad, Πατὴρ and Ἀλήθεια, which with the first Dyad forms the highest Tetrad. From this Tetrad a second Tetrad proceeds—Λόγος and Ζωή, Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, and these complete the First Ogdoad. From Λόγος and Ζωή proceed a Decad, from Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία a Dodecad of Aeons. In this the number 30 of Aeons forming the Pleroma is completed. The names of the Aeons composing the Decad and the Dodecad are not given. We may however venture to assume that the names elsewhere given by Irenaeus (i. 1, 2), and literally repeated by Pseudorigenes (*Philos.* vi. 30), and then again by Epiphanius (xxx. 6) with some differences of detail, in his much later account, did really originate from Valentinus himself. They are as follows: From Λόγος and Ζωή proceed Βύθιος and Μίξις, Ἀγήρατος and Ἐνωσις, Αὐτοφύης and Ἰδουή, Ἀκίνητος and Σύγκρασις, Μονογενής and Μακαρία. From Ἄνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία proceed: Παράκλητος and Πίστις, Πατρικός and Ἐλπίς, Μητρικός and Ἀγάπη, Ἀείνους and Σύνεσις, Ἐκκλησιαστικός and Μακαρίδης, Θελητός and Σοφία. However arbitrary this name-giving may seem, it is evident that the first four masculine Aeons repeat the notion of the First Principle and the first four feminine, the notion of his Syzygy, in various forms of expression. The names Μονο-

γενής and Νοῦς (here Ἀείνους) meet us again among the Valentinians of Irenaeus as expression for the second Masculine Principle, and Παράκλητος as that for the common product of all the Aeons—the Soter. Πατρικός, Μητρικός, Ἐκκλησιαστικός are names simply expressing that the Aeons which bear them are derived from the higher powers within the Pleroma. The feminine names Μακαρία, Πίστις, Ἐλπίς, Ἀγάπη, Σύνεσις, Σοφία, describe generally the perfection of the Pleroma by means of Predicates borrowed from the characteristics of the perfect Pneumatics. So that all these inferior Aeon names are but a further and more detailed expression of the Thought contained in the names of the first and second Tetrad. The first Tetrad expresses the essence of the Upper Pleroma in itself, the second Tetrad divided into two pairs of Aeons expresses its revelation to the Pneumatici and the Pneumatic World.

The last of the 30 Aeons, the Sophia or Μήτηρ falls out of the Pleroma. In her remembrance of the better world she gives birth to Christus with a shadow (μετὰ σκιᾶς τινος). Christus being of masculine nature cuts away the shadow from himself and hastens back into the Pleroma. The mother, on the other hand, being left behind and alone with the shadow, and emptied of the pneumatic substance, gives birth to another Son the Demiurge, called also Παντοκράτωρ, and at the same time with him a sinister archon (the Κοσμοκράτωρ). So then from these two elements, "the right and the left," the psychical and the hylical, proceeds this lower world. This the original doctrine of Valentinus appears to have had in common with that of the Ophites (Iren. i. 30), that both doctrines knew of only one Sophia, and that for the Ophites also Christus leaves the Sophia behind and escapes himself into the upper realm of light. But whereas among them Christus and Sophia as "right and left" proceed from the union of the first and second masculine principle with "the mother of all living," and so are in fact brother and sister, here, on the other hand, according to Valentinus Christus is Sophia's son and elder brother of the Demiurge. And whereas further, among the Ophites, the Sophia herself does not originally belong to the upper world of light, but has come into existence through the sparks of heavenly light which, when Christus was produced, issued from the Pleroma and overflowed into chaos, so here with Valentinus she has her original place in the Pleroma, and now has lost it by a fall into the Kenoma. The σκιά from which Christus separates himself as he mounts upwards into the world of light, is according to the Ophites of Irenaeus, Sophia herself, whereas according to Valentinus it is the Sophia who gives birth to Christus with a shadow, the darkened image of departed light, from which Christus separates himself, leaving his mother with this shadow to form the lower world—"a right hand and a left." Both views were subsequently combined in the later developments of the Valentinian school. The "shadow" was identified with the ἕκρωμα to which Sophia gives birth after the departure of Christus, and this again is shaped into the lower or external Sophia (ἡ ἔξω Σοφία) while the true, the upper Sophia, returns once more herself to the Pleroma.

The notion of a fall of the last of the Aeons from the Pleroma, and the consequent formation of this lower world as the fruit of that fall, is that which is new and peculiar to Valentinus in his reconstruction of the older Gnosticism. He set in fact his Platonic Monism in the place of the Oriental Dualism. The Platonic thought of the soul's fall and longing after the lost world of light he combined with the other Platonic thought of the things of this lower world being types and images of heavenly Archetypes, and so obtained a new solution of the old problems of the world's creation and the origin of evil.

The statements of Irenaeus concerning his teaching are alas too fragmentary on the one hand and too uncertain on the other, to enable us to obtain a complete view of the system of Valentinus. He is said to have taught the existence of a twofold boundary ("Opos), one separating the *Bythos* from the rest of the Pleroma, the other dividing the Pleroma from the Sophia. Later Valentinian doctrine knew of one *Horos* only, who after the return of the upper Sophia into the Pleroma, cut the Pleroma off from any contact with the lower Sophia and her creation. That to this "Opos a twofold function was ascribed—first that of confirming or establishing the Pleroma (in virtue of which he was called *Σταυρός*), and the second that of dividing the Pleroma from the lower world (Iren. i. 3, 5), is not explained by the doctrine ascribed to Valentinus of a twofold "Opos. Possibly by the higher "Opos which divides the *Bythos* from the Pleroma he may have meant the *Σιγή* (cf. *Exc. ex Theodot.* § 29). Yet more unreliable is that which Irenaeus has to tell us about the Christology of Valentinus. According to him Valentinus had three views of the origin of Jesus, first making him the offspring of Theletos the *σύζυγος* of Sophia, who after her fall had withdrawn from her and united himself to the rest of the Aeons; then again deriving him from the Aeon Christus (the son of Sophia) after his admission within the Pleroma; and thirdly making him the offspring of "Ανθρωπος and "Εκκλησία. We cannot imagine that all three views were actually taken by Valentinus himself. The second was probably his own original view, but maintained in the sense of the Anatolic school, that Jesus or Soter, at the intercession of Christus issued from the Pleroma as the common fruit of all the Aeons (*Exc. ex Theodot.* §§ 23, 41). The derivation or mission of Jesus from Theletos the *σύζυγος* of Sophia may be explained as a misunderstanding of the doctrine that their reconciliation had been his work. The simpler and perhaps more original doctrine seems to be that of the Marcosians, which taught that Christus who had left the Sophia and ascended into the Pleroma descended again on Jesus (the *Σωτήρ* or the *άνθρωπος εκ τῆς οικονομίας*) at his baptism (Iren. i. 15, 3). The last notice given us by Irenaeus in this section (i. 11, 1) comes in quite abruptly. The *Πνεῦμα ἅγιον* is said to have proceeded from "Αλήθεια [Eriphan. from "Εκκλησία] *εις ἀνάκρυσιν καὶ καρποφορίαν τῶν Αἰώνων* by invisibly entering into them, and through him they have borne as fruit the products (*τὰ φυτά*, Eriph.; *folia* = τὰ φύλλα old Lat. version) of "Αλήθεια. With this may be compared

the statement in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 31, p. 188) that *Χριστός* and *Πνεῦμα ἅγιον* were emanations from *Νοῦς* and "Αλήθεια; only there the purpose of this new syzygy is said to be the *μόρφωσις* of the lower Sophia. According to Irenaeus (I. 2, 5) *Χριστός* and *Πνεῦμα ἅγιον* proceed from *Μονογενής*, the *σύζυγος* of "Αλήθεια, and by them the Aeons are established. Christus teaches them the law of the syzygies and the limits of their knowledge, the Holy Ghost teaches them how to give thanks, and leads them into the true rest. But neither of these views will quite suit. One might conjecture that *Πνεῦμα ἅγιον* is here to be identified with Jesus as he who was sent to the aid of Sophia, and is also called *Παράκλητος*; but no parallel passage can be cited for such identification. Or one might compare the function here assigned to *Πνεῦμα ἅγιον* with that of the "Opos. But the most probable interpretation is that which refers to the *πνεῦμα ἀγάπης*, which also proceeds from "Αλήθεια, as the *Γνώσις* proceeds from "Ενθύμησις (the *Σιγή*), and united himself with the *πνεῦμα γνώσεως* as the Father is united with the Son, and "Ενθύμησις with *Γνώσις* (*Excerpt. ex Theod.* § 7).

If in these short and meagre notices Irenaeus has made use of some older authority (possibly that of Justin's Syntagma), the authority itself must probably have confounded the doctrines of Valentinus himself with the later opinions of his school. But we have yet another means of obtaining information as to the original teaching of Valentinus. The Excerpts in Clemens Alexandrinus taken from Theodotus and the Anatolic school contain a doctrine in §§ 1-42, which at any rate stands much nearer to the views of Valentinus than the detailed account of Ptolemaic doctrines which Irenaeus gives us in i. 1-8. We have here (in these Excerpts) a somewhat complete whole, differing in some important respects from the doctrinal system of the Italic school, and agreeing with that of Valentinus in this respect, that it knows of only one Sophia, whose offspring Christus leaving his mother, enters the Pleroma and sends down Jesus for the redemption of the forsaken One.

The doctrine of the Aeons stands as much behind the anthropological and ethical Problems in these Excerpts as it does in the Fragments. We find something about the Pleroma in an interpretation of the prologue of St. John's Gospel (*Excerpt.* §§ 6, 7). By the *ἀρχή* of St. John i. 1, in which the Logos "was," we must understand the *Μονογενής* "who is also called God" (the reading *ὁ μονογενής θεός* John i. 18 being followed). "The Logos was *ἐν ἀρχῇ*" means that he was in the Monogenes, in the *Νοῦς* and the "Αλήθεια—the reference being to the syzygy of *Λόγος* and *Ζωή*, which is said to have proceeded from *Νοῦς* and "Αλήθεια. The Logos is called God because he is in God, in the *Νοῦς*. But when it is said *ὁ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶν ἦν* the reference is to the *Ζωή* as *σύζυγος* of the Logos. The Unknown Father (*πατήρ ἄγνωστος*) willed to be known to the Aeons. On knowing himself through his own "Ενθύμησις, which was indeed the spirit of knowledge (*πνεῦμα γνώσεως*), he, by knowledge, made to emanate the Monogenes (*Ἄγνωστος οὖν ὁ πατήρ ὠν ἠθέλησεν γνωσθῆναι τοῖς αἰῶσι, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐνθυμήσεως τῆς ἑαυτοῦ, ὡς ἂν ἑαυτὸν ἐγνωκῶς*

πνεῦμα γνώσεως οὐσης ἐν γνώσει προέβαλε τὸν μονογενῆ. (Bernays by reading ἐνώσει instead of γνώσει and interpunctuating after ἐγνωκώς and προέβαλε, elicits quite a different sense.) The Monogenes having then emanated from the Gnosis, i.e. the Enthymesis of the Father, is in himself Gnosis, i.e. Son, for it is through the Son that the Father is known.

The πνεῦμα ἀγάπης mingles itself with the πνεῦμα γνώσεως as the Father with the Son (i.e. the Monogenes or Noûs) and the Enthymesis with Ἀλήθεια, proceeding from the Aletheia as the Gnosis proceeds from the Enthymesis. The μονογενῆς υἱός, who abides in the bosom of the Father, emanates from the Father's bosom and thereby declares (ἐξηγεῖται) the Enthymesis through Gnosis to the Aeons. Having become visible on earth, he is no longer called by the Apostle Monogenes (simply) but ὡς μονογενῆς. For though remaining in himself one and the same, he is in the Creation called πρωτότοκος, and in the Pleroma Μονογενῆς, and appears in each locality as he can be comprehended there.

Now if we have here a specimen only of that wide-spread Valentinian Exegesis the like of which we find in Ptolemaeus (Iren. i. 8, 5), the Excerpts give us on the other hand from § 29 onwards a detailed and connected account. The Sigé (as the σύζυγος of the Supreme Father [I. τοῦ βουθού instead of τοῦ βάθου] and mother of all his emanations is here called) is silent concerning what she is unable to utter of the Mysteries of the Inexpressible (τοῦ ἀρρήτου); but what she has comprehended that she declares to be incomprehensible (προσηγόρευσεν: the change proposed by Bernays προσαγορεύουσιν is unnecessary). But when the reserved and unapproachable Nature of the Father makes itself approachable, in order to His being comprehended by the Sigé, then (according to Theodotus) suffering enters into the Pleroma. In this way the Father Himself becomes capable of sympathy, for sympathy is a fellow-feeling for the suffering of another, and is therefore itself suffering (§ 30). Through the suffering of the Twelfth Aeon, the Sophia, suffering finds an entrance into the whole Pleroma, which according to them [I. κατ' αὐτούς] suffers in order to restore its suffering member. As afterwards this suffering of the Sophia is communicated to Jesus coming down for her help, and to the pneumatic σπέρματα taken up by Him, so are the Aeons also chastened by the same suffering and suffer too. The Sophia desired to comprehend that which lies beyond Gnosis (comprehension), and so involved herself in ignorance and formlessness (ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ καὶ ἀμορφίᾳ ἐγένετο). And thus the Aeons themselves have learned that they exist by the grace of the Father, who Himself is ὄνομα ἀνωνόμαστον, and μόρφη καὶ γνώσις [I. ὅτι εἰσὶν χάριτι τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅς ἐστιν ὄνομα ἀνωνόμαστον, μόρφη καὶ γνώσις]. In this way also the Pleroma regains its unity, each Aeon being possessed of its Pleroma, i.e. its σύζυγος (I. with Bernays τὴν σύζυγον), §§ 30-32.

The Sophia who has suffered for her longing after forbidden knowledge by a fall from the Pleroma, causes Christos to emanate from her own Ἐννοια (i.e. her remembrance of the higher world), as (so Theodotus calls him) an Image of the Pleroma. For not having emanated like

the perfect Aeons from a Syzygy, but from the Sophia only, Christos is Himself, like the later offspring of the Sophia, a mere image (εἰκὼν). But being of pneumatic nature, he leaves this lower alien world, and mounts up to the Pleroma, where he mingles [I. ἐκράθη] with the rest of the Aeons, and specially with the Paraclete; and as the elect one and first born of this lower world is established as the Son, or receives the name of Son. Sophia seized with longing for the departed one, produces the Ἄρχων τῆς Οἰκονομίας, the Demiurge, or Topos, formed after the type of Christos, or (as is also said) after the type of the Father of all, or (as is said again) after the image of the Monogenes (cf. § 7). Being derived from the πάθος τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, he is of a lower psychical essence (διὸ καὶ ἤτταν γίνεται, ὡς ἂν ἐκ πάθους τῆς ἐπιθυμίας συνεστῶς). The mother herself, seeing his abruptness (τὴν ἀποτομίαν αὐτοῦ), is filled with dislike of this her offspring (§§ 31-33). To this production of the Demiurge and of the whole lower world must probably refer the observation (§ 31) that Sophia in her state of ignorance and formlessness produced a κένωμα γνώσεως, a mere σκιά τοῦ ὀνόματος (that is of the name of the Son). Who is meant by ὄνομα here, called also υἱός and μόρφη τῶν αἰώνων, is not quite clear; one naturally thinks first of the Christos, who is said to have emanated from the Sophia along with the σκιά, which is left behind in the κένωμα (cf. Iren. i. 11, 1). But more probably we should understand the Monogenes who gives form to the Aeons by imparting the Gnosis to them, and whose Name (ὄνομα) Christos as υἱόθετος receives (cf. § 26). The following words (§ 31) are also obscure: οὗτος τὸ κατὰ μέρος ὄνομα τῶν αἰώνων ἀμελεῖ ἐστὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος. Bernays' conjectural reading: οὗτος τοι κατὰ μέρος ὄν ὄνομα κ.τ.λ. is certainly not the right one. Perhaps we should read οὕτως and explain it thus: even as the υἱός (as ὄνομα) is the μόρφη τῶν αἰώνων, so the ὄνομα κατὰ μέρος τῶν αἰώνων (the special name belonging to each individual Aeon), is in fact τοῦ ὀνόματος, i.e. partakes of the ὄνομα.

From beneath the throne of Topos proceeds a stream of fire, which flows into the vacuum (τὸ κενόν) of creation. This is Gehenna, which, though from the beginning of creation fire has flowed into it, is never full. Topos himself is fiery, and therefore hides his countenance behind a veil, that the sight of it may not destroy all things. The ἀρχάγγελος only, i.e. Jesus goes into his presence, as a type of which the high priest entered once a year within the veil (§ 38). Besides the Demiurge and the δεξιά δυνάμεις (the Psychici), Sophia also produces left hand powers (the Hylici), which are left to be shapen by the Demiurge or Topos (§ 34; cf. Iren. i. 11, 1. The reading πρῶται cannot possibly be right). The Demiurge forms this lower world from the right and from the left, i.e. from the Psychical and from the Hylical. At the end of the work of creation he produces Adam, who had already been begotten in thought (§ 40). From Adam proceeds a twofold human race, the δίκαιοι (the Psychici) and "the others" (the Hylici), § 37. Sophia, on the other hand, after giving birth to Christos, and being left behind by him, produces no more anything perfect. Rather she keeps

back with herself the things which she was able (to have produced). This applies not merely to the angels of the *Topos*, but also to the *κλητοί* (the Pneumatici), whereas the *ἐκλεκτοί*, the *ἀγγελικά* who proceeded from the masculine principle the *Logos*, had already withdrawn themselves with him (§ 39, cf. 21 and 23). Here again the text is not sound. I read: ἡ μήτηρ προβαλοῦσα τὸν Χριστὸν ὀλόκληρον καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καταλειφθεῖσα τοῦ λοιποῦ οὐκ ἔτι οὐδὲν προέβαλε ὀλόκληρον, ἀλλὰ τὰ δυνατὰ παρ' αὐτῆ κατέσχευε, ὥστε καὶ τοῦ τόπου τὰ ἀγγελικά καὶ τῶν κλητῶν τὰ σπέρματα αὐτῆ προβαλοῦσα παρ' αὐτῆ κατέχει, τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν τῶν ἀγγελικῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄρρενος ἔτι πρότερον προβλημένων.

The distinction between the *ἐκλεκτοί* and the *κλητοί*, or between the masculine and feminine spirits, is defined more closely elsewhere. According to that definition the *ἐκλεκτοί* are the Angelic beings (τὰ ἀγγελικά), the *κλητοί* called also (as by Valentinus himself) τὸ διαφέρον πνεῦμα, τὰ διαφέροντα σπέρματα, are the spirits of the Pneumatici, who in their totality make up the *Ἐκκλησία*. The former proceed according to one theory from the *Sophia* (§ 21), according to another from the "Masculine," i.e. from the *Logos* (§ 39), but so probably from him as having the *Sophia* for his instrument. At the creation of man, but after the formation of his psychical body by the Demiurge a σπέρμα ἀρρενικόν, an efflux from the ἀγγελικόν, is infused during sleep by the *Logos* into the chosen soul, that it may not be an ὑστέρημα (i.e. subjected to the influence of this lower transitory world). This σπέρμα ἀρρενικόν leavens through and through, that which appeared about to separate, uniting body and soul, although these had been produced by the *Sophia* in a divided condition. But the deep sleep of Adam was that forgetfulness of the soul which held her together with the body, so that she might not be dissolved, until the *Soter* had deposited in her the pneumatic seed which went on glowing as a spark (σπινθήρ) [Read with Bernays: ἄπνοος δ' ἦν Ἄδὰμ ἡ λήθη τῆς ψυχῆς ἢ συνείχε μὴ διαλυθῆναι ἕωσπερ τὸ πνευματικὸν σπέρμα ἐνέθηκε τῇ ψυχῇ ὁ σωτήρ.] This σπέρμα was an efflux of the ἀρρενικόν and the ἀγγελικόν (§ 2, comp. § 3). An operation of the *Logos* (with mediation of *Sophia*) is therefore here spoken of, which precedes the earthly manifestation of *Jesus*. As to the fate of Adam himself, the original creation of the Demiurge, and into whom the pneumatic seed had been deposited, nothing more is here told us. But we may venture to complete the defective account here by older narratives, in this way: the terrified Demiurge makes his creature again to disappear, the masculine σπέρμα deposited in it is carried upwards into paradise, the feminine σπέρμα is taken by him (I. with Bernays ἀρμένον) and through Eve transferred to the pneumatici (§ 21). According to the other account (§ 40) the emanation of the σπέρματα τῆς ἐκκλησίας does not take place till after the production of the Demiurge, who proceeds from the *Sophia* immediately after the departure of *Christus* as a fruit of her πάθος. Seeking aid she lifts up her eyes with a prayer for light. Contemporaneously with this emanate from the mother the σπέρματα ἐκκλησίας, and from the masculine

principle the angels of these σπέρματα who are destined after their complete redemption to form syzygies with them. The angels therefore pray for the σπέρματα to which they belong, because without these (pneumatic ones) they cannot hope themselves to enter the *Pleroma*. They form with these pneumatic souls a spiritual unity by reason of their common origin (§§ 40, 35, 36, 22). They are the angels of "these little Ones who do always behold the face of their Father," the angels of "the elect" who will share their future inheritance and perfection with them (§ 23). The διαφέροντα σπέρματα or σπέρματα ἐκκλησίας are not like πάθη with whose dissolution the σπέρματα too would be dissolved, nor like the creations produced by the *Sophia*, but they are as children (ὡς τέκνα), otherwise when the creation was completed they would have been completed too. And therefore have they kinship with the light which *Christus* first made to come forth by his supplication to the *Aeons*, i.e. with *Jesus*. In him all σπέρματα which with him will enter into the *Pleroma*, are potentially (κατὰ δύναμιν) purified; and therefore we can rightly say that the ἐκκλησία was chosen from the foundation of the world (§ 41). The process of redemption is as follows. *Christus* having left his mother behind and outside the *Pleroma* implores on her behalf the assistance of the *Aeons*. In accordance then with their good pleasure (εὐδοκία) *Jesus* in whom the fullness of the *Aeons* dwelleth, issues forth to be the παράκλητος of the fallen *Aeon* (§§ 23, 31). He is also, as messenger of all the *Aeons*, called λόγος, ἄγγελος and ἀρχάγγελος (§§ 25, 35, 38). Passing over the "Oros which separates the *Pleroma* from the *Kénoma*, he leads with him the angels τοῦ διαφέροντος σπέρματος, in order to redeem the σπέρμα, the pneumatic souls. He himself, as descending from the *Pleroma*, is possessed of the λύτρωσις. But the angels receive it in baptism for our sakes, through the communication of the ὄνομα of him descending in the baptism of *Jesus*. In reference to this baptism of the angels is interpreted the baptism for the dead of 1 Cor. xv. 29. By the "dead" are there meant the (feminine) souls which in this world are subject to death, that is the souls of the pneumatici, by the living we must understand the ἄρρενες or the angels who have no portion in this lower world. This vicarious baptism is that called by the Marcosians λύτρωσις ἀγγελική. With this are baptised all the pneumatici destined for an ultimate union with the angels; they are baptised into the same name as that in which the angel of every single pneumaticus has been baptised, in order not to be debarred by the "Oros or Σταυρός from entering into the *Pleroma* (§ 22).

The coming down of *Jesus*, or the paraclete, takes place so that he assumes a pneumatic body (σαρκίον) formed by the *Sophia* from the pneumatic seed, or, as (with special reference to *Theodotus*) it is elsewhere expressed, by investing himself with the *Sophia* and with the ἐκκλησία τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν διαφερόντων (i.e. the pneumatic humanity) as with a body (§ 1, 26). This body (τὸ σαρκίον) is the visible in *Jesus*, the invisible being the ὄνομα, the υἱὸς μονογενῆς, or the *Logos*. So then *Jesus*, the ἐκκλησία and the *Sophia* form together a powerful and perfect κρᾶσις τῶν σωμάτων

(§ 17) analogous to the parental *κρᾶσις* which produces offspring, or to the mingling of a body with the earth, or of wine with water, only that here the *κρᾶσις* is much easier inasmuch as it is really an intermingling of spirit with spirit. Upon this body the product of Sophia and in exactly called Jesus, the *ὄνομα* comes down at the baptism in the form of a dove (§§ 16, 22, 26); and it must be in reference to this body that it is said that Jesus also needed the *λύτρωσις* in order not to be hindered by the *ἐγνοία τοῦ ὑστερήματος* (to which He had been in a certain way subjected on His issuing from the Sophia) in His mounting upwards into the Pleroma (§ 22). [Heinrici is mistaken in referring these words to Christ.] With regard to the suffering (passion) of Jesus but few hints are given. The *σπέρματα* whom Jesus has taken up into Himself share in this suffering, and thereby the whole universe (*τὸ ὅλον καὶ τὸ πᾶν*, both the Pleroma and this lower world) is drawn into sympathy (§ 31). In his passion he gives over to His Father the Sophia with the words, Luke xxiii. 46, in order to receive her again from Him that she be not kept back by the powers of the left hand [i. with Bernays *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀριστέρων δυνάμεων*]. With the same words He also commends into the Father's hands the whole pneumatic seed of the elect. [By the *ἐκλεκτοί* here we cannot understand, as at § 23, the *ἀγγελικὰ ἀρβενικά*, but only their associates the pneumatici; and must therefore assume a variable use of terms]. The passion of Jesus is also represented as a being divided in order to the reunion of the sundered parts. As Jesus is baptised to bring about the union of the pneumatici whose feminine souls are separated from their masculine consorts the angels, so also the indivisible must be divided in order that the pneumatici may be united to their angel consorts and so we, the many being made one, may all be commingled with the One who for our sakes has been divided (§ 36). [After *ἐβαπτίσατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς* we must place a stop.] What we are to understand by this "being divided" predicated of Jesus will be evident if we bear in mind that it is expressly mentioned (cf. § 1) how in His passion He gives up to the Father the pneumatic elements which on coming down to earth He had received from the Sophia (and from the *ἐκκλησία*), and had clothed Himself therewith as with a body, and so separates Himself from them for a time in order to receive them back again and to take them up with Himself into the Pleroma. But before this can take place Jesus *παρὰ κληθείς*, i. e. the *σαρκίον* united with the paraclete, the pneumatic man Jesus, being risen again, takes His place at the right hand of the Demiurge in order to enable the whole pneumatic seed to enter the Pleroma (§ 38). We have in Paul the Apostle a type of the paraclete, being sent forth as preacher of the Resurrection immediately after the Lord's passion. For that reason he preached the Soter in two different ways [i. *καθ' ἑκάτερον*] according to men's different powers of comprehension. Now, for the sake of the *ἀριστεροί*, he preaches Him as born and suffering (*γεννητὸν καὶ παθητὸν*) because they can only know this Christ and fear Him *κατὰ τὸν τόπον τούτων* [Bernays reads *μετὰ τὸν Τόπον τούτων*]; and now, for

the sake of higher minds, he preaches Him pneumatically even as He is known by the *δεξιοί ἄγγελοι*, and as born of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin, i. e. as proceeding from the pneumatic world and from the Sophia. For the Lord manifests Himself to each one in a different way.

The further details of the work of redemption are given with special reference to that pneumatic seed which is to be redeemed. The descent of Jesus takes place (according to Theodotus) with an accompaniment of *ἄγγελοι τοῦ διαφέροντος σπέρματος* (§ 35). The Soter awakes the soul out of sleep and fans the *σπινθήρ* into flame. For this reason the elect seed which is quickened into life by the Logos, is called *σπινθήρ*, apple of the eye, mustard seed, and leaven, which united unto faith that which seemed to be divided [i. *ἐνοποιούσαν*]. After the resurrection he breathes the Spirit into the apostles, blows away the dust like ashes, but fans the *σπινθήρ* into life (§§ 1, 3). The enlightenment of the pneumatic seed is referred to in John i. 9 (The "light which lighteneth every man"). The humanity here spoken of is the *σπέρμα διαφέρον*. His coming into the world was an adorning Himself (*εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἦλθεν τουτέστιν ἑαυτὸν ἐκόσμησεν*: the play on the word *κόσμος* is untranslatable) by putting away from Him the beclouding and commingling *πάθη* (§ 41). It is thus that by the coming of Jesus down to earth, the separation is accomplished between believers and unbelievers. The instrument of this separation is the cross (*Σταυρός*) which is the sign of Horus ("Opus") within the Pleroma. As Horus divides this lower world from the Pleroma, so Stauros believers from unbelievers (i. *τοὺς ἀπίστους τῶν πιστῶν*). By "believers" here we are not to understand, as in later teaching, the psychici, but the pneumatici, the *σπέρματα διαφέροντα*. These it is whom Jesus carries by the sign (the Cross) upon his shoulders and into the Pleroma. Jesus therefore is called the "shoulders" of the seed as Christos is called their "head;" and therefore is it said, "He that taketh not up his cross and followeth me is not my brother." So Jesus took up his own body (to the cross), which being of pneumatic nature was consubstantial with the church (*ὁμοούσιον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*) (§ 42). The Demiurge and his associates (*οἱ δεξιοί*) before the coming (*παρουσία*) of Jesus into the world, knew the names of Jesus and of Christos (i. *τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰ ὀνόματα*) but not the power of the sign (i. e. of cross) § 43. [i. *ἀλλὰ τοῦ σημείου οὐκ ἔδεσαν φασὶ τὴν δύναμιν*. With the words immediately following in the same section (§ 43) — *καὶ δόντος πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατρὸς* — begins the piece taken from the Italian school]. In order to open the way for the pneumatici into the Pleroma, Jesus after His resurrection places Himself at the right hand of Topos (the demiurge) and pacifies his fiery nature (§ 38 of Iren. i. 30, 14, where precisely the same speculation is reported of the Ophites). But the apostles take their places in the twelve zodiacal circles, because as the natural birth proceeds from the zodiac, so regeneration (or new birth) from the apostles (§ 25). Along with the pneumatic *σπέρματα* Sophia also is brought into the Pleroma. The feminine *σπέρματα* (pneumatic human souls) are

united with their masculine consorts (the angels) and so they all enter together into the Pleroma. Therefore is it said in the Egyptian gospel, "The woman is transformed into the man and the church below into angels" (§ 21). When the mother with the Son and with the σπέρματα have entered the Pleroma, then will Topos take the place which is now taken by the Mother (§ 34). The psychici (otherwise called the Righteous) taking their way through creation (i. ἐν τῷ ἐκτισμένῳ and not with Bernays ἐκ πίστεως) remain behind with Topos, the rest (the Hylici) remain in the dark portion of creation (ἐν τῷ τοῦ σκότου ἐκτισμένῳ) with the ἀριστεροί, and there fall into the fire (§ 37).

The preceding survey shows that in the first forty-two paragraphs or sections of Clemens's Fragments from Theodotus, we really have a well connected and consistent doctrinal system. The scattered notices in §§ 1-28 fit in tolerably well into the dogmatic whole, and there is no more reason to doubt that we have here an account of the so-called Anatolic school, as that it also gives in substance the oldest form of the Valentinian system. When therefore it is added to the Title of these "Excerpts from Theodotus and the Anatolic school," that they are κατὰ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίνου χρόνους, the addition is perfectly justifiable. It is certainly an error when the title expressly assumes that all the excerpts belong to the Anatolic school ('Ἐκ τῶν Θεοδότου καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας), but this mistake is not probably to be laid to the charge of Clemens himself. It seems however likely that the combination of the later account of the doctrines of the Italian school (§§ 42-65) with that of the older Anatolic system was Clemens's own work. We may even discover how he was led to make this combination. In § 44 we are told how the Son upon his coming is received by the Sophia. She sees his likeness to the light which has left her, and hastens to meet him with joy and adoration. But when she discovers the masculine angels by whom he is accompanied, she veils herself for shame. Now the later Italian document (which reappears also in Irenaeus, i. 4, 2) referred this Light by which Sophia had been deserted, to the Aeon Christus who he emanated from the Pleroma along with Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, in order to impart to the Κάτω Σοφία a μὀρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν, and after accomplishing this work had returned into the Pleroma. After which the Soter, at the instance of Christus, comes down to Sophia accompanied by his angels (cf. Iren. i. 2, 6; 4, 5; 5, 6; 7, 1), and imparts to her a μὀρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν (Exc. ex Theod. § 45, cf. Iren. i. 4, 5). Clemens explained this in the sense of the simpler account of the Anatolic school, which he had himself been giving, and referred, therefore, Christus to the Soter of the Sophia, and the ἄγγελοι to the masculine seed which after the creation had been emanated along with the feminine seed at the instance of the Logos. But herein he made the serious mistake of overlooking that the Christus of the older school was a quite different character and performed a quite different part from the Christus of the later school. Again, whereas according to the first account the work of redemption begins with the descent of Jesus, the μὀρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν (imparted to the lower Sophia) is,

according to the second account, the commencement of creation (the elements of the universe being formed out of her πάθη separated and transmuted into earthly substances) and the work of redemption takes place much later. We must indeed allow that the obscure character of the latter account shows plainly that it is derived from an older and simpler source. According to Irenaeus (i. 4, 1; cf. 4, 5) the μὀρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν imparted by the Soter to the lower Sophia, is preceded by the μὀρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν imparted to her by the Aeon Christus. It is however hard to say how these two μὀρφώσεις are to be distinguished the one from the other when the whole process of the world's formation from the πάθη of Sophia is said to proceed from the μὀρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν.

The historical development of the Valentinian doctrine can be traced out with only approximate certainty, and in any case only imperfectly. The roots of the system are to be found in the old vulgar Gnosis. For even if the original dualistic foundation is repressed and concealed by a platonizing pantheism, it still gives evident tokens of its continued existence in the background. The ἕλη and "dark waters" into which the Ophitic Sophia sinks down (Iren. i. 30, 3), are here changed into the κένωμα or ὑστέρημα, which in antithesis to the πλήρωμα is simply an equivalent for the Platonic μὴ ὄν. But yet more when the Universe is no sooner formed than it divided itself into a right and a left, a psychical half, and a hylical, a demiurge and a cosmocrator, the dualistic foundation is no less evident than in the somewhat differently turned Ophitic doctrine which makes Jaldabaoth generate the Ophiomorphos by mirroring himself in the dregs of the ἕλη (Iren. i. 30, 5). The same is the case when the Demiurge is described as a θεὸς πύρρινος (Exc. ex Theod. § 38, cf. Philos. vi. 32, p. 191, and compare what is said of the so-called Docetæ Philos. viii. 9, p. 265), which is not only a reminiscence of a well-known Old Testament representation, but also of the doctrines of the Syrian Gnosis. Compare, more especially, the teaching of Apelles concerning the ἄγγελος πύρρινος, the "igneus praesens mali," who is now distinguished from and now identified with the God of the Jews (Tertullian, de Carne Christi, 8; de Anima, 23; Philos. vii. 38, p. 259). This original dualism appears also in the theories of later Valentinians, as in the piece contained in the Dialog. de recta fide, and erroneously ascribed to Valentinus himself.

The Valentinian doctrine of emanations is also of Oriental origin. If indeed we might venture to reckon Bardesanes himself among the Valentinians, the investigation into points of connection between them and the Ophitic gnosis might be carried much further. But the statement found in the Philosophumena (vi. 35), that Bardesanes was one of the heads of the Anatolic School is not confirmed by a comparison with other accounts. Yet, undoubtedly, the antithesis of a masculine and a feminine principle, which is perpetually recurring in the syzygies of the Valentinian Pleroma, and in ever varying forms, as also the notion of πληρώματα in contradistinction to εἰκόνες, indicates a connection with the ideas and conceptions of Aramaic paganism. From the Syrian gnosis moreover are derived

the Ἀνθρῶπος προόν, the names Ἀχαμῶθ, Ἰαώ (Iren. i. 4, 1; 21, 3), and probably also the Aramaic formulae for prayer and conjuration which are found among Marcosians and other Valentinians. Valentinus, on the other hand, appears to have been the first who, under the influence of Platonic philosophy, found in the old Cosmogonic Myths a new and philosophic meaning. The mythical personages of the Valentinian Pleroma present the history of mind or spirit, which breaking forth from the primal silence of the hidden ground of all being in the form of the creative thought and will proceeds from its hiding-place to revelation. This self-development of the infinite appears to bring it under finite conditions of πάθος or suffering, which affect even the highest Pleroma, and threaten to destroy the primal harmony, unless the individual Aeons, in whom the infinite powers of spirit distribute themselves, can be once more established in their original order, and each restrained within his own limits. The same process which within the Pleroma is brought to rest by the action of Horus (Opos, limit-maker) repeats itself at the lower stages and developments of existence. In the troubles of Sophia we find represented the history of the soul, which having forsaken her original home, and so lost her proper rank and purity, is visited now with innumerable sufferings, pangs of grief and unstilled longings, till deliverance is finally vouchsafed her from above. The origin of this Valentinian Sophia is also to be found in the Syrian gnosis. [SOPHIA.] She is here described as the overflow of light which the mother of life can no longer retain, the beam bursting forth on "the left side," which (like the light sparks of Saturninus' Pleroma) becomes the principle of all life and all formation in the ἄλη. With Valentinus also the Sophia appears as the formative principle in the visible universe: but with this old cosmogonic conception we find the platonic thoughts combined of the soul's fall, of her punitive suffering, of her reminiscences of the long lost home, and her final return thither.

Valentinus himself as well as the older Anatolic school represented in the excerpts of Clemens Alexandrinus knows but one Sophia, the twelfth (or thirtieth) Aeon of whose Fall and consequent sufferings the whole of this mundane creation is the issue. The same conception meets us again in the older source made use of by Hippolytus in the Syntagma, in Marcus (Iren. i. 18, 4; cf. 15, 3; 16, 1, 2; 17, 1; but otherwise 1, 16, 3) as well as in the second account given by Irenaeus (i. 2, 3). According to this last, Sophia after attempting the impossible gave birth after the manner of a woman, to an οὐσία ἄμορφος, on beholding which she is seized with fear and sorrow, with horror and despair, and strives in every way to hide what has happened. She turns at length to the Father in her penitent sorrow, and all the other Aeons make intercession for her. Meanwhile from the passions of Sophia (her ἄγνοια, λύπη, φόβος and ἐκπληξίς) the material world is formed. The οὐσία ἄμορφος here is certainly not the lower Sophia, but the formless after-birth, the σκιά, which remains behind with the mother, when Christus her son, born in reminiscence of the higher world, has mounted up to the Pleroma.

The distinction made of a twofold Sophia, is the most important alteration in the original system taken in hand by a certain part of the Valentinian school. We are expressly informed of this doctrine as taught by Secundus, one of the oldest disciples of Valentinus (Iren. i. 11, 2), but elsewhere we find it only in documents of the Italian school. The Irenaeus' main account from source A relates first the history of the last Aeon Sophia. In overweening desire for immediate communion with the all-perfect Father, she separates herself from her σύζυγος, falls into a state of suffering, and would have been wholly dissolved in her longing if Horus had not delivered her from her suffering, re-introduced her into the Pleroma, and reunited her to her σύζυγος (Iren. i. 2, 2, cf. 2, 4; 3, 3). The purification of Sophia by Horus is thereby accomplished that her Ἐνθύμησις (Desire), together with the πάθος that has come upon her (σὺν τῷ ἐπιγνωμένῳ πάθει), is separated from her (2, 4; 4, 1). This Ἐνθύμησις of the ἄνω Σοφία is the Ἀχαμῶθ or κάτω Σοφία. It is described here, as in the doctrine of the ἔσω (2, 3), with which however this account is not otherwise to be confounded, as a formless being (ἄμορφος καὶ ἀνείδεος). It is indeed still of pneumatic essence and endowed with a certain natural longing after the upper world (the Αἰών), but, being unable to comprehend anything, it is formless, a mere weak feminine offspring, an ἔκτρομα (compare also *Philos.* vi. 31, p. 188 sq.). Outside the region of light and the Pleroma she is driven about by an irresistible fire in places of shadow and emptiness (1. ἐν σκιάς καὶ κενώματος τόποις, cf. *Excerpt. ex Theod.* § 31), till the upper Christus takes pity upon her and imparts to her the μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν (2, 4; 4, 1). Although this μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν is expressly contrasted by Irenaeus with the μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν which has not yet taken place, it nevertheless from his own account appears to have consisted in an impartation of knowledge to Achamoth. Not till the upper Christus has again left her, does she come to the knowledge of her suffering and of her separation from the Pleroma, and is filled with longing after the better world, of which, since the coming of the Christus, a fragrant savour had remained with her. But her endeavour to mount upwards into the Pleroma finds a bar in the action of Horus, who keeps her back with the magical utterance Iao. Now then more than ever feeling herself left alone outside the Pleroma is she laid hold of by all manner of sufferings, sorrow, fear, desperation, ignorance, but also for the first time with an ἔτερα διάθεσις of penitent conversion (ἐπιστροφή) to the Giver of Life. While then her mother (the first Sophia) obtains deliverance (ἐτεροίωσις τῶν πάθων) she (the ἔσω Σοφία) has experience of the opposite. From her πάθη issues this lower world. From her ἐπιστροφή comes the soul of the world (ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ κόσμου) and of the Demiurge, from her φόβος and λύπη the rest, from her tears the watery particles, from her smile the substance of light, from her λύπη and ἀπομύνη the corporeal elements of the universe (4, 1, 2).

This formation of the Universe is further designated as an opening of the μήτρα of Achamoth (3, 3).

The further process of the world's formation is depicted by Irenaeus from two accounts which supplement each other, the first that which he has been using hitherto (source A), a document of the Ptolemaic school; the second (source C) the writing used by Clemens also (*Excerpt. ex Theod.* §§ 43-65). The account given by C is the basis of what is found in Irenaeus from 4, 5 to 5, 5, but is frequently interrupted by insertions from A. Most of the account is given twice in different words and with slight modifications in detail. This is the case with the origination of the Demiurge, the formation of the Psychici and Hylici from the *πάθη* of the Sophia, the psychical Christos of the Demiurge, the constituent parts of the Soter who descends for the work of Redemption, and the like. Common to both accounts is it that the *μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν* of Achamoth or her deliverance from her *πάθη* is effected by the Soter or Paraclete, who on the intercession of Christos is sent forth from the Pleroma and with a company of his angels descends to her. From the psychical substance he forms the Demiurge, or the Hebdomad over which Achamoth as Ogdoad sits enthroned; from the hylical substance proceed the *πνευματικά τῆς ποιηρίας*, the Cosmocrator or Devil and the demons. (Following source A, Iren. 5, 1; following source C, *Exc. ex Theodot.* §§ 43-46 = Iren. 4, 5 down to *δεδημιουργηκέναι φάσκοις* and 5, 2-3). We have here an echo of the old Ophite doctrine, the Demiurge appearing as a limited Being who knows of nothing higher than himself, but the Cosmocrator as an evil spirit who is possessed of that knowledge (Iren. 5, 4, cf. 30, 5). The formation of the various constituents of this lower world out of the *πάθη* of Achamoth is the work of the Demiurge acting as an instrument of the Sophia, while imagining that He himself is the Highest. The further details are with some insignificant modifications the same in both accounts (following source A Iren. 4, 2; 5, 1; following source C, *Exc. ex Theodot.* §§ 47-49 = Iren. 5, 4, where an interpolation from A repeatedly breaks the connexion). To the three original elements of the Universe, the Pneumatic, the Psychic, and the Hylical Elements, corresponds a threefold race of human beings, one by nature capable of salvation, another endowed with freedom of will, and a third by nature devoted to destruction. These three races or kinds of human beings are represented by the three sons of Adam, Seth, Abel, Cain (from A, Iren. 6, 1, 2; from C, *Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 50-57 = Iren. 5, 5; 7, 5). The pneumatic seed is secretly sown by the Sophia in the soul of Adam (*Exc. ex Theod.* § 53) and the masculine angels watch over the *σπέρματα* (*ibid.*). But in the main source A the origination of pneumatic souls from the impregnation of the Sophia by the Angels of the Soter is given with more detail. (Iren. 4, 5, last sentence; 5, 1; 6.) Essentially the same form of doctrine is that presented in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 31-34, pp. 188-192).

The doctrine of redemption is curiously modified in the Italian system. The older teaching of a Christos, son of the Sophia, who forsakes his mother in order to ascend into the Pleroma is attributed besides to Valentinus himself (Iren. 11, 1) and the Anatolic school, to Marcus also, according to whom Christos receives the place

of the xiith Aeon within the Pleroma (Iren. 15, 3; see Hilgenfeld's remarks upon it, *l. c.* p. 374). But according to the source A, as used by Irenaeus, the new Syzygy of Christos and *Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον* takes the place of Christos, son of Sophia, having emanated from the Monogenes (the *Noûs* and *Ἀλήθεια*), after the restoration of the Upper Sophia, and the separation of Achamoth. According to the yet younger form which the doctrine takes in the *Philosophumena* the number of thirty Aeons is first made up by this fifteenth Syzygy (*Philos.* vi. 31, p. 188). The only peculiarity seems to be that in the account given by Irenaeus (from source A) the same functions are ascribed to the Aeon Christos as to the *Ἄγος*. He confirms and establishes the Aeons by teaching them the Law of Syzygy, and shewing them the impossibility of their knowing the Father, whereas the *Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον*, on the other hand, teaches them how to thank and praise the Father of all (Iren. 2, 5, 6). It seems here evident that the new form in which Christos here appears is not part of the original arrangement of the system, and does not well fit in with it. This higher Christos it is, as we have seen, who imparts to the lower Sophia the *μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν*, and immediately after returns into the Pleroma (Iren. 4, 1). Why the Christos leaves Achamoth so quickly after a half-accomplished work of Redemption can only be explained by supposing a transformation of the original doctrine. The *μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν* and the deliverance from the *πάθη* is imparted to the Achamoth through Soter, the Paraclete, or Jesus, who appears here also issuing forth as the common Product of the whole Pleroma. (From source A, Iren. 2, 6; 3, 1, 2, 4; 5, 1; from C, *Exc. ex Theodot.* §§ 43-45 = Iren. 4, 5). He is the general Framer of the Universe, who has formed all things *δυνάμει*; in his work he makes use of Achamoth and of the psychical Demiurge without his knowledge. (From source A, Iren. 5, 1; from C, *Exc. ex Theodot.* § 47 = Iren. 4, 5.) And so the pneumatic seed to which Achamoth gives birth is derived from the angels of the Soter, and comes down at his instance into the lower world (see above).

In this form of doctrine also it is the Soter, who at the end of all things comes down once more, to bring in the universal Redemption. But, whereas, according to Anatolic doctrine, he descends to earth invested with the Sophia and *Ἐκκλησία* as with a pneumatic body, so here he unites on coming down both psychical and pneumatic elements, being obliged to assume the firstfruits of all which he is minded to redeem. Thus from the Achamoth and from *Ἐκκλησία*, he takes the pneumatic elements and adds them to his own pneumatic essence, *i. e.* the *ὄνομα*, and from the Demiurge he takes the psychical. He unites himself with the psychical Christos of the Demiurge, and assumes *ἀπὸ τῆς Οἰκονομίας* a psychical body which has been prepared with exquisite art, in order to be seen and touched, and capable of suffering. Only from the *ἕλη*, which in itself is incapable of redemption, he assumes nothing. His descent on the psychical Christos takes place at the baptism; at the passion he is deserted, not only by the Soter, but also by the pneumatic element received from Achamoth (from source C, *Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 58-61). In the two accounts

given by Irenaeus, 6, 1, and 7, 2, the relation of the sources is not quite clear. As 7, 1 is derived from C, it would seem that the transition to A takes place at the words *εἰσι δὲ λέγοντες*. But this is not a suitable form of expression to denote his main source; and besides this, the points of contact with the excerpts are greater in 7, 2 than in 6, 1.

The notion of a psychical Christ who passes through Mary as water through a conduit (Iren. 7, 2), is to be found everywhere in the Italic school (*Philos.* vi. 35, p. 194 sq.). It assumes that the Demiurge who has fore-announced this his own Messiah by the Law and by the Prophets (cf. *Exc. ex Theodot.* § 59; Iren. 7, 2) is only a limited and not in any way a hostile Being. This last notion however is not peculiar to the Italian school. Among the Marcosians also we meet with the *ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας*, or the *σωτὴρ ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας*, who is also called the *φαινόμενος Ἰησοῦς*, on whom at his Baptism the *Χριστός* descends. The generation of this *ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας*, and his birth from Mary, is the work of Powers flowing forth in a wonderful manner from the Upper Tetrad. The place of the *Logos* is taken by the Angel Gabriel, that of *Zwή* by the *Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον*, that of *Ἄνθρωπος* by the *δύναμις τοῦ ὑψίστου*, that of *Ἐκκλησία* by the Virgin Mary (Iren. 15, 3, cf. 14, 6). The *δύναμις τοῦ ὑψίστου* is understood to mean the Demiurge in the Italian account as it appears in Pseudorigenes (*Philos.* vi. 35, p. 194; cf. *Exc. ex Theod.* § 60), but it is not made out that the Marcosians shared this view. Heracleon, on the other hand, makes the expression *ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* refer to the imperfect and passible, and therefore psychical Body of the Redeemer (ap. Origen. in Ioann. tom. viii. 38).

Apart from this one point of difference the further process of the Work of Redemption is represented in the accounts which have come to us from the Italian school with the same features essentially as in those of the Anatolic school. During the Passion of the psychical Christ, the Soter withdraws himself from the *σῶμα* to give room for Death asserting its power. But the Body having died, and so Death having exercised its power over it [*κρατήσαντος αὐτοῦ*] the Soter sends down a ray of his power and drives away Death [read with Bernays *ἀπήλασε*] awakens the Body, and abolishes its *πάθη* (*Exc. ex Theod.* § 61). The psychical Christ takes then his place after the Resurrection at the Right Hand of the Demiurge (just as Jesus in the Anatolic doctrine) and there will remain till the end of the World (*Exc. ex Theodot.* § 62). In this interval the Pneumatici find rest along with their Mother in the Ogdoad, and wear till their perfecting their (psychic) souls as wedding garments: the other faithful souls (the Psychici) find their place along with the Demiurge. At the end of the World the Mother ascends up into the Pleroma along with her Pneumatici. She is there wedded with the Soter as her *σύζυγος*, and the Pneumatici with their Angels as Brides with their Bridegrooms. And so the great Marriage Supper is celebrated in the Marriage Chamber within the *ὄρος*. The Pneumatici obtain the vision of the Father, and having themselves become rational Aeons, they are now admitted to

the rational and everlasting marriage joys of the celestial Syzygy. The Demiurge along with the faithful psychici moves up into the Ogdoad, and takes the place which the Mother has vacated. He is the guest who has been made *ἀρχιτρικλινος* at the wedding banquet, the conductor of the Bride, the friend of the Bridegroom who stands without and rejoices when he hears the Bridegroom's voice (*Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 61-65. In § 63 a comma should be put after *μητρὶ* and *ἐχόντων* be read instead of *ἐχόντες*; in § 64 read *πατρός* instead of *πνεύματος*). Essentially the same are the accounts given by Irenaeus (from source A, 7, 4; 5; from C, 7, 1), and in the *Philosophumena* (vi. 36, p. 195 sq.).

The doctrinal system contained in source A is, as we have already observed, that of the Ptolemaic school with which the account in source C is in thorough agreement. But the writing also made use of by Hippolytus, or whoever was the author of the *Philosophumena*, represents the Italian type of doctrine. If we except the differences already noted in the doctrine of the Aeons, and some other differences in terminology which have also been already mentioned, it differs from the sources A and C in only a few non-essential particulars. The Fragments of Heracleon moreover agree with the *Philosophumena* in all main points (cf. Hilgenfeld, *l. c.* pp. 472-505, for the proofs of this statement).

Compared with the older Anatolic Valentinianism, the Italian exhibits a richer and more developed Mythology. The sufferings of the lower Sophia are at bottom a mere repetition of those of the upper Sophia, the part played by the higher Christ is a copy of that of Horus. The Christology is also more artificially constructed. The oldest form of doctrine preserved by Marcus appears to have taught quite simply that Christ Son of Sophia, after mounting upwards into the Pleroma came down at his Baptism on the wondrously formed *σάρκιον* (product of the Sophia and *Ἐκκλησία*), the Man Jesus. The Anatolic doctrine which Irenaeus or his authority (Justin) here ascribes to Valentinus himself (*Haer.* i. 11, 1) already attributed the Work of Redemption no longer to Christ himself, but to the Soter, who at his request had been sent forth as a common fruit of the whole Pleroma, and who descended on Jesus, i. e. on the *σάρκιον*. The Italian school distinguished more clearly a threefold Christ: first the Aeon Christ, *σύζυγος* of *Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον*, who emanated after the establishment of the Upper Sophia; second, the Soter, who is also called Christ, and was emanated as the common fruit of the Pleroma; third and last the psychic Christ of the Demiurge with whom Soter unites himself at his Baptism.

The centre of gravity of the whole system lies undoubtedly in its speculative interests. The names alone of the thirty Aeons are a proof of this. It deserves notice that the designations *Noῦς* and *Μονογενής* applied to the first masculine principle emanating from the supreme Father do not seem to have been used by Valentinus himself. It was called simply *Πατήρ* or *Ἄνθρωπος* (*νῦν ἀνθρώπου*). Discussions like those of the Anatolic school (as reported by Clemens, *Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 6, 7) concerning the emanation of the *Μονογενής* from the Supreme

Father minister to that philosophical tendency which seeks to solve the old old question of the origination of all existence from primeval silence, by means of the "Eternal Thought." It is a genuinely speculative feature when, as here (*l.c.*), the knowledge of the Father through the Son is derived from a union of the Spirit of Love with the Spirit of Knowledge. Related to this is the theoretical exposition attributed by Irenaeus to the "Scientiores circa Ptolemaeum" (12, 1). According to this Bythos had two consorts, Ἐννοία and Θέλημα, from whom proceeded the Syzygy of Μονογενής and Ἀλήθεια. Then in the first place he conceived the thought of the emanations, and afterwards made the resolve to carry it out. The unknown authority in Pseudorigenes (the *Philosophumena*) makes love once more the final cause of the emanation of the Pleroma from the Fore-Father in his loneliness, with the beautiful words: ἀγάπη ἦν ὄλος, ἢ δὲ ἀγάπη οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγάπη, ἐάν μὴ ᾖ τὸ ἡγαπημένον (*Phil.* vi. 29, p. 185).

In view of the origin of the doctrine of Valentinus, concerning the Aeons which we have found to be in the cosmogonic and astral powers of the old Syrian Gnosis, one cannot doubt that the Aeons were originally thought of as mythological personages and not as personified notions, although Tertullian (*adv. Valentin.* 4) would refer the former view to Ptolemaeus, and not Valentinus as its first author. The original form of the doctrine, therefore, is that which gives Σιγή or Ἐννοία to Βυθός as his consort. Another mode of conception regards the first principle as both male and female (hermaphrodite), even as the masculine and feminine members of the Syzygies of the Pleroma are again sometimes regarded as bisexual (Cf. *Iren.* 11, 5, with 1, 1 and *Epiph.* xxxi. 5). Just as in the religious systems of Hither Asia, might the Syzygy of the masculine and feminine principle coalesce in a bisexual being, without the original conception being abandoned. It has, on the other hand, a quite different signification when the first principle is raised above all sexual antithesis. So reports Irenaeus repeatedly (2, 4; 11, 5; cf. *Epiph.* xxxii. 7) concerning a portion of the Valentinians. According to them, the Father is above male and above female, or as it is said in the second passage οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἄζυγον λέγουσι μήτε ἄρρενα μήτε θήλειαν μήτε ὄλος ὄντα τι. Here, then, the Platonic or Pythagorean Monas takes the place of the bisexual First Principle. This form of doctrine is presented in the *Philosophumena* in contradiction to the older authorities as the proper doctrine of Valentinus and his disciples Heracleon and Ptolemaeus. The ἀρχὴ τῶν πάντων is here described as μονὰς ἀγέννητος, ἀφθαρτος, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀπερινόητος, γόνιμος (vi. 29, p. 184 sq.). Here, then, we have the speculative question concerning the Absolute answered in a similar way, as by the Basilidians, and as also by the Alexandrine fathers of the church, that, namely, the Absolute is the simple Monad, the One, raised above all quality and definition. Still more clearly appears the Pythagorean notion of the Μονάς in the teaching of that ἄλλος ἐπιφανής διδάσκαλος αὐτῶν, who is mentioned in the ancient source followed by Irenaeus in *Haer.* i. 11. According to him the highest principle is the μονότης, which is further designated as προαρχή

προαεννόητος, ἀρρητός τε καὶ ἀκατονόμαστος. Along with this μονότης subsists another δύναμις, the ἐνότης. Both δυνάμεις are one. From them proceeds, even because they emanate nothing, the μονάς, an ἀρχὴ νοητὴ ἀγέννητος τε καὶ ἀόρατος. Along with the μονάς subsists a δύναμις co-essential with it, τὸ εἶ. We have then here the Pythagorean Tetractys, and from this all the other Aeons are supposed to emanate (*Iren.* i. 11, 3). The same exact doctrine reappears in the teaching of Marcus, who is probably the "illustrious teacher" alluded to (*xv.* 1). The Pythagoreism of the system has here degenerated into a symbolism of numbers, and letters spun out into infinity.

Others make an Ogdoad to precede Bythos, as the πρώτη καὶ ἀρχέγονος ὀγδοάς, whose single members represent the idea of the primal and unfathomable Being on all its sides: the first Tetrad is προαρχὴ ἀεννόητος, ἀρρητός, ἀόρατος, the second is ἀρχὴ ἀκατάληπτος, ἀνονόμαστος, ἀγέννητος (*Iren.* i. 11, 5). How much this purely philosophical questioning occupied the school is evident from what Irenaeus tells us of those who would be more knowing than they. These do not make the first Ogdoad come forth by degrees, one Syzygy after another, but the προβολή of the three first pairs of Aeons from the Προπάτωρ and Ἐννοία takes place at one and the same moment. What the Fore-Father thought within Himself to emit (ἐνενοήθη προβαλεῖν) was hence called Father; because it was true, it was called Ἀλήθεια; because He willed to reveal Himself, it was called Ἀνθρωπος; and they whom He foreknew before causing them to emanate were called Ἐκκλησία. The man (Ἀνθρωπος) spake the word (τὸν λόγον)—which is, therefore, his only-begotten Son; the Logos, moreover, was followed by the Life. And thus the first Ogdoad was completed (*Iren.* i. 12, 3; ap. *Epiph.* xxxv. 1, where this party is called Kolarbasianians).

With the notion of the Syzygy Ἀνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, as preceding that of Λόγος and Ζωή, is to be compared the order in which the unknown source made use of by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxxi. 5) reckons up the lists of the Aeons. Differently again the authority made use of in the *Philosophumena* makes Νοῦς and Ἀλήθεια the source from whence first Logos and Zoë, and then ten other Aeons proceed; from Logos and Zoë proceed again Ἀνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, and after them twelve other Aeons (*Philos.* vi. 29 sq. p. 186 sq.). Of like sort is the controversial question mentioned by Irenaeus (i. 12, 4)—whether the Soter draws his origin from the twelve emanations which proceeded from Ἀνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία, or from the ten derived from Logos and Zoë, or whether merely from Χριστός and Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον. However unimportant such difference may appear, their explanation is to be found in the lively speculative interest which attached itself in Gnostic minds to the various forms of the inner divine life, and its various manifestations in the Pleroma. Secundus, himself the oldest of all Valentinus' disciples, set up a doctrine of his own concerning the relations of the different Aeons one to another. So in the first Ogdoad itself, he distinguished a Tetras δεξιά and a τετράς ἀριστερά, and called the one φῶς, the other σκότος (*Iren.* 11, 2, cf. Pseudotertull. 13). It is, indeed, quite possible that this statement, as it stands, is founded on error;

and one may venture to conjecture that what Secundus really meant was to distinguish an upper and a lower Tetrad, one within, the other outside the divine Pleroma. In this case his system of doctrine would approach very nearly to the old Syrian Dualism. But this is a point on which we can no longer decide with certainty.

A yet more widely different conception of the Valentinian doctrine of Aeons is found in the Fragment given by Epiphanius (xxxi. 5-6). Here, too, the speculative interest is manifest in the endeavour to follow up in detail the process of the emanation of individual Aeons within the Pleroma from the *Ἀβρόνιαν*. But the whole description, bathed as it is in sensuous warmth, with its peculiar plays with numbers and its barbarous names for individual Aeons, appears to be merely a degenerate Marcsonian form of Gnosis.

Finally, we have a quite peculiar transformation of the Valentinian system in the doctrine of the so-called Docetae, as preserved in the *Philosophumena* (viii. 8-11). From the *πρῶτος θεός* who is small as the seed of a fig-tree but infinite in power, proceed first of all three Aeons, which by the perfect number ten enlarge themselves to thirty Aeons; from these again proceed innumerable other bisexual Aeons. From these proceed an infinite multiplicity of Ideas, of which those of the third Aeon are expressed and shapen in the lower world of darkness as *φωτεινὰ χαρακτῆρες*. To prevent a further robbery of Light, the third Aeon forms a wall of partition between the upper and lower world. After his form the *πυροειδὴς θεός* comes into existence as the Creator of this lower world, having for his essence, Light changed into Fire. He holds in his keeping the sparks of light which have been congealed into souls, and compels them to transmigrate from one dark body into another, and exercises violence over them till the Soter appears, and puts an end to their transmigrations. For the formation of the Soter all the Aeons meet together in the middle Aeon, and so form a product of equal power with that of the fig-tree seed. The great task set before him in his work of Redemption is to bring back all the sparks of light which have sunk down into the material world, or all the Ideas which have congealed into human souls, to that particular Aeon from which each has originally proceeded. In order to become the Redeemer of all, he clothes himself with the ideas of all the Aeons; last of all the soul thus produced puts on a clothing of *σάρξ*, taken from the lower World of Darkness. The process of this Incarnation is precisely that described in the Gospel. When the Demiurge nails his own creature, the *σάρξ*, to the cross, the *ψυχὴ* of the *σωτῆρ* puts off this *σάρξ*, and clothes himself again, in order not to be found naked, with the *σῶμα*, which at his Baptism had been formed in the water to take the place of that *σάρξ*. Each soul comprehends that Jesus, who corresponds to her own nature, whom the eternal Monogenes has taken from the eternal places, and therewith clothed himself. And this is why so many sects or parties (*αἰρέσεις*) seek Jesus with contention, who is really kin to them all, and appears to each otherwise according to the different places in the spirit-world to which each belongs. Each

party regards that Jesus who is its own kinsman and fellow-citizen as the only true one, and all the others as spurious. Those whose nature is derived from the inferior places in the spirit-world, are unable to discover these Ideas of the Saviour, which are above them, while the higher natures from the middle Decad, and the noblest Ogdoad, perceive and know Jesus, not only *ἐκ μέρους* but entire, and for that reason only are the perfect ones, while all others have only a partial knowledge.

The Platonic foundation of the Valentinian system is very perceptible in this its last offshoot though mixed up in a peculiar way with Oriental Dualism. At the same time these Docetae endeavour to reduce the metaphysical distinctions which they maintain, to merely gradual ones. No part of Christendom therefore is entirely excluded from the knowledge of the Redeemer, and participation in His Redemption: all, even those of the lower grades of the spirit-world, participate at least *ἐκ μέρους* in the Truth. The way in which all, and each according to his measure, attain to the knowledge of the truth, is, as in the Doctrine of the Church, *Faith*. Since the Redeemer's advent—so we read expressly—"Faith is announced for the Forgiveness of sins."

Beside working out philosophical problems, the disciples of Valentinus were much occupied with the endeavour to find traces of their Master's doctrine in Holy Scripture. The Excerpts of Clemens and abundant notices in Irenaeus give us information as to an allegorical method of scriptural exposition pursued with great zeal in the Valentinian schools. It is not limited to the Gospels or the Pauline Epistles but extends to the Old Testament, and attaches special significance to the history of creation in the book of Genesis. Valentinian expositors shew a special preference for the Gospel of St. John, and above all for its Prologue. Of those allegorical expositions have been preserved some belonging to the Anatolic school (*Exc. ex Theod.* §§ 6, 7) and others derived from Ptolemaeus (*Iren.* i. 8, 5). But before all we must make mention of the labours of Heracleon, of which Origen has preserved numerous specimens. From Heracleon proceeded the first known commentary on St. John's Gospel.

VI. *Literature.*—Valentinus occupies a distinguished place in all works on Gnosticism; so, after still older writers, in the works of Neander, Baur, Matter, Lipsius, Müller (*Geschichte der Kosmologie in der Christlichen Kirche*), and Mansel (*The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries*—a posthumous work, edited by Bishop Lightfoot); as well as in the Prolegomena of Harvey's edition of Irenaeus. The best Monograph is that by Heinrici (*die Valentinianische Gnosis und die Heilige Schrift*, Berlin, 1851), with which may be compared the Review by Lipsius (*Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1873, pp. 174-186). The latest inquiries are those set forth by Hilgenfeld in two papers, in his *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1880, pp. 280-300; 1883, pp. 356-360), and in his "*Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*," Leipzig, 1884 (pp. 283-316; 335-384; 461-522; 546-550). Compare also the Articles in this dictionary on Bardesanes, Colorbasus, Heracleon, Marcus, Ptolemaeus. [R. A. L.]

VALENTINUS (2), a bishop mentioned by Sulpicius Severus as in company with St. Martin when he was visiting Chartres. On a little dumb girl being brought by her father to the saint for cure, the father's prayer was supported by Valentinus and by Victricius, another bishop who was with them, and St. Martin complied (Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* iii. 2 in *Pat. Lat.* xx. 213). Valentinus is believed to have been bishop of Chartres c. 390, and Victricius, bishop of Rouen (Tillem. x. 333; *Gall. Chr.* viii. 1094). [C. H.]

VALENTINUS (3), a layman, in high official position at Constantinople, friendly to Chrysostom. Three letters of Chrysostom's to him are extant (*Epp.* 41, 116, 217). [E. V.]

VALENTINUS (4), bishop of Baiana, or Vaiana, a place of unknown site in Numidia, respected by the Donatists, who wished that their case might be heard in his presence at Ravenna, A.D. 406. (Aug. *Ep.* 88, 10.) He also joined in a letter to the Donatists, from the bishops assembled at Zerta, about the charge of partiality at the conference brought against Marcellinus the President. (*Ep.* 141.) He was present at the conference A.D. 411 (*Carth. Coll.* i. 57, 99), and also at the Council of Mileum A.D. 416, and at that of Carthage, A.D. 419, by which time he had become primate of Numidia, after the death of Silvanus. (*Ep.* 176, 182; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 156.) [URBANUS (of Sica); XANTHIPPIUS.] [H. W. P.]

VALENTINUS (5), abbat of a monastery at Adrumetum or Hadrumetum, capital of Byzacene. (*Dict. of Geog.* i. 1024). The troubles which disturbed this monastery A.D. 423 or 427, are briefly described above [FELIX (189) and FLORUS (12) Vol. II. 500, 546.] In his letter to St. Augustine Valentinus explains their origin, describes the restoration of peace, and begs his prayers for the welfare of the house, and his advice as to its regulation. (Aug. *Ep.* 214, 215, 216.) [H. W. P.]

VALENTINUS (6), abbat of St. Andrew's at Rome [VALENTIUS].

VALENTINUS (7), abbat, had allowed women to frequent his monastery, and also permitted his monks to be sponsors with women. Gregory the Great wrote to him in A.D. 594 forbidding both practices. He was perhaps the same as the priest Valentinus, who complained to Gregory the Great that monks of his monastery, whom he had excommunicated, fled to the diocese of Spoleto, and were allowed to receive communion there. He also complained that one of two slaves whom a deacon had manumitted on condition of their becoming monks in his monastery had left it. (*Epp.* iv. 42, ix. 37.) [F. D.]

VALENTIO (1), May 25, martyr with Pasiscrates at Dorostorum (Silistria). He suffered under a president Maximus in the Diocletian persecution. His name occurs in the acts of Julius, *AA. Sincera*, ed. Ruinart, p. 616. These acts are plainly genuine according to the tests laid down by Le Blant, *Actes des Martyrs*, p. 121, and elsewhere in that work. The acts of Julius mention that Julius, when about to die, was asked by Hesyclus, another soldier, to salute from him Valentio and Pasiscrates, who had already suffered. [G. T. S.]

VALENTIO (2), bishop in Numidia. Crisconius, bishop of an adjoining see, complained to Gregory the Great that he had arbitrarily joined certain parishes of Crisconius's diocese to his own, and that he had also appropriated the property of Crisconius's predecessor. These complaints were referred by Gregory the Great to bishops Victor and Columbus for investigation, and, if proved, for redress. (*Epp.* viii. 28.) [F. D.]

VALENTIUS (VALENTIO, VALENTINUS), abbat, first of a monastery in the province of Valeria, and afterwards of Gregory the Great's own monastery at Rome, while Gregory the Great was a monk there, is his authority for the story of the sheep-stealer miraculously stopped as he passed a priest's grave, and for that of the two monks who were hanged by the Lombards, whose souls were heard singing after their murder. (*Dial.* i. 4, iii. 22, iv. 21.) He is commemorated on March 14th. [F. D.]

VALERIA (1), Ap. 28. [VITALIS (1).]

VALERIA (2), Christian daughter of Diocletian, compelled by her father to sacrifice to the gods (Lactant. *Mort. Persec.* cap. 15). She became the wife of the emperor Galerius, and in her widowhood was sought in marriage by Maximinus Daia. On her refusal to marry him she was banished, together with her mother Prisca (39, 40). After wandering for some time they were both apprehended at Thessalonica and put to death by order of Licinius (50, 51), their bodies being cast into the sea. (Tillem. v. 7, 24, 117, 180; A. J. Mason, *Persec. of Diocl.* 40, 121, &c.) [C. H.]

VALERIA FALCONIA PROBA. [FALCONIA.]

VALERIANA, martyr with Victoria and Fidentius, a bishop. They seem to have been numbered among the twenty martyrs who had a church at Hippo, whom Augustine praises in *Serm.* 325. August. in his *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8, tells a story of the effects of prayer to these twenty martyrs. [FLORENTIUS (2)]. [G. T. S.]

VALERIANUS (1), C. PUBLIUS LICINIUS, emperor, belonged to a noble family. He was born probably about A.D. 190, and filled all the offices of the state in regular succession. In A.D. 237 he was princeps senatus, and as such received the embassy from Africa, announcing the elevation of the Gordians to the empire (*Vita Gord.* c. 9). When Decius, shortly before his death, revived the office of censor [DECIVS], the senate, to whom the election had been left, unanimously chose Valerian, who was then in Thrace with the emperor. He prudently declined so invidious an office, and the death of Decius, which followed immediately afterwards, put an end to the project. When Gallus heard that Aemilianus had been proclaimed emperor by the army in Moesia, he despatched Valerian to Gaul and Germany to collect troops (A.D. 253). Before the close of that year, Valerian was proclaimed emperor by the legions of Rhaetia and Noricum, and associated his son Gallienus with him in that dignity. Meanwhile Aemilianus had marched on Italy, and Gallus and his son had been slain at Terni by their own troops, who went over to

their rival. This happened probably in February or March A.D. 254. Valerian then crossed the Alps, Aemilianus in his turn was slain by his soldiers at Spoleto (or, according to Victor, *de Caes.* c. 31, died of disease) three months after the death of Gallus, and in June or July Valerian was recognized as sole emperor, the senate also ratifying the elevation of Gallienus to the empire (Victor, *de Caes.* c. 32).^a

The reigns of Valerian and his son were the most disastrous period in the history of Rome down to the time of Honorius. The empire seemed on the verge of dissolution. Not only was every frontier menaced by barbarian attacks, but even the interior provinces were invaded and ravaged. A German host entered Italy itself, and penetrated as far as Ravenna. The Franks, who now first appear under this name in history, assailed the Rhine frontier, and notwithstanding the efforts of Gallienus, who was sent there to command in person, forced a passage at several points, and after ravaging Gaul invaded Spain, where they stormed and sacked the capital Tarragona, and even Africa suffered from their attacks. In the West the Goths and their kindred tribes poured across the Danube into Illyricum and Macedonia. The great city of Thessalonica was besieged, and was with difficulty saved by the gallant defence of the inhabitants. The walls of Athens were rebuilt by the terrified citizens, and the Isthmus of Corinth fortified. The Boians, Goths, Carpi, and Burgundians, obtaining vessels from the inhabitants of the Crimea, ravaged the coasts of the Euxine. Trebizond was taken by them, probably in A.D. 259, and in the following year Bithynia was invaded, and Nicomedia, Nicaea, and Prusa were taken and burnt. Cyzicus was saved only by a freshet in the Rhyndacus. The Persians took Nisibis and Carrhae, and, led by the renegade Cyriades, even penetrated into Syria and captured Antioch (? A.D. 255). Worse even than all these wars was the great plague which had begun in the reign of Decius, and which raged for fifteen years (*Zon.* xii. 21).

To the other calamities of the reign was added the most terrible persecution the church ever experienced, except the final one under Diocletian and his colleagues. There are some curious points of resemblance between the events that preceded these persecutions. In the early part of his reign Valerian was exceedingly favourable to the Christians, and his palace, like that of Diocletian, was filled with believers. But in A.D. 257 a terrible change took place. Valerian fell more and more under the influence of the praetorian prefect Macrianus, an Egyptian, who was chief of the "magi" of that country. The same means that were used again half a century later in Diocletian's case were employed to incense Valerian against the Christians. Macrianus persuaded the emperor to have recourse to sacrifices of children, and other abominable means of forecasting the future, and attributed the failure of these unholy

^a The accounts of these events are exceedingly meagre and conflicting. The deaths of Gallus and Aemilianus and the elevation of Valerian are often placed in A.D. 253. The narrative in the text is based on Eckhel's dissertation, *Doctrina Numorum*, vii. 361.

rites to the presence of the Christian members of the imperial household. (Compare *DIOCLETIAN*, Vol. I. 835.)

Under the influence of the favourite, Valerian issued an order, commanding that those who did not belong to the religion of Rome should at least render the outward signs of conformity to it under pain of exile. By the same edict, Christians were forbidden, under pain of death, to assemble for worship, or to enter their cemeteries. The cases of St. Cyprian (*Acta Procons.* c. 1, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* iii. 1499) and St. Dionysius of Alexandria (*Eus. H. E.* vii. 11) shew how uniform the procedure was under this edict. St. Cyprian was apparently the first to suffer in Africa, and the date of his exile (August A.D. 257) shews when the persecution began. His sentence was simple banishment, but a great number of African bishops, priests, and deacons, besides some of the laity, were sent to the mines, where they endured great hardships (*S. Cyp. Epp.* 77, 78, 79, 80 in *Patr. Lat.* iv. 414).

This edict was followed in A.D. 258 by a rescript of tremendous severity from Valerian, who, in the interval, had probably set out to the East to take the command against the Persians. (In the early part of the year he had held a council of war at Byzantium [*Vopiscus, Vit. Aureliani*, 13].) The punishment for the clergy of every grade—bishops, priests, and deacons—was death. Apparently in their case even recantation was unavailing. Senators, *viri egregii*, and knights were punished with degradation and confiscation of property. Death was the punishment if they refused to recant. Noble ladies were to forfeit their property and be exiled. Members of the imperial household suffered a similar forfeiture, and were to be sent in chains to work on the imperial possessions. It is remarkable that no mention is made of Christians in general, but only the clergy and the higher classes of the laity are included. The emperor's policy was apparently to strike at the leaders. The first victim of this rescript was pope Xystus. On August 6th he was found, in violation of the first edict, in a subterranean oratory in the cemetery of Praetextatus, and was put to death as he sat in his episcopal chair. Four of his deacons suffered with him. This was the beginning of a violent persecution at Rome (*Cypr. Ep.* 82) in which our days later the famous St. Lawrence followed his master. The news was brought to Cyprian by the messengers he had sent to Rome, who also informed him of the terms of the rescript, and that letters of similar purport had been sent by the emperor to the *praesides* of the provinces. Cyprian calmly awaited his fate, which was not long delayed. He was beheaded on September 14th. Both in Rome and Africa a great number of Christians suffered the fate of their leaders. The best proof of the violence of the persecution is the long vacancies of the sees of Rome and Carthage. The former remained vacant more than eleven months till the July after the death of Xystus, and the latter probably about the same time. In Spain, Fructuosus the bishop of Tarragona, with two of his deacons, were burnt alive in the amphitheatre (Jan. 21, A.D. 259). In Palestine the names of three martyrs are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 12) who came before the governor and declared themselves Christians.

A woman who was a follower of Marcion shared their fate.

But the reign of Valerian was not destined to be of long duration. Dionysius regards his persecution as lasting the forty-two months mentioned in the Apocalypse. After the council of Constantinople he had hastened to the East, and busied himself in rebuilding and restoring Antioch, which had suffered much from the Persians. At the news of the Gothic invasion of Bithynia, he marched into Cappadocia, but again retreated, either on account of the departure of the Goths, the Persian invasion, or the state of his army, in which the plague had broken out. His campaign against Sapor, the scene of which was the neighbourhood of Edessa, was disastrous. He found himself, it was said, through the treachery of Macrianus, in such a position that he could neither fight nor fly. He was taken prisoner, and passed the rest of his life in a miserable captivity, embittered by the insults of the Persian king. The most probable date of his capture is late in A.D. 260. How long he lived in captivity is unknown. Indeed the order of events throughout his reign is very doubtful, and the dates of nearly all of them are uncertain. Gallienus, immediately after his father's captivity, put a stop to the persecution, but it probably lasted in the East till the fall of Macrianus, who on Valerian's captivity had assumed the purple in A.D. 262. (*Zos. i. 28-36*; *Zon. xii. 22, 23*; Bernhardt, *Geschichte Roms von Valerian*; Tillemont, *Emp. iii., M.E. iv. 1*; Victor, *de Caes. 32*; *Epit. 32*; the life of Valerian in the Augustan history; Gibbon, c. 10, 16.)

[F. D.]

VALERIANUS (2), Sept. 15, martyr with Marcellus, near Lyons, towards the close of 2nd cent. Their acts are rejected by Ruinart, though their fame is celebrated by Gregorius Turonensis (*de Gloria, MM. lib. i. cap. 53, 54*). [G. T. S.]

VALERIANUS (3) husband of St. Caecilia. For the story of his martyrdom (commemorated April 14) see Vol. I. p. 365. Here may be added the ingenious explanation given by the late bishop Fitzgerald, how St. Caecilia came to be regarded as the patron of music. Her Acts relate that although she had dedicated herself to a life of virginity she consented, in compliance with the urgency of her family, to go through the ceremony of marriage with Valerianus. She is described as steeling her heart against all the allurements to sensual pleasure on the occasion of the wedding festivities, and among these, special mention is made of the "symphonia instrumentorum" to which she refused to hearken; but "organis cantantibus die nuptiarum" she made melody in her heart to God, saying, "may my heart and body be undefiled." The necessities of the pictorial art demanded that each saint should be depicted with an appropriate symbol by which the spectator might recognise what saint was intended. Bishop Fitzgerald thought that as St. Lawrence was represented with his gridiron and St. Catherine with her wheel, so St. Caecilia was represented in early pictures with the organ prominent in her Acts; and that she was thence imagined to be a musician by those who did not understand that she was only represented with an organ in the same way that other saints are

depicted with the instrument of torture by which they suffered.

We may certainly believe that Dryden's "drew an angel down" had its origin in a misunderstanding of pictures. The Acts relate that on her wedding night she told Valerianus that she was under the protection of an angel who would punish him if he did not respect her chastity, and whom he could see for himself if he would be baptised. This no doubt is the angel who appears in pictures of St. Caecilia, and there is no ground for the idea that the angel came down to listen to her music.

The Acts of St. Caecilia have been recently studied by Erbes (*Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte, ix. 1*), who has given good reason for thinking that they are not earlier than the end of the 5th century. They not only exhibit a use of St. Augustine's work on the Trinity which appeared in A.D. 416, but coincidences in language, as well as in substance, make it probable that the whole story of Caecilia is derived from the story of Martinianus and Maxima told by Victor Vitensis l. 30. This would bring down the date of the Acts to about A.D. 490. The name of Caecilia is not found in earlier lists of Roman martyrs. Erbes remarks that the original day of commemoration of St. Caecilia was Sept. 16; the day Nov. 22 really commemorates the dedication of the church of St. Caecilia, which probably took place under Sixtus III. between 434 and 440. Erbes ingeniously supports the opinion that this, and not the church of St. Mary in Trastevere, was the church which as Lampridius tells (in his life of Alexander Severus, c. 49) was adjudged by that emperor to the Christians, in opposition to the rival claim of the Company of Victuallers, who desired to make a tavern of it. Concerning the neighbourhood of the burial-place of St. Caecilia in the catacombs to that of certain popes, Erbes holds that in the year 236 a suitable burial-place was being prepared for the body of Pontianus, then brought from Sardinia, as well as for that of Anteros who had died in Rome, that the site was furnished by the Caecilian family, and that in order to make room for the two bishops the body of Caecilia was moved to an adjacent side chamber. How Caecilia suffered martyrdom or whether she was a martyr at all, we have no authentic information. [G. S.]

VALERIANUS (4), ST., bishop of Aquileia, is first mentioned as present at the council of Rome in A.D. 371. (Theodoret, *H. E. ii. 17*.) He presided also at the council held in A.D. 381 in his own city against the Arian bishops Palladius and Secundinus, but took hardly any part in the discussion, in which St. Ambrose was the leader on the Catholic side. (*Gesta Conc. Aq. in Ambrosii Op. ii. 786* in Migne, *Patr. Lat. xvi. 9, 16*.) He was also at the council of Rome in the following year (Theodoret, *H. E. v. 9*.) The date of his death is uncertain. He is commemorated on Nov. 27. But little is known of his life, but under his rule there grew up at Aquileia the society of remarkable persons, of whom Hieronymus became the most famous [HIERONYMUS (4), Vol. III. 30], and which he describes in his Chronicle (A.D. 378) as a company of the blessed. [F. D.]

VALERIANUS (5), addressed by Eucherius in a long letter on contempt of the world, the date of which is about A.D. 428. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* iv. 711.) [G. W. D.]

VALERIANUS (6), bishop of Iconium, addressed by Cyril (*Ep.* 50 al. 44) in censure of the Nestorians. [C. H.]

VALERIANUS (7), ST., bishop of Cemele, thought to have been the Valerius, monk of Lérins, who was honoured as a bishop at Nice on July 24th. He is probably the Valerianus who subscribed at the council of Riez in 439 (Mansi, v. 1196), the Valerianus who occurs among the Gallic bishops in the letters which passed between them and pope Leo the Great in 450, 451, 452 (Leo, *Epp.* 66, 99, 102 in *Pat. Lat.* liv. 884, 966, 984), and the Valerianus present at the council of Arles under Ravennius in 455, supporting FAUSTUS (11) of Riez (Mansi, vii. 907). Under pope Leo the bishoprics of Cemele and Nice were united, and it seems likely that this was done while Valerianus held the see of Cemele (*Gall. Chr.* iii. 1271). He was the author of *Homiliae XX* and *Epistola ad Monachos* (Galland. *Bibl. t. x.*; *Pat. Lat.* lii. 691). The first of his homilies, *De Bono Disciplinae*, was long ascribed to St. Augustine, and printed among his writings. On the strength of some expressions in his eleventh homily he has been accused of semi-pelagianism, but Theophilus Raynaud has vindicated him in a treatise, *Apologetica pro Valeriano*, accompanying the bishop's works. (Cave, i. 427; Ceillier, viii. 444, 605, x. 154; Dupin, i. 485, ed. 1723; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 328.) Migne's edition includes a *Vita* from Galland. [G. W. D.]

VALERIANUS (8), patrician, to whom pope Pelagius writes about PAULINUS of Aquileia and the other schismatic bishops of Istria and Venetia. The letter is almost identical word for word with those numbered 4 and 2 to Narses. (Pelagius, *Epp.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 413, 397, 394.) Another fragment has been published by Theiner. (*Disq.* 203.) [F. D.]

VALERIANUS (9), advocate at Rome, father-in-law of Ammonius, who afterwards became a monk in Gregory the Great's monastery. (*Dial.* iv. 26.) [F. D.]

VALERIUS (1) (VALERIANUS), June 14, martyr with Rufinus at Soissons, in 287. Their *Passio* was composed in the ninth century by Paschasius Radbert. (*Boll. Acta SS.* 14 Jun. ii. 284; Paschas. Radb. ed. Sirmond in *Pat. Lat.* cx. 1489; Ceill. xii. 545.) Guérin (*Les Petits Boll.* vii. 5) mentions several small places near the Vesle in the diocese of Soissons as under their patronage. [C. H.]

VALERIUS (2), ST., I., first certain bishop of Saragossa and confessor, was arrested and brought to Valencia with his archdeacon, the famous ST. VINCENT, by order of DACIANUS, the praeses, probably in A.D. 304. After a long and rigorous imprisonment they were summoned before the praeses, and ordered to offer libations to the gods. Valerius, as he had an impediment in his speech, left the reply to St. Vincent. The praeses, enraged at St. Vincent's answer,

sent Valerius into exile. Valerius was afterwards at the council of Elvira in May (?) A.D. 306. He is commemorated on Jan. 28 (*A.A. SS.* Jan. ii. 394, 834; *Esp. Sag.* xxx. 101; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 21.) [F. D.]

VALERIUS (3), vicar of Africa. [VERINUS.]

VALERIUS (4), a bishop addressed by Firmus, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (*Ep.* 38 in *Pat. Gr.* lxxvii. 1507.) [C. H.]

VALERIUS (5), bishop of Melza, a place mentioned by Pliny, and called by Ptolemy Meldita, in Proconsular Africa, between Tabraca and the river Bagradas (Plin. *H. N.* v. 4, 30 Ptol. iv. 3. 31) present at the council of Bagaia A.D. 394 (Aug. c. *Cresc.* iii. 19 §§ 22, 53 § 59, iv. 4 § 5, c. *Gaud.* ii. 7, 7.) [H. W. P.]

VALERIUS (6), bishop of Hippo R. predecessor of Augustine, whom he had admitted to the priesthood at the earnest desire of the people, against Augustine's wish, expressed in a letter to Valerius, but in answer, as Valerius thought, to his own prayers. (Aug. *Ep.* 21; Possidius, *Vit. Aug.* 4, 5.) Contrary to African usage, but in accordance with that of the Eastern Church, Valerius caused Augustine to preach in his presence when he himself became unable to do so. When Valerius felt his own infirmities increase, fearful lest so able a man should be caught up to fill some other see, he sought and obtained the consent of the other bishops, but at first not that of Megalius of Calama, primate of Numidia, to ordain Augustine as a coadjutor to himself, contrary to the usual practice of the church, and to the express wish of Augustine, who refused on this ground to accept the office, though, as he said afterwards, he was not then aware of the canon of the council of Nicaea, that there should not be two bishops in the same place. (*Conc. Nic. can.* 8, Bruns, *Conc.* p. 16; Aug. c. *Petil.* iii. 16, § 19, c. *Cresc.* iv. 64, § 79; *Brevie. Coll.* iii. 7, § 9.) But his objection was overruled by the earnest desire of all concerned, and by the instances adduced of similar practice, both in Africa and elsewhere (Aug. *Ep.* 31, 4; 213, 4.) Valerius, better acquainted with Greek than with Latin, was rejoiced to have one so able as Augustine, to teach and preach in the Latin language. He is spoken of in the highest terms by Augustine, by Possidius and by Paulinus of Nola. (Aug. *Ep.* 31, 4, 32; Possid. *Vit. Aug.* 5; Paulinus, *Ep.* 5.) After Augustine's appointment, Valerius gave him a piece of land for his monastery. (Aug. *Serm.* 355, 1, 2.) He died A.D. 396. (Aug. *Ep.* 33, 4.) A Donatist, Proculeianus, was bishop of that sect in Hippo during his lifetime. (Aug. *Ep.* 33; PROCULEIANUS.) [H. W. P.]

VALERIUS (7), count of Africa, a firm upholder of Catholic truth against heretical attack, who wrote to St. Augustine three letters, in return for which Augustine sent him the first book of his work *de Concupiscentia et gratia*. (Aug. *Ep.* 200.) Valerius had adopted the rule of conjugal continence, and of this Augustine expressed high approval. This was about A.D. 418 or 419. To this book Julian of Eclana replied in four books, in which he accused Augustine of denying the divine institution of marriage; and

of this work some one sent extracts to Valerius who was then at Ravenna, who caused them to be sent by Alypius to Augustine, in order that he might reply to them, which he did in his second book, about A.D. 423. The entire book by Julian was sent to Augustine by Claudius. (*Ep.* 207, 224; *c. duas Ep. Pelag.* i. 5, 9; *Retract.* ii. 53, 62.) On another occasion Augustine wrote to Valerius commending to him a bishop named Felix. (*Ep.* 206; *De Nuptiis et Concupisc.* i. 2, 2; ii. 1, 1; *c. Jul. resp. i. praef.*) [H. W. P.]

VALERIUS (8) II., (?) bishop of Saragossa, attended the first council of Saragossa in A.D. 380. The sees of the bishops are not given, but Valerius was probably the bishop of Saragossa, as from the allusion of Prudentius (*Peristeph.* iv. 79) it appears that several bishops of Saragossa had belonged to the Valerian house, just as at Seville we find several Sabini among the bishops. He is supposed to be the Valerianus to whom Prudentius dedicated his hymn on St. Hippolytus. (*Peristeph.* xi. 2.) (*Esp. Sag.* xxx. 122; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 124.) [F. D.]

VALERIUS (9), friend of Nilus, who addressed to him a letter on the duty of forgiving. (*Nili Epp.* ii. 313.) [I. G. S.]

VALERIUS (10), a presbyter of Antioch, who, with Castus, Cyriacus, and others, supported Chrysostom's cause against the intended bishop Porphyry, and addressed together with them by Chrysostom in consolatory letters (*Chrys. Epp.* 22, 62, 66, 107, 130, 222). See CASTUS. [E. V.]

VALERIUS (11) ST., July 5, first bishop of Conserans, about the finding of whose remains by Theodorus, one of his successors, a story is told by Gregory of Tours (*Glor. Conf.* c. 84). His period is doubtful (*Boll. Acta SS.* Jul. ii. 227; *Tillem.* x. 465; *Gall. Chr.* i. 86, 1123). [J. G.]

VALERIUS (12), an abbat of the Monasterium Rufianense who lived about the year 655, and produced several treatises, which are collected in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxxvii.; cf. *Ceill.* xi. p. 734. He wrote the life of S. Fructuosus, founder of his monastery. [FRUCTUOSUS (10).] [G. T. S.]

VALERY, ST. [WALARICUS.]

VALGIUS, an old man whose life was preserved in a wonderful manner in a shipwreck. In consequence of his deliverance, Valgius became a Christian, and was baptized under the name of Victor. (*Paulinus, Ep.* 49, and note 197.) [H. W. P.]

VALLAGAS, a presbyter of the church of Nisibis, who accompanied Domitianus, the oecumenus of the church of Constantinople, to Rome, conveying the particulars of the judicial proceedings of Optatus, the prefect, against Olympias, Pentadia, and the other friends of Chrysostom, charged with the conflagration of the church; as well as the complaints of the inhabitants of the monasteries of Mesopotamia who were being induced by force to abandon Chrysostom and recognise Porphyrius. (*Pallad.* p. 28.) [E. V.]

VANDRILLE, ST. [WANDRISGISILUS.]

VANNES, ST. [VITONUS.]

VARARANES, son of Isdigerdes, and king of Persia in the earlier part of 5th cent. This prince persecuted the Christians with much violence till he was overthrown by the imperial forces and compelled to desist, about A.D. 420 (*Socrates, H. E.* vii. 18, 20). [G. T. S.]

VARIMADUS, an Arian, against whom was written the treatise *Contra Varinodum* bearing the name of Idatius Clarus, but believed to have been written by Vigilius bishop of Tapsus, among whose works it now appears (*Pat. Lat.* lxii. 351; *Ceillier*, x. 483). [C. H.]

VARNACHARIUS, VARNAHARIUS (WARNAHARIUS), presbyter at Langres, c. A.D. 615. As a scholar and a man of some eminence, he was applied to by St. Ceraunus, bishop of Paris, for the acts of the three Martyrs of Langres, Speusippus, Eleusippus, and Meleusippus. He provided these, and also sent the Acts of St. Desiderius, along with a letter, commendatory of the zeal of St. Ceraunus. These Acts were probably copied by this cleric and retouched, rather than composed by him, but we can draw no exact conclusion. They were given, in an altered form, by Surius (*Vit. SS.* i. 392), but in their original form in *Boll. (A.A. SS. Jan. ii. 440 sq. and Mai v. 246 sq.)* and Migne (*Pat. Lat.* lxxx. 186 sq.) [ELASIPPUS] (*Ceillier, Aut. Scr.* xi. 630-1; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 524-5). [J. G.]

VEAU, ST. [VENERANDUS.]

VEDASTUS (VAAST, WAAST), ST., first bishop of Arras and Cambay (circ. A.D. 500-540), assisted in the conversion of Clovis. His biography, though the text is very corrupt, is of some value as a contribution to the history of the time. Born and reared in Aquitaine, in the country between Limoges and Périgueux, he left parents and home and wandered to Toul, where apparently he was ordained a priest. Clovis passing through after his victorious battle with the Alamanni in the heat of which he had called upon Clotilda's God, being now inclined towards Christianity, heard of Vedastus as a priest leading the religious life, and carried him with him to Rheims, where he and other members of his family were baptized by St. Remigius (A.D. 496). About four years later Remigius consecrated Vedastus bishop of Arras, to help on the conversion of the Franks. In this city he found paganism supreme, and the church neglected and dilapidated. After an episcopate of about forty years, during which he converted many to Christianity and extended his efforts to Cambay, he died on Feb. 6, on which day he is commemorated, and was buried in the cathedral church. St. Dominicus is the next name both at Arras and Cambay (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 2, 320). The sees remained united for some time.

Vedastus's memory has been preserved in the name of the famous abbey of Saint-Vaast, the germ of which was constituted by a little cell of planks built by himself at a spot called Nobiliacum, on the brook Le Crinchon. He had desired to be buried there, but it was not till towards the close of the 7th century that one

of his successors, St. Autbertus, removed his body from the cathedral thither, and constructed the monastery. For the history of this foundation see *Gall. Christ.* iii. 373 sqq.

The rude style of the original life displeased later ages, and Alcuin undertook to write it afresh, but his version adds nothing to our knowledge. Both are to be found in *Boll. Acta SS.* Feb. i. 792 sqq., together with a metrical epitaph by the same author and a voluminous narrative of the translations of the saint's body and the miracles ascribed to it. [S. A. B.]

VENANTIUS (1), African bishop, *Syn. 4 Carth. sub Cyp. A.D. 252, de Basilide, Cyp. Ep. 67*; 49th suffrage in *Sent. Epp. Syn. Carth. vii. sub Cyp. de Bap. iii.*; bishop of Thinisa (Thinissa, Tinnisa) in *Prov. Proc.* between Utica and Hippo Diarrhytus; famous for its martyr Felix, on whom Augustine preaches (*Morcelli*). No inscriptions. He is called Confessor in the later margin. Three other bishops known up to 5th century. [E. W. B.]

VENANTIUS (2) (**VENANCUS**), recluse, was elder brother of Honoratus, bishop of Arles [**HONORATUS (10)**]. Under the influence and instruction of Honoratus, he distributed all his goods to the poor, and set out on pilgrimage with him, but in passing through Greece he died at Methona, which is supposed to be on the coast of Messenia, c. A.D. 395 (*Hilar. Arel. Sermo de Vit. Honor. c. 2*). His feast is 30 May, and his life, by an anonymous author, is given by the Bollandists (*Mai vii. 236 sq.*, with *praev. comment.*, and see also *ib. Jan. ii. 382-3*). [J. G.]

VENANTIUS (3), **ST.**, abbat of a monastery at Tours, which afterwards took his name, lived in the latter half of the 5th century. He was, according to Gregory of Tours, *vir magnificae sanctitatis* and possessed of wonder-making powers. His tomb, which Gregory knew, was also celebrated for the cures performed at it (*Greg. Tur. Vitae Patr. cap. xvi., Lib. de Glor. Conf. xv.*). Venantius is commemorated Oct. 13. For his mention in the martyrologies and the history of his relics see *Boll. Acta SS.* Oct. vi. 211.

[S. A. B.]

VENANTIUS (4), patrician of Palermo, was in A.D. 601 addressed by Gregory the Great. (*Epp. xii. 4, 40, xiii. 15.*) [F. D.]

VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS. [**FORTUNATUS (17).**]

VENANTIUS (5), bishop of Perugia. [**ECCLISIUS (2).**]

VENANTIUS (6), a patrician of Syracuse, a friend of Gregory the Great, before the latter became pope, had embraced and left the monastic life, and had married a wife named Italica, by whom he had two daughters, Barbara and Antonina. One of the first cares of Gregory on becoming pope was to write to Venantius and urge him to return to the monastery. Venantius refused to comply, but Gregory continued on friendly terms with him. Venantius subsequently quarrelled with Joannes, the bishop of Syracuse, because the latter had refused his offerings, and actually used violence towards him, for which conduct Gregory reproves him. **VENANT.** **CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.**

tius died in A.D. 602, having steadily refused to resume the monastic life, and Gregory after his death took pains to protect the interests of his orphan daughters (*Epist. lib. i. ind. ix. 34*; *lib. vi. ind. xiv. 43*; *lib. ix. ind. ii. 123*; *lib. xi. ind. iv. 30, 35, 36, 78*, in *Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 486, 850, 1056, 1143, 1147, 1218*). There is no authority for the title of cancellarius sometimes given to Venantius. [F. D.]

VENANTIUS (7), Roman nobleman, was anxious to procure for himself a patent of ex-consulship, and had asked Gregory the Great to exert his influence in his favour, who accordingly wrote on his behalf to Honoratus, his apocrisarius at Constantinople. (*Epp. ii. 53.*) [F. D.]

VENANTIUS (8), bishop of Luna. Seven letters are addressed to him by Gregory the Great (*lib. iv. ind. xii, 21, lib. v. ind. xiii. 3, 7, lib. viii. ind. i. 4, lib. ix. ind. ii. 29, 34, lib. x. ind. iii. 44*, in *Migne, Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 690, 723, 728, 908, 967, 969, 1102*). Of these the most important are the first, directing him to enforce the law which forbade Jews to have Christian slaves, Christian coloni, however, on estates of Jews to remain as before; the second, forbidding that clergy guilty of immorality should ever be restored to their office, and the fourth, giving the conditions as to ornaments and endowment, on which Gregory allowed a church to be consecrated. Venantius is Gregory's authority for four remarkable stories in the *Dialogues* (*iii. 9, 10, 11, iv. 53*, in *Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 233, 414*). He was perhaps the bishop deputed by Gregory the Great to investigate the complaints of bishop Theodorus against **DEUSDEDIT (4)** (*Ep. xiii. 30*). [F. D.]

VENERANDUS (VEAU), seventh bishop of Clermont, succeeded Artemius, c. 394. He is classed with other well-known bishops in Gaul by Paulinus, a presbyter, who is cited by Gregory of Tours (*His. Franc. ii. c. 13*), and was possibly Paulinus bishop of Nola. Venerandus died c. A.D. 423, and was buried in the church dedicated to his memory (*Greg. Tur. De Glor. Conf. c. 35-7* in *Migne, lxxi. 855 sq.*; *Gall. Christ. ii. 229*). His feast is Jan. 18 (*Boll. AA. SS. Jan. ii. 558*). [J. G.]

VENERIUS (1), bishop of Milan, to whom Aurelius bishop of Carthage in June 401, a season of dearth, recommended that an envoy should be sent to ask his assistance to the African clergy (*Cod. Can. Afr. Ecc. num. lvi.* in *Hard. i. 895*; *Hefel. Conc. i. 422*). An epistle written by Chrysostom to pope Innocent was addressed likewise to Venerius (*Pallad. Dial. cap. ii. fin.* in *Pat. Gr. xlvii. 12*). Palladius (*cap. iv. p. 15*) mentions his having written to Chrysostom, and among Chrysostom's letters there is one (*Ep. 182*) addressed to Venerius in 406. Venerius is also praised in a poem of Ennodius (*lib. ii. carm. 79*). See also Ughelli (*Ital. Sac. iv. 47*) and Cappelletti (*Le Chiese d'Ital. xi. 109, 301*). [C. H.]

VENERIUS (2), fourth bishop of Marseilles, between Priculus and St. Eustasius (circ. A.D. 428-452), is said to have been a disciple of Cassianus in his monastery of St. Victor. The rivalry of the two sees of Arles and Marseilles

was so bitter that Venerius was charged with welcoming the assassin of Proculus, archbishop of Arles, and "rejoicing at his own brother's murder." The pope Caelestinus I, in a well-known letter written in 428, refers the matter to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne (*Epist.* iv. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 1. 435). Venerius, however, seems to have been undisturbed, as he is one of the prelates addressed a few years later by the same pope in his letter against the Semipelagians (*Epist.* xxi. *Patr. Lat.* 1. 528), and later on he was a correspondent of St. Leo, (see Leo, *Epist.* xcix. cii. ciii. *Patr. Lat.* liv. 966, 984, 988). He is said also to have sat in the council of Arles, held in 451. It was at the bidding of Venerius that Musaeus, the priest of Marseilles, composed his lectionary and treatise on the Sacraments (Gennadius, *De Scriptor. Eccl.* lxxix., *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 1103). See *Gall. Christ.* i. 634; Ricard, *Les Evêques de Marseille*, 13, 14. [S. A. B.]

VENERIUS (3), monk. [MAXENTIUS (4), p. 867 a.]

VENERIUS (4), bishop of Vibo, in Bruttii, is addressed with other bishops by Gregory the Great in A.D. 599, and the next year, with Stephanus, is appointed by him visitor of the churches of Taurianum and Turris, sede vacante. (*Epp.* ix. 48, x. 17.) [F. D.]

VENERIUS (5), apocryphal bishop of Cagliari, to whom two spurious letters, purporting to be from Gregory the Great, are addressed. (Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.* Sp. n. 268, 269; *Sardinia Sacra*, 81.) [F. D.]

VENNIANUS, according to St. Columbanus in his letter to pope Gregory the Great (*Epp.* ix. 127), inquired of Giltas what should be done in the case of monks who, from desire of a more ascetic life, left their monasteries against their abbat's will and retired to deserts. This Giltas may be GILDAS the author. [F. D.]

VENUSTIANI. [PATERNIANI.]

VENUSTUS. Mart. Carthage A.D. 250. See ARISTO. [E. W. B.]

VERA, a lady in the family of JULIANUS (106). Jerome in a letter to him (*Ep.* 118 § 7, *fin.*), mentions her eminent piety as supporting her under the trials of life, and counsels him to copy her example. (Ceillier, vii. 640.) [C. H.]

VERANUS (1), ST., fourth bishop of Vence in the 5th century, was a son of St. Eucherius, the famous bishop of Lyons, and Galla. With his brother Salonius he was educated at Lérins, and their father wrote for their instruction the *Instructionum Libri duo ad Salonium*, and the *Liber Formularum spiritalis intelligentiae ad Veranum*; EUCHERIUS (1). Both of the brothers became bishops (see Gennadius, *De Scriptor. Eccl.* lxiii. lxvii.; and cf. Salvianus, *Epp.* viii. ix., *Patr. Lat.* lvii. 168, 169); but there has been considerable discussion as to Veranus's see, some having maintained that he and his brother succeeded their father at Lyons. It seems probable, however, on the evidence of an ancient martyrology of Vence and a MS. of Lérins, that he may be assigned to Vence. The

question is discussed in *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1212, iv. 24, and *Boll. Acta SS.* Sept. iii. 547. As bishop, whatever his see may have been, he seems to have been in the confidence of the contemporary popes. A joint letter of himself, his brother, and a third bishop, to Leo, on the subject of Eutychianism, written in 451, is to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 887. And Leo's successor, Hilary, delegated to him the task of composing several episcopal controversies in the south of Gaul (Hilarius, *Epp.* iv. xi., *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 20, 28). It is not certain whether he is the bishop of the same name who was at the council of Arles in 475. The year of his death is unknown. His day is Sept. 10. For a former abbey of his name in the diocese, see *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1234.

Veranus may have been part author of the Dialogue on the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, in which he and his brother appear as interlocutors, though the work is usually ascribed to Salonius alone (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liii. 967 sqq.; cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 435, 436, 476-478). [S. A. B.]

VERANUS (2) (vulg. URAIN), ST., 6th bishop of Cavillon, was a man of some consequence, being twice employed on royal missions. The first date we have is 585, when he was at the second council of Mâcon. The next year Praetextatus, bishop of Rouen, was murdered in his church at the command, as was said, of Fredegund. Veranus, with two other bishops, was sent by king Guntram to examine into the matter, and, according to Gregory of Tours, boldly defied the queen (*Hist. Franc.* viii. 31). In 587 he was chosen to baptize Childebert's son Theodoric II. (*ibid.* ix. 4), and two years later he was one of the bishops summoned to deliberate on the scandalous outbreak of the nuns of St. Radegund's convent at Poitiers (*ibid.* ix. 41, CHRODILDIS). Veranus is commemorated on Nov. 10 and 12, and on Oct. 19, on which day the Bollandists notice him; and he is honoured as the patron saint of Cavillon. Gregory, to whom he was personally known (*De Mirac. S. Martini*, iii. 60), speaks with great reverence of his sanctity (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 4). A biography published by Labbe (*Nov. Bibl.* ii.), and repeated by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Oct. viii. 467 sqq.), makes him a native of the Gévaudan, but this work is of a very legendary character.

In Mansi (ix. 947, 48) is a *Sententia* on the subject of chastity in priests, spoken at some synod of about 584, which is attributed to Veranus (cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 357; Ceillier, xi. 322). His body is said to have been carried in later times to Gorgeau, in the diocese of Orleans, though another opinion is that it always remained at Cavillon. (*Gall. Christ.* i. 941; *Boll.* p. 461 sqq.) [S. A. B.]

VERECUNDUS (1), a citizen of Milan and teacher of grammar, an intimate friend of St. Augustine. He became a Christian, after an illness of which he died, while Augustine was at Rome. (*Conf.* ix. 3; NEBRIDIUS.) [H. W. P.]

VERECUNDUS (2) (VERGUNDUS), d. 552. He was bishop of the Civitas Juncensis in Byzacena, and was summoned to Constantinople in 549, touching the question of the "Three Chapters." He died at Chalcedon, the year before

the second council of Constantinople. In the controversy on the "Three Chapters," he seems to have acted until his death with Virgilius, defending the works in question, and joining with Virgilius in his censure on Theodore of Caesarea and Menas of Constantinople. He joined with him also, it would appear, in his withdrawal to Chalcedon, and would probably have continued to act in concert with him had their union not been terminated by his death. Some part of the adverse judgment pronounced upon him by Isidorus Hispalensis may be due to the fact that he died a defender of works afterwards condemned; the expressions of Victor of Tunnum perhaps are rendered more favourable by the same cause. There is certainly no reason to think, as Isidorus hints, that his poem "de Poenitentia" was intended as a lament over his own past heterodoxy. It is very probable that he is identical with the presbyter Verecundus who composed a commentary on the Ecclesiastical canticles, comprehending the songs of Miriam, Moses (from Deuteronomy), Azariah, Hezekiah, Habakkuk, and Deborah, the prayer of Manasseh and the thanksgiving of Jonah. The commentary is printed in the fourth volume of the *Spicilegium Solesmense*, with other works attributed to Verecundus. It is an explanation of the canticles according to the various modes of interpretation, though these are not always all given for every verse: in fact a full statement of them seems to be the exception. The commentary shows some philosophical learning and historical knowledge, and some illustrations are drawn from his own experience. His manner of referring to the Vandal persecution in Africa and the unsettled state of affairs seems to fix the date of this work before 534, when the persecution ended. The poems attributed to him, and also published in the *Spicilegium*, are as follows: (1) *Exhortatio Poenitendi*, (2) "De satisfactione Poenitentiae," (3) "Crisias."

The first of these, by its closing lines, seems to have been the first portion of a longer poem: and it is hard to believe that the second is really the continuation of it, though from its sense it might well be so. The metre of the two is entirely distinct, that of the first being extremely rude, and regardless of the quantity of syllables, while that of the second is more nearly normal. But as Pitra points out, the first of the poems is an example of a special style of versification, illustrated also by Commodianus, and not the result of mere barbarism, rude though it seems. The spirit of the two poems is alike: in both there is expressed a strong sense of the need of repentance, and an earnest anticipation of the Judgment. But the remark of Isidorus mentioned above ("lamentabili earmine propria delicta deplorat") seems unwarranted: the poems are, in their purpose, hortatory rather than penitential. The third poem, concerning the signs of the Judgment, is probably not by the same hand. It has much more artificiality, and much less earnest distinctness than either of the others.

A "Breviarium Concilii Chalcedonensis" drawn up so as to favour the supporters of the "Three Chapters" is also attributed to Verecundus. It is very possibly his; such a work would be less likely to have been composed after his death than in his lifetime, when preparations were

being made for a general council on the question. But it may have been composed by a more extreme partisan, and issued under his name, by one who regarded him as a confessor, and wished to obtain the influence of his reputation. Pitra prints this also in the *Spicilegium*. [H. A. W.]

VERENA, virgin, martyr with St. Ursula. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 22 Jul. v. 187.) [J. G.]

VERGILIUS MARO, a Latin grammarian of the sixth or seventh century. The fragments of his works which remain are very important, as representing the Latin when it was fast merging into the modern languages. They are written in a very provincial dialect. They also illustrate the development of rhyming Latin poetry and of mediaeval Latin. Keil, *de Grammat. quibusdam, Lat. Inf. Act.* Erlangae, 1868, p. 5; *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 1881-82, t. xcix. p. 510, contains a long article on his *Epitomae* by Huemer. [G. T. S.]

VERGUNDUS. [See VERECUNDUS.]

VERIANUS (1), African bishop, Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. A.D. 252, Cyp. *Ep.* 57. [E. W. B.]

VERIANUS (2) (VERINIANUS), a layman of Nazianzen, a friend of Gregory Nazianzen, who having received some cause of offence from his son-in-law was anxious to bring about a divorce from his daughter, a matter in which Gregory refused to aid him (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 181 al. 145; Ceill. v. 256). [E. V.]

VERIMODUS. [See DARIUS, Vol. I. 789.] [H. W. P.]

VERINA, empress, wife of LEO I., and cousin to the wife of JULIUS NEPOS (Malchus), a person of great influence during the reign of her husband's successor, her son-in-law, Zeno. (Joh. Ant. in Müller, *Frag. Hist. Gr.* iv. 210, 211, 214, and *Hermes*, vi. 326.) Suidas (s. v. Βηρίνη) mentions two statues of her at Constantinople, one near the church of St. Agathonicus, and one near that of St. Barbara. (Tillemont, *Emp.* vi.) [F. D.]

VERINUS (VALERIUS), vicar of Africa, A.D. 321, to whom Constantine wrote about removing the prohibition against the Donatists to carry on their worship, issued after the acquittal of Caecilianus. (Aug. *Ep.* 141, 9; *Brevic. Coll.* i. 24, 42; *ad Don. post Coll.* 33, 56.) [H. W. P.]

VERONICA (ἡ ἀιμορροῦσα), July 12, the woman whom our Lord cured of the bloody issue (Matt. ix. 20). Concerning her Eusebius tells a very curious story (*H. E.* vii. 18). "But as we have mentioned this city (Caesarea Philippi or Paneas as the Phoenicians called it) I do not think it right to pass by a narrative that also deserves to be recorded for posterity. They say that the woman who had an issue of blood, mentioned by the evangelists, and who obtained deliverance from her affliction by our Saviour, was a native of this place, and that her house is shewn in this city, and the wonderful monuments of our Saviour's benefits to her are still remaining. At the gates of her house, on an elevated stone, stands a brazen image of a woman on a bended knee, with her hands stretched out before her,

like one entreating. Opposite to this there is another image of a man erect, of the same materials, decently clad in a mantle, and stretching out his hand to the woman. Before her feet, and on the same pedestal, there is a strange plant growing which, rising as high as the hem of the brazen garment, is a kind of antidote to all kinds of diseases. This statue, they say, is a statue of Jesus Christ, and it has remained even until our times, so that we ourselves saw it whilst tarrying in that city. Nor is it to be wondered at that those of the Gentiles who were anciently benefited by our Saviour should have done these things. Since we have also seen representations of the apostles Peter and Paul, and of Christ Himself still preserved in paintings; as it is probable that, according to a practice among the Gentiles, the ancients were accustomed to pay this kind of honour indiscriminately to those who were as saviours or deliverers to them." With regard to the subsequent history of this statue the authorities are conflicting. Eusebius tells us it was there in his time. Asterius, as quoted by Photius in *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 271, p. 1508, cf. Combefis. *Auct. Nov. Biblioth.* t. i. p. 235, et 262 sq., states that Maximinus overthrew it during the persecution A.D. 308-312, while Sozomen (*H. E.* v. 20) asserts that Julian removed it, substituting instead his own statue, which a thunderbolt soon after cut in twain, hurling the head and neck to the ground, where the historian says it still remained even in his time, bearing traces of the lightning's action. The fragments of the statue of Christ, which the populace had smashed, were carefully preserved in the church. J. Malalas (*Chronograph.* x. 306-308, in *Corp. Scriptt. Hist. Byzant.*), writing in the 7th century, tells us that Haemorrhoida petitioned Herod, the murderer of John the Baptist, for leave to erect the statue. He gives us the very words of the petition, and relates that in his time the fragments of the statue were still preserved in the local church, and that he himself had seen a copy of the petition preserved by a certain Bassus, a convert from Judaism to Christianity. Gibbon, in chap. xlix. note 7, accepts the testimony of Eusebius to the existence of the statue, which he supposes may have been inscribed τῷ Σωτήρι, τῷ εὐεργέτη, but he ridicules the idea that it could have been erected in honour of the Saviour by a woman whom the Gospels describe as poor. He thinks that Beausobre more reasonably conjectures the philosopher Apollonius or the emperor Vespasian; in the latter supposition the female is a city, a province, or perhaps the queen Berenice." Round the person of this woman legendary tradition flourished during and after the 4th century. Macarius Magnesius says she was princess of Edessa, and that her name was Veronica or Berenice (Macarii Magnet. ed. Blondel, Paris, 1876; Till. *Mém.* i. 20; *Hist. des Emp.* iv. 308), following whom Baronius (*Annal.* xxxi. 75) makes her rich and noble. Pseudo-Ambrosius (*Serm.* xlv. in *App. Opp.* ed. Bened. p. 454) maintains she was Martha, the sister of Lazarus, while the gospel of Nicodemus introduces her under the name of Veronica as one of the witnesses in behalf of Christ at His trial by Pilate (Thilo, *Cod. Apocryph. N. T.* p. 560). In addition to the authorities already mentioned

there may be consulted Joan. Damasc. *de Imag.* *Orat.* 3; Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 3; a long and learned note in Thilo, *l. c.*; Du Cange, *s. v.*; *Acta SS.* Boll. Jul. iii. 273-279; Alban-Butler, *Lives of the Saints*; Ceillier, vi. 308.)

[G. T. S.]

VERRES, bishop of Ombœ. [SILVANUS (8).]

VERSE-WRITERS. Poetry, which in its lyric form is the natural outpouring of joy and in other forms is the attempt to express in the most appropriate words the truths which underlie the world of nature and of human action, has naturally found a congenial soil in Christianity, with its message of good-will to all men and of redemption of the universe. And so poetry has struck deeper and wider notes, whether in telling of the sympathy of man with nature, or the secrets of human life, or in pouring out the soul to God in Christian times than in any previous era. This is true of one side of Christian poetry from the earliest times: the lyric poetry of popular church use from the first formed to itself new metres and new methods, and rose far above all contemporary heathen lyric. Great themes like the nature of God and the work of Christ, became at once themes for joyous praise. In other forms of poetry it is less true during the period treated of in this Dictionary. Poetry, which should be the willing handmaid, is made the slave of religion; it could complain, as the soul does to the body in Synesius, ἀντὶ δὲ θήσσας γερύμην δούλα. The poet is too much dominated by the dogmatic or apologetic purpose which he has to serve: like St. Cyprian, Dissertit, eloquitur, narrat, docet, instruit, prophetat. (Prud. *Perist.* xiii. 101.) Nature, which had been prominent in Hebrew poetry, falls into the background for the time before the thought of God's work in humanity. Further, the poet has to use as his instrument, languages decaying, artificial and unnatural; and so, it is not till Christianity has emancipated the modern languages of Europe that Christian poetry reaches the level of Dante, of Shakspeare, of Milton, or of Wordsworth. It will be best, therefore in this article to consider first the liturgical, and afterwards the more individual poetry.

A. Liturgical Poetry. The example of the Jewish Church (cf. St. Matt. xxvi. 30), and the natural expression of joy at the new gifts of the Spirit, produced hymns, psalms, and spiritual songs from the earliest times in the Christian assemblies (I. Cor. xiv. 26; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16). The Old Testament Psalter doubtless supplied the main body of such songs; but in addition to this we have the Christian Canticles in St. Luke's Gospel, and probable traces of short hymns and expressions of praise embedded in the New Testament (cf. Acts iv. 24-30; Eph. v. 14; 1 Tim. iii. 16, vi. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 11-13; Rev. iv. 8, 9, xi. 15-17, xxi. 3-8).

In the 2nd century we find frequent allusions to such hymns. Antiphonal singing, which had been practised among the Jews (cf. *Péilo de Vita Contempl.* 11), had already been introduced into the church of Antioch by the time of St. Ignatius, to whom it is sometimes attributed (Socrates, vi. 8, but cf. Theodoret, ii. 24; Bishop Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, i. p. 31). On his death the church sings hymns to God,

ἀμνήσαντες τὸν Θεὸν τῶν δοτῆρα τῶν ἀγάθων καὶ μακαρίσαντες τὸν ἅγιον (Martyr. *Ijn.* vii. 3; cf. *Ijn. ad Rom.* ii.), words which summarize the chief characteristics of Greek hymnody. Hymns to God for His blessings in creation (Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 13); hymns to Christ as God (*Pliny*, x. 97; cf. Euseb. iii. 33, and v. 28); hymns to the Holy Spirit (Basil, *de Sp.* § 29), form a regular part of church worship (Origen, *c. Celsum* viii. 67; Sozomen, vi. 33), whether they were taken from Holy Scripture or composed anew (Tertullian, *de Orat.* 28; *Apol.* 39).

Very few relics of this body of hymns are extant; many poets sang before their historian arose. But to this century belongs, perhaps, the lyric hymn to Christ attributed to St. Clement of Alexandria. (This is metrical, but with strophes, but was never used in worship.) Probably also the *φῶς Ἰλαρον δόξης*; the morning and evening hymn, and the grace found in the Apostolical Constitutions, vii. 48, 49; hymns of a loose rhythm, without any strophes, probably modelled upon the Hebrew Psalms.

In the 3rd century the martyrs in the Thebaid meet death with psalms and hymns (Eus. viii. 9), and the prevalence of such hymns is shown by the frequent use made of them by heretics to secure acceptance for their own opinions. This was the case with the Syriac hymns of the Opnites (Origen, *c. Celsum*, vi. 31), and of Bardesanes and Harmonius (Theodoret, iv. 29; Sozomen, iii. 16); with the hymns of Nepes in Egypt (Dionysius ap. Euseb. vii. 24), and rather later with those of Apollinaris at Antioch (Soz. vi. 25), of Paul of Samosata (Eus. vii. 30), and with those of the Arians in Alexandria and Constantinople (Socrates, i. 9, vi. 8, *ὡδας ἀντιφώνους*, Ath. c. *Arian*, i. 4). One hymn of the Naassenes is preserved in Origen (Phil. v. 1), and also some corrupt translations of the Syriac hymns of the Ophites (*c. Celsum*, vi. 31). This use caused a reaction in the Church itself, and a canon (§ 59) was passed in the council of Laodicea (A.D. circ. 350), *οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικοὺς ψαλμοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ λέγεσθαι*, which at least insisted that all hymns should have church sanction. It is doubtful whether we have any extant hymns of this century. The interesting *παρθένιον* of Methodius—a bright Christian song in praise of virginity, with verses sung by one leader and a refrain taken up by the whole chorus—was composed not for church use, but to be sung at a banquet. It is, however, interesting both in its metre, and in the indication it gives of a larger amount of lyric song adapted for social life (comp. Sozomen, vi. 25, who says of the songs of Apollinaris that *ἄνδρες τε παρὰ τοὺς πότους καὶ ἐν ἔργοις καὶ γυναῖκες παρὰ τοὺς ἰστούς τὰ αὐτοῦ μέλη ἐψάλλον· σπούδης γὰρ καὶ ἀνεσέως καὶ ἑορτῶν καὶ τῶν ἑλλων πρὸς τὸν ἐκάστον καιρὸν εἰδίλλια αὐτῶ πεποίητο, πάντα εἰς εὐλογίαν Θεοῦ τένοντα*).

The church, indeed, soon recovered from the reaction caused by this use of heretical hymns. The value of orthodox hymns was soon perceived; and the fourth century became one of the chief eras of hymnody. The sufferers in the late persecutions celebrate their deliverance with hymns and psalms (Eus. ix. 1). Under Julian the Antiochenes sing psalms at once in honour of their Christian martyr, and with satire on Paganism (Socr. iii. 18). St. Chry-

sostom composed orthodox hymns in rivalry of the Arians at Constantinople (Socrates, vi. 8; Sozomen, viii. 8). Of these, however, none are extant. The chief product of this century are the Syriac hymns of Ephrem, composed on the incidents of the life of our Lord and of the chief martyrs, and though not metrical, prepared for a regularly-trained choir (Sozomen, iii. 16; Theodoret, iv. 29).

This hymnody of the Eastern Church produced a similar development in the West, of which we must speak later. Contemporaneous with it are the lyrical poems of Synesius and Gregory of Nazianzus, but none of these (except perhaps the rhythmical poem of Gregory) were ever used in church services, though those of the latter probably influenced the later writers of church hymns. As we pass into the fifth century, we gain a firmer treading. The work of the councils had stereotyped the creed of the church, so that there was less danger of innovation in doctrine. The services of the church had become popular, so that there was a greater desire for a bright and attractive ritual (cf. Euseb. x. 3). In some quarters indeed, *e.g.* in the Egyptian monasteries, any change was resented as destroying the greater simplicity of ancient times (Christ and Paranikas, pp. xxx. xxxi.), but the change was very general; and the church services were expanded. The liturgies were enriched, *e.g.* by the addition of the Cherubic hymn, said to have been inserted by the orders of Justinian, and by the end of the sixth century at least, the two chief services, mattins and evensong, were arranged very much as at the present day. Hitherto these services had consisted of three parts, the chanting of psalms, generally with antiphonal chants, the reading of Scripture, and prayers. To these was added now an elaborate system of *τροπάρια*. These probably originated in the short doxologies and antiphons which had been common in the liturgy, and consisted of short stanzas interspersed in different parts of the services, sometimes between the different sections of a psalm, knitting together the Old and New Covenant by praise of the Incarnation, or commemorating the acts of the saint whose festival was being celebrated. Then these were developed into regular hymns, sung apart from the psalms, and were divided musically into *αὐτόμελα*, *προσόμοια*, and *ιδιόμελα*, according as they were composed for a new tune, or for one already existing, or for one which was new, and never adapted to any other hymn subsequently. They were further divided by their subject-matter or by the position in the service into various kinds, such as *καθίσματα*, *κοντάκια*, *μεγαλυνάρια*, *ἐξαποστειλάρια*, *ἐώθινα*, *στιχῆρα*, *ἀπόστιχα*, *ἀπολύτικα*, *Θεοδοκία*. They consist of short hymns, not metrical, but with a slight rhythmical similarity, the number of syllables being generally the same in each line, and one or two syllables in each being regularly accentuated. The names of two writers of *τροπάρια* are mentioned in the fifth century, Anthimus and Timocles: but the earliest extant *τροπάριον* that can be dated is that by Justinian in the sixth century. The seventh century was the most prolific: in it wrote Sophronius of Jerusalem, Sergius archbishop of Constantinople, Syriacus, Anastasius; at the end of it should probably be placed Romanus

and though with more doubt, Anatolius († 458, Neale, p. 3), Germanus and Ephraim of Caria; and in the 8th century St. Andrew bishop of Crete. Many of the *κοντάκια* run to great length, and give a dramatic account of scenes in the Gospel narratives. These, perhaps, were chanted at great imperial solemnities, as well as in festival services, and may have been the origin of the mysteries of the Middle Ages, and so of the Christian drama. The 8th century, however, marks a new departure in Greek hymnody. The Iconoclastic controversy and the inroads of the barbarians had stirred men's minds and led to frequent appeals for protection to the Blessed Virgin and to the saints. The *τροπάρια* are developed into more regular hymns — the canons — which entirely supplanted them in the services. The origin of these canons was as follows. Originally the nine Bible Canticles had been sung throughout in mattins, with a short *τροπάριον* attached to each; then, for sake of brevity, only the first verse of each canticle was recited, each with its *τροπάριον*: then the place of both canticle and *τροπάριον* was taken by one connected hymn, consisting properly of nine odes (though the second ode was omitted except in Lent, perhaps from the sad tone of the second canticle). Each ode consisted of several strophes, though generally it was limited to three. The substance of the hymn consisted of a praise of the fact celebrated in the festival of the day, with an address of prayer or praise to the Virgin in the last ode. Besides these long full canons sung on Sundays and the greater festivals, there were shorter canons, called according to their length *διόδια*, *τριόδια*, *τετραόδια*, for week days, for lesser festivals and for special services such as funerals. Three of the canons of John of Damascus are metrical; but all the rest are like the *τροπάρια*, rhythmical and accentual, and are generally also alphabetically arranged.

The two great writers of canons in the 8th century were John of Damascus, author of the greater part of the canons for Sundays: and his friend Cosmas, bishop of Maiuma, author of the greater number of canons for the chief festivals, canons which are more directly theological and less purely poetical than those of John. This is the golden age of Greek hymnody, and these writers are called *μελῳδοί*, as they composed their tunes as well as the words. Later writers adopted their tunes, and so are only called *ὑμνογράφοι*. The chief of these are Joseph Hymnographus and Theophanes Graptus in the ninth century; less famous writers were Theodorus Studites, Methodius, Casia, Photius in the same century, and the emperors Leo and Constantine in the tenth. By this time the hymns were collected into the service books, and very few were added after this date.

The chief centres of Greek hymnody were, then, Alexandria, Constantinople, Jerusalem and the neighbouring monasteries. The chief influences to which it is indebted, are (1) the spirit of Christian joy pouring itself forth in song; (2) the Hebrew Psalter throwing this song into the form of rhythmical parallelism; (3) the Syrian hymns, especially those of Ephrem Syrus, which supplied the impulse for Acrostichs, refrains, division of lines by the quantity of

syllables. The practice of *rhyme*, which at one time prevailed in Greek hymns, may have come from Arabian influence, but it never secured a strong hold on Greek poetry and soon died out; (4) the influence of classical Greek lyric poetry supplying the division into strophes, and, to a certain extent, metrical form. The characteristics which are specially peculiar to it are (a) the bright wealth of praise; praise of God and praise of His saints, praise especially of the Virgin and prayer to her is the chief theme, poured forth so lavishly that it has been calculated that four-fifths of the Greek service-books consist of poetry; (b) theological precision and fulness; the praise is always based on the great facts of the Incarnation or the nature of the Godhead and is objective rather than the expression of individual feeling; (c) monotony arising from a constant repetition of the same truths; (d) great artificiality of arrangement; the acrostich system is found as early as Methodius, perhaps due to the influence of the Hebrew Psalter, or of Syrian Christian hymns; and reaches its climax in the metrical accentual acrostich canons of John, and in the poems of Elias Syncellus, in which each line of each verse is alphabetic.

Authorities. — Daniel. *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*: J. P. Pitra, *Hymnographie de l'Eglise Grecque*, Rome, 1867 (with an interesting account of previous works); and *Analecta Sacra* vol. i. Paris, 1876; but especially Christ et Paranikas, *Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum*; with excellent introduction, and a good selection of hymns (Leipzig, 1871). Interesting articles will be found in *The Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1859. "Greek Hymnology:" Dr. Smith's *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* s.v. Hymns; a short monograph on the metre by A. Thierfelder, *De Christianorum Psalmis et hymnis*, Lipsiae, 1868; Meyer, *Anfang der Lat. und Griech. rhythmischen Dichtung* (Munich, 1885). *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Nov. 1881 (an excellent summary of Pitra and Christ, with an account of the general tendencies of Greek hymnody by Jacobi); and some translations of Greek hymns in J. M. Neale's *Hymns of the Eastern Church* (4th edit. by S. G. Hatherley: London, 1882); and *Chatfield's Songs and Hymns of earliest Greek Christian Poets*: London, 1876.

Latin. — In the Western Church there was an equally striking development of Christian lyric poetry, seizing upon and stirring the very heart of the church and of the individual Christian (S. Aug. *Conf.* ix. 6). As in the East this lyric is the popular poetry. The Christian hymns are "the only true Roman lyric poetry." They seize on new metres and popular methods of accentuation and of rhyming, and are far simpler and more direct in their expression than other poetry (e.g. contrast the directness of the hymns of Venantius Fortunatus and Sedulius with the artificiality of their poems). But historically these hymns arise at a later date than in the East, and were later in reaching their climax, many of the greatest writers falling quite outside the scope of this Dictionary. It is not until the 4th century that we find any definite notice of hymn-writers or any extant hymns. The impulse to hymnody came then from contact with the Eastern, i.e. probably the Syrian, church; and from the same cause which had operated

there, the desire to find an antidote to growing heretical opinions. Hilary of Poitiers, during his banishment to Asia, collected many of the Greek hymns which he found in use there, translated some of them, and probably composed some of his own, and introduced the practice of hymn-singing into the Gallican Church to check the growth of Arianism. These hymns were contained in his *Liber Hymnorum*, but this has been lost. Daniel attributes seven extant hymns to him; but Kayser only admits his authorship in the case of four ["Lucis largitor Splendide," "Deus pater ingenitus;" "In matutinis surgimus;" "Jam meta noctis transit"]; and even these four are suspected by Ebert. Possibly, we are to attribute to him the Latinising of the Gloria in Excelsis (K. p. 32). About the same date pope Damasus more thoroughly organised psalm-singing in the services of the church, and two hymns, in honour of St. Andrew and St. Agatha, are attributed to him, but on doubtful authority. St. Ambrose is the first writer to whom any of our extant Latin hymns can with certainty be attributed. We have his own statement that he purposely wrote hymns and introduced the practice of singing them in the church at Milan in the interests of orthodoxy (*Ep.* 21), and the authority of St. Augustine for saying that this was done in conscious imitation of the Eastern Church (*Conf.* ix. 6). The same authority attributes to him the authorship of four extant hymns—"Deus Creator Omnium," "Aeternae rerum conditor," "Jam surgit hora tertia," "Veni redemptor gentium." These are all written in the same metre, and so are some thirty or forty others, which were called Ambrosiani, but it is impossible to say whether any of them are written by him or only by later imitators. Contemporaneously with St. Ambrose, we have mention of Donatist hymns in honour of Donatus (*Optat.* iii. 3).

In the 5th century, we have the chief Lyric poet Prudentius; but as his poems were not written for church service, being too long and too didactic for that, they will be mentioned later. Extracts were, however, adapted from them, and used both in the Roman and Spanish services. An hymnarium is ascribed to Paulinus of Nola, but nothing is known of its character.

The alphabetic hymn of Sedulius belongs to this century, and also a large number of the anonymous "hymni Ambrosiani," and other hymns which are found incorporated in breviaries and monastic rules drawn up at the beginning of the next century mainly under the influence of St. Benedict (cf. Kayser, ii. cap. 13, iii. cap. xi.). To these should be added the "Te Deum Laudamus," a hymn formed from the language of the earlier Liturgies and of the Psalms, which may with great probability be ascribed to some Gallican writer in the first half of this century (*Ch. Qu. Review*, April, 1884). This is the only early Latin hymn which is unmetrical and based upon the rough parallelism of Hebrew and Greek hymnody.

In the 6th century we have the two hymns of *Elpis*, and several by *Ennodius* (though apparently not used in church); the famous hymns of Venantius Fortunatus, "Vexilla Regis prodeunt," and "Pange lingua gloriosi;" several hymns attributed to Gregory the Great, whose name is more important, however, as the or-

ganizer of the music and psalmody of the church. Lastly, in the 7th and 8th centuries, we have a few Latin hymns written by the Northern Christians, such as Bede, and Boniface, and Alcuin, and possibly even by Charlemagne himself, if the "Veni Creator Spiritus" is to be attributed to him. The great development of accentual hymns, and of prose sequences, lies outside our scope. Up to this point the chief influences which moulded Latin hymnody are—

(i.) The influence of the Eastern Church, suggesting the practice, and perhaps supplying models for translation.

(ii.) The classical Latin lyric poetry supplying the metres, strophes, and prosody. The iambic dimeter and trochaic esp. tetrameter catalectic remain the popular metres, with rare use of sapphic.

(iii.) The exigencies of popular expression and of chanting, which gradually substitute an accentual rhythm, emphasized by rhyme and alliteration, for the classical prosody. This change took place gradually, and owing to the uncertainty of the authorship of most of the hymns, it is difficult to speak with any certainty of the exact stages in the change. Apparently St. Ambrose preserves a classical metre, with correct prosody, with no attempt at rhyme, and no attention paid to the accent; in Sedulius there is a growing tendency to rhyme, and a carefulness to avoid conflict between accent and quantity, and a more frequent hiatus; in Fortunatus both these tendencies are more strongly marked still, though St. Gregory, who is mainly modelled on St. Ambrose, falls back on the more classical prosody. By the end of this time the number of metrical hymns with classical prosody still preponderates; but the tendencies to rhyme, to leonine lines, to alliteration, have all set in, and were destined soon to gain the upper hand. Such tendencies were more in sympathy with the early tendencies of the Celtic and Teutonic races, and found expression in the vernacular hymns and poems as well as in application to Latin.

The characteristics of this Latin hymnody are—

(i.) Its objective character: like the Greek it deals mainly with the praise of God, for the facts of Redemption, and the lives of the martyrs; but far less prominence is given to the Blessed Virgin than in the Eastern Church; in Mone, vol. ii. *Marienlieder*, there is not one which can certainly be placed in this period. The personal tone is commoner in the later hymnody of the Middle Ages.

(ii.) Its directness and simplicity, in contrast with the profuseness and artificiality of the Greek.

(iii.) Its moralizing and hortatory character. *Authorities.*—Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*; Mone, *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters*, Freiburg, 1853-55; Kayser, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des ältesten Kirchen-hymnen*, Paderborn, 1881-86, a clear and careful account of the history, with elaborate exegesis of the chief hymns; Ebert, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1874; Huemer, *Untersuchung über die ält. lat.-christl. Rhythmen*, Vienna, 1879; Du Méril, *Poésies populaires Latines antérieures au xii. siècle*, Paris, 1843.

3. *Syrian.*—No notice of this subject would

be complete without referring to the large mass of Syrian poetry, especially as it seems to have given the impulse and the type to much both of Greek and Latin poetry. But the present writer can only do this shortly and at second-hand. We have already seen that to the church at Antioch has been attributed the introduction of antiphonal singing in liturgical worship, and consequently that it may have had an influence both upon Greek and upon Latin hymnody. But of the details of the early Syrian hymnody, there is very little historical information. From the first three centuries A.D. we have no relics extant, except the fragments of Gnostic hymns preserved in *Ephrem Syrus*. These are attributed by him to Bardesanes, and, if so, would date from the 2nd century; but more modern critics have assigned them to Harmodius, the son of Bardesanes, or even to later writers (*Christian Biography*, Vol. I. p. 252-254). They cannot be later than the 3rd century, and their chief importance lies in the impulse which they gave to Ephrem himself. Setting himself to counteract their Gnostic tendency, Ephrem wrote orthodox hymns, and used poetry for nearly every purpose. He used it for dogmatic treatises, for controversy, for history, for the praise of saints and hermits, for the exposition of Scripture, for description of the events in our Lord's life, as well as for metrical sermons, and for hymns for the services of the church (cf. Ephrem the Syrian, *Christian Biography*, Vol. II. pp. 139-141).

This century proved indeed the golden age of Syrian poetry. In addition to the works of Ephrem there remain three hymns by *S. Symeon* of Barsabae, preserved in the Nestorian offices; short songs in praise of martyrs by Maruthas, Rabulas, and Balaesus, as well as historical poems by Balaesus and Cyrillonas. In the first half of the 5th century, Isaac of Antioch (31, Vol. III. p. 296) followed the example of Ephrem, writing historical poems on the sack of Rome, the *Ludi Saeculares*, the earthquake at Antioch, &c., as well as composing many hymns and metrical discourses. At the same time Simeon the Cucita composed hymns of a new kind, which gave rise to a whole class of hymns, named *Cucitae*, from him; like the *hymni Ambrosiani* from St. Ambrose in the Western Church. Indeed the chief work of this century was the formation of the office books of the Nestorians, which seem to have received their permanent shape soon after the Nestorian controversy. In them the recitation of the Psalms occupies a prominent part, and they are supplemented by hymns (*teshbuchthae*) and by a kind of anthem (*unithae*), in which each strophe is preceded by an antiphon. The chief writer of these Nestorian hymns is Narses; others are preserved from this century by Barsauma, and Abraham and John of Bethrabba. In the 6th century come the very prolific writings of Jacobus of Sarug [*JACOBUS* (13) Vol. III.], consisting mainly of hymns to the Saints and the Blessed Virgin and of metrical homilies; there are also hymns by the Patriarch Marabbas and by Babaeus the elder; in the 7th by George bishop of Nisibis, and by Babaeus the younger. Beyond these there are few names to record in the period which falls within this Dictionary.

Authorities.—Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus*,

iii.; Asseman, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*; Bickell *Conspectus Rei Syrorum literariae*, Münster, 1871 (a most clear and excellent introduction); Badger, *The Nestorians and their Rituals*, London, 1852; and J. M. Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*. Translations of some specimens will be found in German in Zingerle, *Die heilige Muse der Syrer*, Innsbruck, 1833; and in English in Burgess, *Select Metrical Hymns of Ephrem*, London, 1853.

Individual Poetry.—1. *Greek*. In this section of poetry, the relative proportion of Greek to Latin poets is reversed. The number of Greek poets is comparatively few. Perhaps it was that Greek poetry was more intimately connected with religion, than Roman had been, and therefore Christian writers were slow to use it for sacred purposes. Certainly the two chief literary centres in classical times, Athens and Alexandria, remained under the power of heathenism longer than the rest of the East, and very few new poetic centres arose. But even in heathen literature, poetry holds a very small place during these centuries and scarcely rises above the play of epigram or the seriousness of didactic treatises. The chief sources of poetic inspiration had died out and it was not being rekindled, as in the West, by contact with the fresh blood of the new races of the North and West of Europe. The first impulse to use poetry as a Christian instrument, seems to have come from imitation of the Jews. These latter had been accustomed ever since their contact with the Romans, to throw their future hopes of deliverance from their persecutors, and their warnings of the certainty of judgment into the form of prophetic utterances of the Sibyl; and Christian writers imitated this practice, from the first century until the fourth, soon after which the present collection seems to have received its present form. [*SIBYLLINE BOOKS.*] With this exception the only extant poems of the first three centuries are the metrical hymn to Christ, found in Clement of Alexandria, and perhaps written by him; and the rhythmical acrostich poem with regular refrain which is sung by the Virgins in the *Symposium* of Methodius. In the 4th century there is a great change. Christians no longer dread the heathen associations of poetic form, but are anxious to preserve it, and not to leave charms of style only to the heathen (v. Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 16, and Gregory Nazianzen, *Eis τὰ ἔμμετρα*, *Hist. Poems*, No. 39). Two results followed upon this. First, the attempt to put parts of the Bible into the classical metres, as illustrated by the work of the two Apollinarii at Laodicea. Here, too, there was a Jewish example to follow. Before the time of Clement of Alexandria, a Jew, Ezekiel, had written a tragedy on the subject of Moses. So now, under the stress of the Julian persecution, the two Apollinarii translated the whole of the Bible into Greek classical metres or Platonic dialogues, that Christian scholars might learn at once the classical forms and the Christian truths. Of this gigantic effort the only remains are a complete translation of the Psalms in hexameters of some merit, but of rather halting rhythm. Some editors have attributed to Apollinarius the *Χρίστος πάσχων*, a quasi-Euripidean tragedy, which is found in some MSS. of Gregory Nazianzen and attributed

sometimes to him; but the metrical and linguistic peculiarities point to a much later date than either, and it has recently been assigned to Theodorus Prodrômus in the 12th century (J. G. Brambs, *Dissert. Inaug.* Eichstädt, 1883, and *Christus Patiens*. Leipzig, 1885). But besides this pedantic use, poetry flowed in another and more natural channel. It became the true expression of human feeling, and reached the highest point which it touches in these centuries. We may pass by the romantic story of the *Ethiopia* of Heliodorus as written before he was a Christian (Socrates, *H. E.* v. 22), but the songs of Apollinarius are said to have been popular, and sung by men and women alike at work and at festival (Sozomen, vi. 25). Two poets meet us here, each characterized by much real feeling and power of expression. The first is Gregory of Nazianzus. Influenced perhaps by the example of the Syrian poems of Ephrem, and aiming, as he himself tells us, both at consolation for himself in his trials, and also to entice those who cared for poetical form, and not to leave the graces of style in the possession of Paganism, he uses poetry for almost every possible purpose. Theological, dogmatic, and moral treatises are found in hexameters, elegiacs, and iambs; historical accounts of his life and times in hexameters and iambs; satirical epigrams in iambs; epitaphs in elegiacs, and hymns in anacreontics; while he even mixes several metres together in forming *memoriae technicae* on the books of the Bible, the plagues of Egypt, &c. One of his poems is to be compared with the *Abecedarius* of St. Augustine, as ignoring quantity altogether and introducing a new verse-system, based upon the number of syllables and the stress of the accent (*vide infra*). Perhaps with Gregory is to be classed his friend Amphilocheus, the bishop of Iconium, if he is the author of the "graphic and effective" *Iambi ad Seleucum*. The other great name is that of Synesius of Cyrenê, "the chief for true and natural gifts of all our Greek Christian Poets." He stands quite independent of Gregory, and probably did not know of his writings, as he calls himself the first Christian poet. Of his hymns some may have been written while he was still pagan; but the later are strongly Christian. They are anacreontic in metre, Doric in dialect and in simplicity of tone, full of lyrical melody: the lavish outpouring of a philosophical spirit in praise of the One Source of life and light, with frequent prayer for protection from evil and thanksgiving for past mercies.

The 5th century saw a short revival of Greek Epic poetry in Egypt, which was used either for mythological stories or for historical poems. The Christian representative of this revival is Nonnus, who, after writing the *Dionysiaca*, probably as a pagan, paraphrased the whole of St. John's Gospel in elaborate and luxuriant style, in fluent and luscious hexameters. Meanwhile Constantinople was springing into a new poetical centre: an emperor led the hymns; an empress wrote poems; and court patronage stimulated and spoilt the rising poet (cf. Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 21-22). The empress Eudocia followed the lead of Apollinarius in translating large parts of the Old Testament into Greek hexameters, as well as composing *Centones Ho-*

merici; she also celebrated in her poems the emperor's victories and the life of St. Cyprian. The last of these, and perhaps the *Centones Homerici*, are her only extant works.

In the sixth century the only poem preserved is that of another court-poet, the description of the Church of St. Sophia by Paulus Silentarius in hexameters, with iambic prologue. Perhaps, too, the epigrams and sonnets of Agathias should be added—if, indeed, he were a Christian.

In the seventh century another court poet, George of Pisidia, writes an historical poem on the victories of Heraclius in correct iambs, and uses the same metre for dogmatic subjects and descriptions of the lives of the saints. A few spirited anacreontic hymns in honour of the facts of Christ's life, and of the mercies of God have come down to us from Sophronius of Jerusalem and his friend Maximus, *Theologus* (No. 23). But from this time onward we find little poetry except the liturgical hymns, and a few metrical *tours de force* like the acrostich hymns of Cosmas and John of Damascus.

The Greek poetry of this period is, then, indebted partly to Jewish influences, as in the Sibylline Books and the fondness for the acrostich form; partly, perhaps, to an impulse from Syrian Christian poetry; partly to the Greek classical models. Greece Proper contributes to it no poet; but the centres round which it clusters are Asia Minor, esp. Laodicea and Nazianzus, Egypt, and, at the end of the time, almost exclusively Constantinople. The metres used are few, and almost entirely classical; but in Methodius we have a rhythmical poem in strophes, with the quantities rather freely treated, which should be compared with the somewhat similar phenomena in the Latin poems of Commodian; and in some of the hymns of Gregory the influence of the accent over the old system of quantity is beginning to assert itself. The sources of inspiration are either the desire to teach the truth, whether in dogmatic controversy (*e. g.* in Gregory, George of Pisidia, &c.), or in explanation of the facts of the Bible (Apollinarius, Eudocia, Nonnus): or the desire to win others to a true life (Gregory, Amphilocheus); or the desire to commemorate the beauties of Christian Art (Paulus Silentarius) or the victories of Christian emperors and the lives of Christian saints (Eudocia, George); or, lastly, the more personal expression of gratitude to God for His glory and His mercies (Gregory, Synesius, Sophronius, Maximus).

Authorities.—The poems will be found in the large editions mentioned below; an anthology in Alzog's *Patrologie*; an account of the poets in Cave and in Bernhardt. *Grundriss der Griechischen Literatur*; and an interesting introduction to the study of them in Mrs. Browning's *Greek Christian Poets*.

2. *Latin.*—In Latin the quantity of poetry is greater than in Greek, though the quality is not much higher; Prudentius, and possibly Paulinus of Nola and Venantius Fortunatus, being the only poets who can be ranked with Synesius and Gregory of Nazianzus. Yet it is not till the third century that we find any poetry at all. The power of paganism remained stronger in the West than in the East, and Christians were therefore more suspicious of an

art which had served the cause of their antagonists; indeed, Rome itself produced very little poetry during the whole of this period. The main centres are Gaul, Spain, the North of Italy, and Africa in the earlier part; while in the later, Ireland and Great Britain take up and continue the old classical culture; Milan, Autun, Toulouse, Marseilles, Bordeaux, Carthage, and Bangor being the chief educational centres.

The authenticity of the poems attributed to Tertullian and St. Cyprian is so doubtful, that we must probably regard the poems of Commodianus as the earliest that have survived; originating either in Africa or in Syria. If so, the first impulse to Christian poetry comes from the missionary desire to instruct the ignorant and to defend them against error. "Instructiones" and "Carmen Apologeticum" are the titles of the earliest Christian poems; "perdoctus ignaros instruo verum" the motto of the first Christian poet. It is interesting also to note that the form already marks a change from classical metres. The lines have been generally regarded as based on accent; but Meyer (*ubi infra*) seems to have shown conclusively that they are based on quantity, which is roughly observed in the middle and at the end of the lines; but with that exception both quantity and accent are ignored, the mere number of syllables being the only guide. Further, there are traces of rhyme, and of constant acrostichs (in the "Instructiones"), and lines of the "Carmen Apologeticum" are grouped in couplets. All these changes are probably due to the influences of Eastern Semitic poetry, but they all contributed to make the poem serve a didactic purpose, by making it more easy to be learnt and remembered by ignorant people. Possibly also in this century is to be placed the elegiac "De Phoenice," attributed to Lactantius, an attempt to enlist heathen mythology in the service of Christian truth.

In the 4th century, poetry takes a freer range. Christianity has gained the upper hand. It can take the measure of its antagonist and learn from it; it can venture to appreciate and to use the culture and beauty of art, and to enlist them against heathenism. The poet writes to express freely his own feelings; his poetry is to win immortality for him (Juvencus, Preface, 25-31). But the missionary spirit also remains. The attempt to keep the masses from error is seen in the *Abeccedarius* of St. Augustine: a warning against Donatist error in the form of a rhythmical poem, in which the laws of quantity are entirely ignored; the lines fall into two halves of about an equal number of syllables with a similar accent at the end of each half; rhyme is observed throughout the whole poem; the strophes are alphabetical, and divided by a refrain. But the missionary spirit directs itself mainly to the educated: they are to be won to Christ, and to attract them the Christian poet uses the forms of classical poetry. (cf. Sedulius, *C. P. I.* 1-35). Consequently the most characteristic work of this century is to put the message of the Bible into metrical form. Spain is the scene of the earliest attempt. Thus Juvencus composes "the first Christian Epic," a continuous narrative of the Gospel story in hexameters. Probably, too, he attempted the gigantic

work of translating the whole of the Old Testament history, of which fragments remain containing the first Christian lyrics in the translation of the Old Testament Canticles. Similar attempts to translate parts of the Bible were made in the poems *De Sodoma* and *De Jona*, sometimes attributed to St. Cyprian or Tertullian; and with greater freedom and dramatic power in the *De fratribus septem Machabaeis* attributed to Marius Victorinus. The didactic spirit reaches its climax in the *Cento Virgilianus* of Faltonia Proba, in which lines or half-lines of Virgil are pieced together in such a way as to convey the teaching of the Old and New Testaments in the form of a memoria technica. In the writings of pope Damasus we find a lighter kind of poetry used for epitaphs, inscriptions, poems on saints and martyrs, which was afterwards largely developed. By the end of the century, poetry is felt to be such a power that Prudentius forsakes his secular calling to devote himself to it, and in his early Latin Christian poetry reaches its highest point. Lyrical poetry becomes in his hands the vehicle of graphic description and of panegyric, especially in praise of the martyrs; and the hexameter is used for direct teaching, for controversy, and for apology; while in the *Psychomachia* we have the first specimen of the allegorical poetry, which had so strong an effect upon the imagination of the Middle Ages, and bore rich fruit in later literature.

In the 5th century the number of poets is unusually large, though none of them is equal in merit to Prudentius. Among them there emerges more clearly than before a distinction between two classes. On the one hand, there are those who use poetry almost as a plaything, certainly without any serious Christian purpose. Christianity has conquered classical paganism; pagan poetry practically ceased with Claudian; but Christianity, or at least some Christians, have taken up its forms, and we have so-called Christian poets whose tone is almost heathen, who dress up Christian truth in pagan phraseology, or who devote their poetry to purely secular subjects. Such had been in the last century Ausonius, whose religion is still a matter of doubt. Such were now Boethius, about whose faith there is equal doubt; Merobaudes, with his lavish panegyrics on the emperor; Ennodius, with his panegyrics and *vers de société*; Sidonius Apollinaris, whose instinct (unlike that of Prudentius) was, on becoming a bishop, to give up poetry: "Ne reus cantu petulantiore, sim reus actu" (*Ep.* ix. 16). Such was also a small group of African writers, whose short poems are preserved in the *Anthology* (cf. *Ebert*, p. 410).

On the other hand, there is still the class who devote poetry to the direct service of Christianity. The translation of the Bible is continued with a freer treatment and a greater fondness for mystical interpretation in the paraphrase of *Psalms* i. viii. cxxxvi. by Paulinus of Nola; the *Commentary on Genesis*, by Claudius Marius Victor; the *Carmen Paschale* of Sedulius; the *De Mosaicae historiae gestis* of Avitus. The *Hexameron* of Dracontius dwells on the mercies of God in creation and redemption; Christian apology is represented by Paulinus of Nola and the anonymous *Carmen de Providentia* (printed among St. Prosper's works), which

upholds a belief in God's Providence as against a fatalistic belief in astrology, in the face of the barbarian devastations of Gaul; Christian controversy by the *De Ingratis* of Prosper and the *Epigrammata ex sententiis Augustini*, written against Pelagianism; Christian exhortation in the *De Castitatis Laude* of Avitus, and the *Commentorium* of Orientius. Satire appears in the *Epistola ad Salmonem* of Claudius Marius Victor; even an attempt at pastoral poetry in *Severus Sanctus*. The praise of the saints is found in Elpis, in Paulinus of Périgueux, and especially in the poems in honour of St. Felix by his pious and cultured namesake of Nola, which, with the autobiographical *Eucharisticon* of Paulinus of Pella, are perhaps the most interesting poems of this time. The tristichs of Elpidius are valuable as illustrations of the painting of the time.

In the 6th century there is little poetry, and its quality is inferior. The decay of classical literature was complete, and it survived only within the walls of the monasteries, whose inmates were too much occupied with the harder tasks of preaching to and civilising the barbarians. A test of the culture of the day may be found in the applause which greeted Arator when he recited publicly at Rome his versification of the Acts of the Apostles, a free translation full of mystical interpretation. A far higher level is reached in Gaul by Venantius Fortunatus, the versatile court-poet of Sigibert, and priest of the convent of Rhadagunda, whose poems deserve to rank next to those of Prudentius; whether for their variety, or for their metrical power, or for the insight which they give into the life of the time.

In the 7th and 8th centuries there is no real poetic inspiration apart from hymn-writing. We have fugitive pieces showing clever variety of metre by Eugenius in Spain. In the main, however, culture passes northward. Ireland contributes the poetical epistles of St. Columban; Wales, hymns of its monasteries, especially that of Bangor; England gives proof of the study and imitation of the classics in the *Aenigmata* and *De Laude Virginum* of St. Aldhelm, and the praises of the martyrs by Bede, and the short poems of Alcuin: Germany in the *Aenigmata* of St. Boniface. But for the time poetry was silent. The old classical inspiration was dead; the work of the Christian church was to convert and inspire the heart of the great nations which were to influence Europe. These were already trained by their bards to associate poetry with religion, and were destined to give to the germs laid in these centuries a far wider development.

In looking back upon the whole period we see that, like the Pagan poetry of the time, there is much that was artificial, pedantic, fanciful, imitative. Such especially were the poems of Merobaudes, Ennodius, Sidonius, and, partly, Venantius. But this was not all. There were genuine feelings which found their expression. Perhaps most marked of all, more marked than in Greece, was the genuine love of the new truth revealed. This prompted the desire to extend the truth to others, to robe it in the form which would make it most acceptable, whether to the ignorant (Commodian, St. Augustine) or to the educated (Juvencus,

Sedulius, Prudentius, Marius Victorinus, Marius Victor, Paulinus, Avitus, Arator); or even to children (Falconia Proba). This prompted also the desire to defend it in controversy (St. Augustine, Prudentius, Prosper, Paulinus). With other poets the inspiration came from admiration of the new life, now lived on earth. In a few there is a pathetic note of sadness at the shortness of life and its uncertainties (Paulinus of Nola, Eugenius, Columban); but, as a rule, the glory and brightness of life is celebrated. This evoked the praises of chastity (Avitus, Aldhelm); the panegyrics of the saints and martyrs (Damasus, Prudentius, Eugippius, the three Paulini, Bede); and, more rarely in this period, of the Blessed Virgin (Fortunatus). With others the mercies of God to the poet himself (Dracontius, Paulinus of Pella) are the source of inspiration; to others, the beauties of Christian painting or architecture, and numerous illustrations of these will be found in the poems of Prudentius, Elpidius, Paulinus of Nola, Eugenius, Venantius Fortunatus. The poems of the latter and of Dracontius are specially valuable to the historian for the light which they throw on the life of the time.

Of the various kinds of poetry, nearly all those which belonged to the old classical literature were adopted. Epic found its counterpart in the translations of the Bible and the longer lives of the saints; didactic in the moral and apologetic and controversial treatise; lyric in the hymns to the saints, and the slighter fugitive pieces. Satire, though scarcely a separate class of poetry, found full scope in the derision poured upon the follies and immoralities of the heathen religion (cf. esp. Commodian and Prudentius). Only the drama is wanting. Tragedy and comedy had both practically ceased in classical Latin literature; and Christian instinct had not developed them afresh. The most original developments of the time are the half-epic use of lyric for description of the lives of the saints by Prudentius, and his introduction of the allegorical poem. And these various poems did not pass away. Side by side with classical authors they were regularly studied and commented on in the monastic schools. Venantius Fortunatus boasts of the long roll of Christian poets, including Juvencus, Sedulius, Orientius, Prudentius, Paulinus, Arator, Alcuin (*De Vita S. Martin*, i. 15-25); and the number of glosses in the MSS. bears witness to their study. Consequently students have traced the influence—often indeed remote, yet probably quite real—of the poetic renderings of the Bible upon the *Heliland* and the *Harmony of the Gospels* by Otfried; of the lyrics of Prudentius upon mediaeval ballads; of the description of God's plans of creation and redemption by Avitus upon Milton's "Paradise Lost"; of the vivid description of the rewards of the good and the punishment of the wicked by Prudentius (Hamartigeneia) upon Dante's *Divina Commedia*; of the *Psychomachia* upon the allegorical literature which culminates in Spenser and Bunyan.

A similar influence may be found in the style of these early poets. In that, there are two tendencies. (a) On the one hand, there is the careful imitation of the best classical writers, of

Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, &c., such as is found in Juvenecus, Prudentius, Paulinus, Fortunatus. The prosody is indeed often but slackly observed: there is, as in most periods of decadence, a fondness for archaisms, a redundancy of epithets, a fanciful formation of compound words; there is much that is artificial in the mere form, such as the mixture of different metres in one poem (Paulinus, Eugenius); the practice of epanalepsis (Sedulius, Fortunatus); the introduction of acrostichs and alphabetic poems (Amoenus, Sedulius, Eugenius, &c.); but yet with all this artificiality the imitation of classical models does preserve a classical simplicity to some extent. A comparison of the prose and poetry of the same writers (*e.g.* of Avitus or Sedulius) will show that the poetry is the less turgid and artificial of the two.

(b) Side by side with this imitation, a new tendency arises in a more popular direction. To this tendency may perhaps be partly due the frequency of alphabetic poems and acrostichs mentioned above, as they would serve as helps to the memory: to it also is due the growing fondness for alliteration (Fortunatus, Aldhelm, Boniface) and for rhyme (St. Augustine, &c.). But the most important point is the growth of an entirely new system of poetry, which substitutes for the old "quantity" a method, based upon the number of syllables, combined with accentual stress on a few important parts of the line (Commodian, St. Augustine, &c.). The origin of this change was complex. It was due, doubtless, to the fact that the old classical pronunciation of Latin was much corrupted in the mouths of the barbarians who spoke it, so that a poem based on classical prosody became less and less to correspond with the pronunciation of daily life. St. Augustine directly gives this as his reason for adopting his new method, "ne me necessitas metrica ad aliqua verba quae vulgo minus sunt usitata compelleret" (*Retr.* i. 20). Possibly, too, like other points, such as alliteration and rhyme, this change corresponded with tendencies in the songs of the Northern races; but probably the main cause is to be found in Eastern Semitic influences; for a similar development took place almost exactly contemporaneously in Greece, where these other reasons do not operate; and nearly all the tendencies which mark it find parallels either in the Hebrew poetry of the Old Testament or in the Christian hymns of the Syrian Church. Within this period the tendencies are not fully developed; further influence from the Greek Church in later centuries contributed to that development, and to the great lyrical outburst of hymns and sequences which marked the Middle Ages (*v. esp.* Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry* (Introduction); and Meyer, *ubi infra*).

Authorities.—The poems referred to will be found in the large editions of Aldus, Fabricius, Gallandi, Migne (with most useful indices in vol. ccxxi. pp. 70-91); a few of them in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*. Accounts of the writers in Fancius, *De Vegeta Lat. linguae senectute*, capp. iii. and xi.; in Cave, *Script. Eccles.*, Oxf., 1740; and especially in Bähr, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, vol. iv. Carlsruhe, 1872; Teuffel, *History of Roman Literature*, London, 1873; and Ebert, *Geschichte der Christlich-Lateinischen Literatur*, Leipzig,

1874. Good discussions of metrical questions in Trench's *Sacred Latin Poetry* (Introduction), and in G. Meyer's *Anfang und Ursprung der Lat. und Griech. rythmischen Dichtung*, Munich, 1885; Munro in *Transactions of Camb. Phil. Society*, vol. x. A short anthology in J. Alzog's *Patrologie, ad fin.*, Freiburg, 1876.

A full account of previous literature will be found in Bähr, pp. 16-21. [W. L.]

VERULUS, bishop of Rusiccade, the port of Cirta and a Colonia, called in later MSS. "martyr de schismaticis," appears in Roman martyrologies on ix. Kal. Mart., but erroneously referred to Vandal persecutions (see Morcelli); *sufr.* 70, *Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. de Bap. iii.* [E. W. B.]

VERUS (1), bishop of Vienne, present at the council of Arles, A.D. 314. (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 95.) [H. W. P.]

VERUS (2), addressed by Salvianus of Mar-seilles (*Ep.* 7 in *Pat. Lat.* liii. 167; *Ceill.* x. 377). [C. H.]

VERUS (3), eighth bishop of Tours, was consecrated about 498, and, like his predecessor Volusianus, was driven into exile by the Goths on suspicion of being favourable to Clovis, whose orthodoxy commended him to the Catholic clergy. According to Gregory of Tours he sat eleven years and eight days (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 26, x. 31). But the authors of the *Gallia Christiana* (xiv. 16) shew good reason for suspecting an error, probably clerical, in this statement, and would substitute six for eleven. He was succeeded in the see by Licinius, and after his deposition was represented by a deacon at the council of Agde in 506 (Mansi, viii. 338). He died in exile, leaving his goods in part to the churches (Greg. Tur. *ibid.*). [S. A. B.]

VERUS (4), bishop of Orange some time between 475 and 517, author of a life of his predecessor EUTROPIUS (*Gall. Chr.* i. 767; *Boll. Acta SS.* 27 Mai. vi. 693; *Hist. Litt. Franc.* ii. 663). [C. H.]

VERUS (5), seventh bishop of Rodez, between St. Deus-dedit I. and Aredius, was the recipient of one of the three extant letters of St. Sulpicius of Bourges (*Epist.* 2, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 593), and was the writer of two to St. Desiderius of Cahors (St. Desiderius, *Epist.* ii. 16, 19; *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 263, 265). His signature is also found in a fragment published by Mabillon, supposed to be part of a privilege-gium of St. Faro for the monastery of the Holy Cross, which afterwards bore the latter's name (see *Gall. Christ.* i. 201). He was one of the prelates enumerated by Flodoard as present at the council of Rheims in 625 (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 5, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxv. 102). [S. A. B.]

VESPASIANUS, TITUS FLAVIUS, emperor July 1, A.D. 69-June 24, A.D. 79, and his son TITUS, emperor June 24, A.D. 79-Sept. 13, A.D. 81. As a great part of the imperial power was exercised by Titus during his father's reign, of which his own short reign may be regarded as the continuation, it seems convenient to treat them together. The influences of these princes on Christianity was wholly indirect.

The destruction of Jerusalem and the temple tended to hasten the complete separation of Judaism and Christianity. This distinction, however, had not as yet become apparent to the Roman authorities, and as far as they had any knowledge of the existence of Christians, they still regarded them as one of the various sects into which the Jews were divided. As such on the one hand they shared the protection Judaism enjoyed as a *religio licita*, while on the other they had to pay the half-shekel, originally levied for the temple, to the service of the temple of Jupiter on the capitol, to which it had been transferred (Dion lxvi. 7; Jos. B. J. vii. 6), a tribute which must have offended the consciences of many, and might be made an engine of oppression (Suet. Dom. 12). The fact that the Christians had taken no part in the Jewish war of independence, and had withdrawn from Jerusalem before the siege, would have distinguished them favourably in Roman eyes from the other Jewish sects with which they were confounded. The reversal of the sentences on treason in the cases of all who had been convicted of *ἀσέβεια* in the reign of Nero and his three successors, and the prohibition of prosecutions on such a charge for the future (Dion lxvi. 9), which was one of the first acts of Vespasian's reign, an example in which he was followed by Titus (Dion lxvi. 19), must also have been very favourable to the Christians. Consistently with these circumstances a long and almost unbroken chain of Christian authorities bear witness to the favourable condition of Christianity under these emperors. Melito of Sardis, writing in the reign of M. Aurelius (Eus. H. E. iv. 26), knows of no imperial persecutors except Nero and Domitian. Tertullian (*Apol.* 5) expressly denies that Vespasian was a persecutor. Lactantius (*Mortes* 2, 3) in like manner knows of no persecution between Nero and Domitian. Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 17) expressly asserts that Vespasian did no harm to the Christians. It is not till we reach Hilary of Poitiers, writing after A.D. 360, that we come to any charge of persecution against Vespasian. In a rhetorical passage (*contra Arianos* 3 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* x. 611), contrary to all previous Christian testimony, he couples Vespasian with Nero and Decius. Sulpicius Severus (*H. E.* ii. 30 in *Patr. Lat.* xx. 146), in a passage, whose style suggests it was borrowed from one of the lost books of Tacitus, states that the motive of Titus in destroying the temple was to abolish not only Judaism but Christianity, but he does not mention any hostile act on the part of Vespasian or his son against the Christians.

Besides Gaudentius, who is only known by a forged inscription (Aubé, i. 142), the only martyrs ascribed to the reign of Vespasian are Linus and Apollinaris, the bishops of Rome and Ravenna, and Leontius, Hypatius, and Theodulus, soldiers of Tripoli in Phoenicia. The last three names, like that of Gaudentius, according to De Rossi, quoted by Aubé, indicate a date later than the 3rd century, and the only authority for placing their martyrdom in the reign of Vespasian is their Acts, which are of later date, and, contrary to the early Christian testimony above cited, represent Vespasian as issuing edicts against the Christians, and directing a persecution (*AA. SS.* Jun. iii. 555, 561).

As for Linus, there is no early authority for his martyrdom. The only martyr among the Roman bishops known to Irenæus (in Eus. *H. E.* v. 5) is Telesphorus, nor does Linus appear as a martyr before a catalogue of the time of pope Hormisdas or the early part of the 6th century (Lipsius, *Chron. der röm. Bisch.* 78). As for St. Apollinaris, he is first mentioned by his successor Peter Chrysologus in the 5th century, who knows him only as a confessor and not as a martyr (*Serm.* 128 in *Patr. Lat.* lii. 552), and the only authority for placing him in the reign of Vespasian is his Acts and the martyrologies that follow them, which Tillemont (*M. E.* ii. 103, 518) and Görres (526) consider to be spurious. We may therefore conclude that the reigns of the first two Flavian emperors were a period of tranquillity for the church. The chief authorities for the general history of these emperors are Tacitus, *Hist.* ii.-v.; Suetonius; Dion lxv. 8-lxvi.; Josephus, *B. J.*; Merivale, c. lvii.-lx.; Tillemont, *Emp.* i. ii.; and for their relation to the church Tillemont, *M. E.* ii. 102, 152, 555; Aubé, *Hist. des Persec.* c. 4; Görres, *Zeitsch. für wissent. Theol.* xxi. 492. M. Double in his recent work on Titus (*L'Empereur Titus*) ingeniously maintains that, contrary to the received opinion, he was in reality a monster of wickedness. [F. D.]

VESTIANA, a lady, an inmate of the female monastery conducted by Macrina, who related to Gregory Nyssen the circumstances of his sister's miraculous cure (Greg. Nyss. *Vit. S. Macr.* p. 199). She is identified by Baronius, without sufficient grounds, with the lady who, to avoid an unwelcome marriage, took refuge at the altar of Basil's church (Basiliius of Caesarea, D. C. B. vol. i. p. 290; Baron, *Annal.* 370, § 64; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* ix. 667, 6). [E. V.]

VETRANIO (1), a pretender to the empire set up by the military at Sirmium in Illyricum about A.D. 351. (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 25, 28; *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.*) [G. T. S.]

VETRANIO (2), bishop of all Scythia about A.D. 378. He boldly reproved the emperor Valens for his persecution of the orthodox party. (Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 35.) [G. T. S.]

VETTIUS EPAGATHUS. In the early persecutions, the Christians felt it to be a gross injustice that a man should be put to death merely because he acknowledged himself to be a Christian, and without any investigation whether there was anything contrary to morality or piety in the Christian doctrines or practices. It not unfrequently happened [see LUCIUS (14)] that a bystander at a trial would press on the judge the necessity of such an investigation, whereupon the magistrate would say, I think you must be a Christian also yourself, and on the advocate's confessing that he was, would send him to share the fate of those whom he had attempted to defend. This befel Vettius Epagathus, a distinguished Christian citizen of Lyons in the persecution of the year 177. He came forward as the advocate of the Christians first apprehended, and in consequence was himself "taken up unto the lot of the martyrs." The word "martyr," as at first used, did not necessarily imply that he who bore witness for Christ sealed his testi-

mony by death; and Renan (*Marc Aurèle* p. 307) is of opinion that Vettius had "only the merits of martyrdom without the reality." His reasons are that no mention is made of Vettius in the subsequent narration of the sufferings of Christians tortured in the amphitheatre, and, what he thinks decisive, that the epistle of the churches says of Vettius that "he was and is a genuine disciple of Christ, following the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." But the addition "following the Lamb, etc." indicates that the "is" does not refer to the life of Vettius in this world, but rather to that which he enjoyed in company with Christ. Vettius was probably a Roman citizen, and as such was simply beheaded instead of undergoing the tortures of the amphitheatre. [G. S.]

VIATRIX, July 29 (alias BEATRIX), sister to the martyr FAUSTINUS (25). She is called Beatrix in the *Martyrologies*. De Rossi, in his *Bullet.* 1883, p. 144. Cf. 1866, p. 53; 1868, p. 25, 48, 87; 1874, 118; and in his *Rom. Sott.* t. iii. has shown that her name was Viatrix. Her story is told under Faustinus. [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (1), bishop of Rome after Eleutherus, in the reigns of Commodus and Severus. His dates are variously given in the ancient records. The Liberian Catalogue assigns him an episcopate of nine years two months and ten days, the Felician of ten years and the same number of months and days, giving the consuls of A.D. 186 and A.D. 197 as those of his first and last years. The Eusebian Chronicle assigns him twelve years, ending A.D. 198 or 199; Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 28) ten years, and says that Zephyrinus succeeded him about the ninth year of Severus, i.e. A.D. 202. Lipsius (*Chron. der röm. Bischof.*) supposes his episcopate to have been from A.D. 189 to A.D. 198 or 199. Soon probably after his accession he excommunicated Theodotus of Byzantium (*ὁ σκυρεὺς*), who had come to Rome, and taught that Christ was a mere man (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28; cf. Epiph. *Haeres.* liv. 1). Eusebius in the passage referred to is quoting from an opponent of the sect of Artemon, who afterwards under pope Zephyrinus maintained a similar heresy. It appears from the quotation that the Artemonites alleged all the bishops of Rome before Zephyrinus to have held the same views with themselves; and the allegation is refuted by the fact of Victor, the predecessor of Zephyrinus, having excommunicated Theodotus, "the founder and father of the God-denying apostasy." Montanism also was rife in Asia Minor during the reign of Victor, who is supposed by some to have been the bishop of Rome alluded to by Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* c. 1) as having issued letters of peace in favour of its upholders, though afterwards persuaded by Praxeas to revoke his approval. But others think it more probable that Eleutherus was the bishop referred to. [ELEUTHERUS (11).] See, however, MONTANUS, p. 940 b.

The most memorable action of Victor was with regard to the Asiatics on the Easter question. They still persisted in what is called the Quartodeciman usage, for which they pleaded the authority of St. John, of keeping their Pasch on the 14th of Nisan, on whatever day of the week it fell. So far, intercommunion be-

tween them and the church of Rome had not been broken on this account. The Roman bishop Anicetus had (c. 160) communicated with St. Polycarp of Smyrna, when the latter was at Rome, and parted from him peaceably, though each upheld the tradition of his own church. In the time of Victor the usage of the Asiatics in which, according to Eusebius, they stood alone among all the churches of Christendom, had attracted general attention. Synods were held on the subject in various parts—in Palestine under Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem, in Pontus under Palmas, in Gaul under Irenaeus, at Corinth under its bishop Bacchillus, at Osdroene in Mesopotamia, and elsewhere, by all of which synodical letters were issued, unanimous in disapproval of the Asiatic custom, and in declaring that "on the Lord's Day only the mystery of the resurrection of the Lord from the dead was accomplished, and that on that day only we keep the close of the paschal fast" (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23). But the general feeling was that the retention of their own tradition by the Asiatics was no sufficient ground for breaking off communion with them. Victor alone was intolerant of difference. He had issued a letter in behalf of the Roman church to the like effect with those of the synods held elsewhere. What Eusebius says of it is: "And of those at Rome there is in like manner another, indicating bishop Victor (*ἐπίσκοπον Βίκτορα δηλοῦσα*)." From the reply to it we may conclude it to have been peremptory in its requirement of compliance. This reply was from Polycrates bishop of Ephesus, as head of the Asiatic churches, who, at Victor's desire, had convened an assembly of bishops who concurred with him in his rejoinder. In it he resolutely upholds the Asiatic tradition; he supports it by the authority of "great lights" who slept in Asia awaiting the resurrection; of Philip the apostle, who, with his two aged virgin daughters, was buried at Hierapolis; of another saintly daughter of his who lay at Ephesus; of St. John ("who lay on the Lord's bosom, and became a priest wearing the *petalon*"), also at rest at Ephesus; of Polycrates of Smyrna, bishop and martyr; of Thraseas of Eumenia, also bishop and martyr, who slept at Smyrna. After naming others after them, who had all kept the fourteenth day according to the Gospel, he speaks also of seven of his own kinsmen, all bishops, before himself, who had maintained the same usage. He adds, "I therefore, having been for five-and-sixty years in the Lord, and having conferred with the brethren from the whole world, and having perused all the Holy Scripture, am not scared with those who are panic-stricken. For those who are greater than I have said, 'It is right to obey God rather than men.'" After receiving this reply, Victor endeavoured to induce the church at large to excommunicate the Asiatics, but failed in his attempt. Whether he himself, notwithstanding this failure, renounced communion with them on the part of the Roman church is not clear from the language of Eusebius. Socrates (*H. E.* v. 22) says he did; and that this was the case is probable, though Eusebius speaks only of his endeavour to cut them off as heterodox from the "common unity," and of his letters with a view to this end. Jerome also (*de vir. illustr.* c. 35)

speaks only of his desire to have them generally condemned: "Siquidem Victor multos Asiae et Orientis episcopos, qui decima quarta luna cum Judaeis Pascha celebrabant, damnandos crediderat. In qua sententia hi qui discrepabant ab illis non dederunt manus." At any rate it is evident that the judgment of the bishop of Rome did not in that age carry any irresistible weight with other churches. For Eusebius expressly tells us that "these things did not please all the bishops;" that they exhorted him in return to "mind the things of unity and of love towards his neighbours;" and that they wrote "sharply assailing Victor." He cites a letter sent on the occasion to Victor by Irenaeus, who, though holding with him on the question at issue, exhorted him in the name of a synod of the church of Gaul "that he should not cut off whole churches of God for preserving the tradition of an ancient custom." He reminds him that churches have long differed on other points of usage as well as this without interruption of communion:—"not only about the day is the controversy, but also about the very mode of the fast preceding it. For some think that they ought to fast for one day, some for two, some for more; while some make forty hours of day and night the measure of their fast." Such variety, he says, was of long standing, having originated with persons of influence who (it might be wrongly) had handed down different usages. "And nevertheless all these were at peace, and we are at peace with one another, and the diversity of the fast establishes the unanimity of faith." Lastly, he cites "the elders before Soter," chiefs of the Roman church, who had been at peace with those from other dioceses who differed from them in the matter at issue; and especially Anicetus, who, though unable to persuade the blessed Polycarp to give up the custom which, "with John, the disciple of our Lord, and the other apostles with whom John lived," he had always observed, and, though himself not persuaded to renounce the custom of the elders in his own church, had still honourably accorded the Eucharist in the church to Polycarp, and parted from him in peace (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24). Jerome (*de vir. illustr.* c. 35) alludes to several letters written by Irenaeus to the same purpose: "Feruntur ejus et aliae epistolae ad Victorem episcopum Romanum de quaestione Paschae epistolae, in quibus commonet eum non facile debere unitatem collegii scindere." The sentiments of Irenaeus (whose name, as Eusebius observes, corresponded with his character of peacemaker) appear elsewhere when he says, probably with reference to Victor's attitude in this dispute, "The apostles ordered that we should not judge any one in meat or in drink, or in respect of a feast, or new moon, or sabbaths. Whence then are these contentions? Whence these divisions? We keep the feast, but in the leaven of malice and wickedness, rending asunder the church of God; we keep external things that we may cast away the better things of faith and love. These are the feasts and fasts which we have heard from the prophets are pleasing to the Lord." (Iren. *Frag.* iii. ed. Pfaff.) The Quartodecimans after these conflicts seem to have maintained their usage undisturbed till the council of Nice, which enjoined its discontinuance. It is true

that the Asiatics themselves appear from Constantine's letter after the council to have already conformed to the general usage, which he speaks of as disregarded only by some Easterns not specified, but observed in the Asiatic diocese.^a Athanasius also (*de syn.* c. 5) says that one reason for summoning the council of Nice was that "those from Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia kept the Pascha with the Jews," but he does not mention the Asiatics as then doing so. If, then, the Asiatics had by this time conformed, it would seem, if Eusebius is to be trusted, that others had adopted their usage after Victor's denunciations; for, while he says that in Victor's time the Asiatics stood alone with respect to it among the churches of all the rest of the world (*H. E.* v. 23), he speaks of synods having condemned it in Palestine and at Osdroene, which was in Mesopotamia, whereas Athanasius refers to both Syria and Mesopotamia as maintaining it. The usage may have prevailed more extensively from the first than Eusebius was aware of, and notwithstanding what he says; and that this was the case is implied by Jerome, who speaks of "multos Asiae et Orientis episcopos" as implicated in it; or it may be that the action of Victor in the matter had the effect of rather spreading than checking it, and that some of those who adopted it from the Asiatics retained it longer than they. At any rate it is evident that the intolerance of Victor neither won general approval nor effected his intended purpose.

Victor is mentioned by St. Jerome (*de vir. illustr.* c. 34) as the writer of a treatise on the Easter question and other works. Four spurious epistles are assigned to him, addressed to Theophilus of Alexandria, to the Africans, to Desiderius of Vienne, and to a bishop Paracodas, the leading subjects being Easter, and the authority of the Roman see. He is said in the *Liber Pontificalis* to have been an African and the son of Felix; to have ordained that in case of necessity converts might be baptized anywhere—in a river, in the sea, in a fountain, or in a lake; to have summoned Theophilus bishop of Alexandria^b to a council at Rome at which the time for keeping Easter was ordained; to have suffered martyrdom; and to have been buried beside the body of St. Peter on the Vatican. He is commemorated in the Roman martyrology on the 28th of July as pope and martyr. There is no evidence of his martyrdom beyond the tradition which, contrary to the testimony of Irenaeus, assigns that honour to all the early Roman bishops. [J. B—y.]

VICTOR (2), African bishop on committee *de Virg. subintroductis*, A.D. 249, *Cyp. Ep.* iv. [E. W. B.]

^a "Nonnulli qui ad Orientem habitant non admittunt." . . . "Ut quod in urbe Roma, in Italia, in Africa, in Aegypto, in Hispania, Gallia et Britannica, in Libya, in universa Graecia, in dioecesi Asiatica et Pontica, in Cilicia denique, una et consentienti sententia conservatur, hoc etiam vestra prudentia libenter approbet." (Constant. Ep. in Gelasii *Hist.* l. ii. c. 36; Labbe, vol. ii. p. 275; Euseb. in *V. C.* iii. 19.)

^b Theophilus of Caesarea, mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 22) as the contemporary bishop of that see, may be intended. But Eusebius makes no mention of his having attended a Roman council.

VICTOR (3) The same (African bishop) on Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 3, *de Pace danda*, A.D. 252, Cyp. *Ep.* iv. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (4) (? the same as (2), or (3)). Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 4, *de Basilide*, A.D. 254, Cyp. *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (5) (? the same as (2), or (3)). Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 5, *de Bapt.* i. A.D. 255, Cyp. *Ep.* 70. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (6). The above apparently distinct from Victor, bishop of Assuræ, *ab Assuras*, in Prov. Proc. Colonia Julia Assuras, mentioned several times by Augustine, *hod. Zarfür*, and the plain near it *B'hairt Essers*. Seven other bishops in Morcelli before 5th century. See FORTUNATIANUS (1). In A.D. 253 Victor had not yet succeeded EPICETUS, but was bishop before A.D. 255 (6?) in Syn. *de Bapt.* iii. *Sent.* 68. He is distinguished as a "confessor" in the late margin of the list. But if this note is intended to refer to the confessor bishop addressed in *Ep.* 76, and replying in *Ep.* 77, one would think it a mistake for a Numidian Victor, as all the names capable of identification are Numidian. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (7), bishop of Octavum, Octabum, Octanu H., in Numidia, near Cirta, in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. *de Bap.* iii. *Sent.* 78, then recently appointed [VICTOR (3)]; probably the same as the Numidian bishop addressed in Cyp. *Ep.* 62 [see JANUARIUS (1)]; and in *Ep.* 70 (Syn. *de Bap.* i.), a confessor in the mines, *Ep.* 76 and 77. See NEMESIANUS (1). [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (8), another Victor, a Numidian bishop addressed in same *Ep.* 70 [see VICTOR (3)], who cannot be distinctly separated from 3. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (9), bishop of Gor (Gorbuda H.) in Prov. Proc. (? same as *Coreva*, on road from Carthage to Sufetula, Morcelli); 7 Syn. Carth. *de Bap.* iii. *Sent.* 40. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (10), a lapsed African presbyter restored too early to communion as a layman. See FIDUS, Cyp. *Ep.* 64. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (11), African bishop associated with CALDONIUS, Cyp. *Ep.* 41, 42. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (12) appears, in the (spurious?) close of *Ep.* xiii., as companion of Cyprian in retirement, a lector made deacon, who sends a large sum with one of Cyprian's bounties to Carthage. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (13). Mart. Carthag. A.D. 250. See ARISTO. [E. W. B.]

VICTOR (14), martyr of Marseilles, belongs to the Diocletian period about the close of the third century. The church dedicated to his memory at Marseilles is alluded to by St. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 22 and *De Glor. Mart.* i. 77), which shows that by the end of the sixth century his name was well known. His *Acta* (Breviora and Longiora) are anonymous, though the longer has been attributed to St. Cassian. (Both the *Acta* were published, first by Bosquet, *Hist. Eccl. Gall.* ii. 127 sq.; also with *Miracula* in eight chapters, by Boll. A. SS. Jul. v. 142 sq.; the

longer alone is given by Ruinart, *Acta Mart.* 333 sq., ed. 1859). According to the *Acta*, Victor was an officer in the Roman army when Maximian came to Marseilles to persecute the church. Victor employed his nights in visiting and encouraging the Christians, until he himself was arrested and brought before the emperor. He was cruelly tortured, but in the prison converted his keepers, and was at last martyred. His most famous monument is the church and monastery of St. Victor, built at Marseilles by St. Cassian [CASSIANUS (11) JOHANNES], and given afterwards to the Benedictines. His feast is 21st July. [J. G.]

VICTOR (15), bishop of Garba, a town of uncertain site in Numidia, present at the meeting at Cirta A.D. 305, and one of those who gave their opinion that the acts done during the persecution, like those of Secundus of Tigisis, should be left to the judgment of God (Opt. i. 14; Aug. c. *Cresc.* iii. 27-30). He was afterwards sent to preside over the small Donatist community (paucos erraticos) at Rome, where he is described by Optatus as "pastor sine grege, episcopus sine populo." (Opt. ii. 4.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (16), martyr at Gerona in Spain in the persecution of Diocletian. [ORONTIUS (1)]. [C. H.]

VICTOR (17), one of the friends of Theodotus bishop of Ancyra and his companion in martyrdom. [THEODOTUS (9)]. (Mason, *Persec. of Diocl.* 358.) [C. H.]

VICTOR (18), Donatist bishop of Russicada, in Numidia, a town (Sgigata) near the sea-coast and the river Thapsus, called a colony in Peut. Tab., between Hippo and Chulli. (Vib. *Seq. flum.* Ant. *Itin.* 5, 3; 19, 2, Mela. i. 7; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 46.) He was one of those who met at Cirta, A.D. 305, to elect a bishop, and was there taxed by Secundus of Tigisis with having surrendered a book of the gospels during the persecution. He did not deny that under compulsion he had thrown it into the fire; but hoped that he might be pardoned. [SECUNDUS of Tigisis.] (Aug. c. *Cresc.* iii. 27, 30; Opt. i. 13; *Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. p. 176, ed. Oberthür, p. 170 ed. Dupin.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (19), bishop of Utica, and (20) bishop of a place in Numidia called Legisvolumini, present at the council of Arles, A.D. 314 (Routh. *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 95). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (21), a professor of Roman literature, but of Moorish origin, brought forward as a witness at the enquiry under Zenophilus, A.D. 320, and accused by Nundinarius with "tradition" in his own person and of knowledge of the guilt of Silvanus. Victor however denied that he was present, or that he had any knowledge of the act attributed to Silvanus, but the judge decided that his evidence tended to convict Silvanus (Aug. c. *Cresc.* iii. 29-33; *Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. p. 168-179 Oberthür, p. 167-170 Dupin.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (22), a fuller by trade, who gave 20 *folles* to Silvanus in order to be admitted to the order of presbyters (Aug. c. *Cresc.* iii. 19-23;

Mon. Vet. Don. iv. pp. 172-179 Oberthür, 169-70 Dupin. [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (23), son of Samsuricus, a grave-digger (fossor) and worker (artifex) probably in gold and silver, deposed before Zenophilus that he had heard from Silvanus himself a confession of his act of surrender. He seems to have been a candidate for the episcopate when Silvanus was appointed (*Aug. c. Cresc.* iii. 29-33: *Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. pp. 170-178 Oberthür, pp. 168-170 Dupin). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (24), one of the Numidian bishops addressed by Constantine, A.D. 330. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* xxvi. p. 215 Oberthür, p. 189 Dupin.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (25), a distinguished general under Valens, a man of high character, consul in A.D. 369 an orthodox Christian who felt a high regard and esteem for Basil, whom he reproached for not writing to him more frequently. Basil excuses his silence on the ground of his unwillingness to trouble one of so exalted a station with many letters, but promises amendment, and thanks him for the services rendered by him to the church. (Basil, *Ep.* 152 [374].) In another letter Basil thanks Victor for continuing to honour him with his letters, and for not allowing his regard to be affected by calumnious reports (*Ep.* 153 [428]). Gregory Nazianzen also wrote to Victor in 382 to excuse himself from attending the council which Theodosius was then proposing to summon, and begging him to use his powerful influence to extinguish the flames of discord which were threatening to consume the church (*Greg. Naz. Ep.* 133). In another letter he commends to him an accomplished young friend Hyperechius (*Ep.* 134). In 378 he united with TRAJANUS (2), Arintheus and other generals in remonstrating with Valens on his Arian impiety (*Theod. H. E.* iv. 30 al. 33). [E. V.]

VICTOR (26), bishop of Abziris, Abdira, or Audira (*Plin.* v. 4, 30; *Ptol.* iv. 3, 34), present at the Council of Carthage, A.D. 390. (*Bruns. Conc.* i. 117, 121.) [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (27), bishop of Putput, a town of the Proconsular Province of Africa (Hammamats), on the way to Hadrumetum, *Ant. Itin.* 52, 4, present at the second Council of Carthage, *Bruns. Conc.* i. 117. [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (28), a eunuch of infamous character, made bishop of Ephesus by the enemies of Chrysostom in the place of the deposed Heraclides (*Pallad.* p. 140). [E. V.]

VICTOR (29), bishop of Liberta, a place of unknown site in the proconsular province of Africa, present at Carth. Conf. A.D. 411 (*Carth. Coll.* i. 116). (30), bishop of Hippo Diarrhytus, one of the keepers of the documents on the Donatist side at the Carth. conference A.D. 411 (*Carth. Coll.* i. 132, 139). (31), the name of two bishops present at the Council of Carthage A.D. 412, and of one present at that of Mileum A.D. 416 (*Aug. Ep.* 175-6, 181). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (32), brother of Nebridius, of whom St. Augustine, in urging him to live with him

says, that if Nebridius consents, his mother will still have Victor to live with her (*Aug. Ep.* i. iv.). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (33), a Donatist presbyter of Hippo R. about whom, in a letter to Eusebius, Augustine enquires (*Aug. Ep.* 34-35). [EUSEBIUS (135) Vol. II. 330. PROCULEIANUS.] [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (34), a bishop of Mauretania Caesariensis, who having committed an offence, was forbidden by St. Augustine to communicate outside of his own diocese. The case is mentioned by Augustine in a letter to pope Celestine concerning the case, one of a similar kind, of Antonius, bishop of Fussala (*Aug. Ep.* 208-9; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 71. URBANUS of Sicca). [H. W. P.]

VICTOR (35), solitary of Egypt, friend and follower of Cyrillus of Alexandria, was accused by the Nestorians of many crimes before the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, but honourably acquitted (*Cyrrill. Alex. Apolog. ad Theodos.* s. f.). [J. G.]

VICTOR (36), accuser of Cyril. [SOPHRONAS.]

VICTOR (37), a disciple of St. Martin and one of the religious brotherhood under Sulpicius Severus (*Paulin. Nol. Epp.* 23, 29). [C. H.]

VICTOR (38), bishop of Martyrites in Africa, published a revised edition of Cassian's conferences with the doubtful points omitted or corrected. It is not now extant. It is mentioned by Cassiodorus in his *Inst. Div. Litt.* cap. xxix. [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (39) (VICTORIUS, VICTORINUS), CLAUDIUS MARIUS, the author of three books in hexameter verse, containing the narrative of the Book of Genesis down to the destruction of the Cities of the Plain, and also of a letter to "Salmon," or Solomon, an abbat, in hexameter verse, on the corrupt manners of his time. He is probably to be identified with the Victorius, or Victorinus, mentioned by Gennadius (*De Vir. Il.* 60) as a rhetorician of Marseilles, who died "Theodosio et Valentiano regnantibus" (*i.e.* 425-50), and who addressed to his son Aetherius a commentary on Genesis. Gennadius says "a principio libri usque ad obitum patriarchae Abrahae tres diversos edidit libros." This, indeed, does not accurately describe the work which we have under the name of Cl. M. Victor. But it is to be noted that there is a diversity of reading in the passage of Gennadius. In Erasmus's edition of St. Jerome, the passage stands "quatuor versuum edidit libros." If this be the right reading, it seems almost certain that the three books we now have of Cl. M. Victor, ending as they now do at a point which seems to call for some explanation, are the first three books of those mentioned by Gennadius, and that a fourth book, now lost, carried on the narrative to Abraham's death, where a natural halting place for the work is presented. This hypothesis answers one of the reasons which Teuffel assigns for doubting the identity of Cl. M. Victor with the Victorius of Gennadius (*Teuffel*, ii. 457), and possibly the objection he alleges from the absence of a dedication to Aetherius may be met by the same argument

Aetherius may have been addressed, not at the beginning, but at the end of the work, in which case the address to him would have probably shared the fate of the fourth book, even if it did not form part of it. His third objection, that the Victorius of Gennadius, being a native of Marseilles, would probably have shown more traces of semi-Pelagianism than are discoverable in Victor's work, may be an objection, if we assume that all the people of Marseilles were semi-Pelagian in the first half of the 5th century. But the writer of the books which bear the name of Victor, while he is certainly not a Pelagian, does not go into the opposite extreme, and there is nothing in his work which would absolutely exclude or contradict semi-Pelagianism. The three books inscribed as the work of Victor correspond very well with what Gennadius says of the character of the work of Victorius; they are written in a pious and Christian spirit, but without depth or great force of treatment. They are in fact, for the most part, a paraphrase in verse of the portion of the book of Genesis to which they correspond. There are but few reflections, and the narrative, with one or two exceptions, keeps closely to that of Scripture. The most notable variation is the introduction of a prayer by Adam on his expulsion from Paradise, which is followed by a strange episode. The serpent is discerned by Eve, who urges Adam to take vengeance on him. In assailing him with stones, a spark is struck from a flint, which sets fire to the wood in which Adam and Eve had taken shelter, and they are threatened with destruction. This mishap, however, is the means of revealing to them metals, forced from the ground by the heat, and of preparing the earth, by the action of the fire, for the production of corn.

The style of the poem and its language are in no way remarkable; its versification is for the most part tolerable, but there are one or two instances of disregard for the normal quantities of syllables.

The Epistle to Salomon is a poem of about 100 hexameters, and is more original, though not of any special interest. The vices especially blamed are, in men, a desire for gain, and a desire to search unduly into the secrets of nature known only to God; in women, immoderate love of personal adornment, leading to extravagance in dress. From the closing words it would seem that it either was, or was intended to be, one of a series of epistles. Its date would seem to be about 450. It may be added, that if Victor and the Victorius, or Victorinus of Marseilles, mentioned by Gennadius, are one, he is probably not to be identified with the poet Victorius mentioned by Sidonius in the last letter of the fifth book of his Epistles; for that epistle is written to the nephews and heirs of Victorius, who is therefore not likely to be the same as the father of Aetherius. The *Comment. in Genesim* and *Epistola ad Salomonem* are to be found in de la Bigne's *Bibl. Patr.* viii. 278, and Appendix; they are also in *Maittaires' Corpus Poetarum Lat.* ii. 1567. [H. A. W.]

VICTOR (40), bishop of Cartenna about the middle of the fifth century. He was a zealous opponent of the Arians during the Vandal persecution. Gennadius (*de Viris Illust.* cap. 77) attributes to him several works (none of which is now extant),—specially one against

the Arian heresy, which was presented to Genserius; a treatise on the Repentance of the Publican (identified by some with a treatise found in St. Ambrose, *Opp.* ed. Migne, *P. L.* t. xvii. col. 971); together with some devotional works and homilies (Ceill. x. 468). [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (41), bishop of Donaghmoyno, co. Monaghan, said to have been an unwilling convert of St. Patrick, but full of zeal when converted (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 95, c. 139, 151, c. 12, 266, and *Acta SS.* 424; Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. 28, iii. 723). As Victor is not an Irish name, Colgan (*Tr. Th.* 115, n. 47) thinks it may be a translation of Buaidhbheo. [BUAIDHBHEO.]

[J. G.]

VICTOR (42), quaestor under Anthemius (467-472). Sidonius Apollinaris, in a poem addressed to the emperor, speaks of him as his own master in the art of poetry. This reference has been interpreted, perhaps unwarrantably, to imply that Victor was actually a teacher of the subject:—it probably means nothing more than a compliment to the poetical powers of an officer in favour with the emperor. Except for Sidonius's passing mention of Victor, he is unknown.

[H. A. W.]

VICTOR of Mans. [VICTURIUS.]

VICTOR (43), bishop, addressed by pope Gelasius I. (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 100, 154). Victor had by the pope's advice discontinued the processions from the basilica of St. Agatha on the estate of Caclanum, because Petrus, the owner of the estate, had appropriated the revenues of the basilica. The pope directs him to resume the processions, as Petrus had now made a satisfactory arrangement. By the second letter the pope permitted Victor to ordain acolytes or sub-deacons as priests, if his deacons declined to take priest's orders. A third letter (*Patr. Lat.* lix. 143) addressed to Victor and some other bishops deals with the case of an alleged violation of sanctuary at Beneventum.

[F. D.]

VICTOR (44) VITENSIS, a North African bishop and writer of the latter half of the fifth century. The known facts of his life are very few. He was called Vitensis either after the see over which he presided (Ebert), or after the place where he was born (Auler). Of the year of his birth we have no information, but as he seems to have been numbered amongst the clergy of the church of Carthage about the year 455, he may have been born about the year 430. His *Historia Persecutionis Provinciae Africanae* is very interesting because he seems to have been an eye-witness of the Vandal persecution for more than thirty years, though he also seems to have escaped any serious inconvenience on his own part. He was actively employed by Eugenius, metropolitan of Carthage, in the year 483. Huneric banished in the earlier part of that year 4966 bishops and clergy of every rank. Victor was used by Eugenius to look after the more aged and infirm of the bishops, and tells us in lib. ii. 8 how cruelly Felix of Abbir Major, bishop for forty-four years, was treated. [FELIX (17.)] He was paralytic and unable to speak. Victor strove to obtain permission from the Vandal monarch for Felix to

remain in Carthage as he was in a dying condition and unable to bear the journey. The king in a rage ordered that "if he can not sit on an animal, let him be carried bound between two untamed oxen." The History of Victor is very useful, not only for the view it gives us of the religion of the Vandals, but also for other reasons. It tells us many particulars about Carthage, and its churches, their names and dedications, as those of Perpetua and Felicitas, of Celerina and the Scillitans (i. 3). It shows the persistence of Paganism at Carthage, and mentions the temples of Memory and of Coelestis as existing till the Vandals levelled them after their capture of Carthage. This temple of Coelestis deserves special notice. Victor's present text (i. 3) refers to it as "Aedem Memoriae et viam quam Coelestis vocitabant, funditus deleverunt." Eyssenhardt in *Hermes* t. 11 (1867), p. 319, suggested a reading "unam" for "viam," which makes good sense of the passage. The Temple of Coelestis existed, as we know, in Augustine's time, who describes in his *De Civ. Dei*, lib. ii. capp. 4, 26 (cf. Tertull. *Apol.* c. 24), the impure rites there performed. The site of this temple at Carthage has lately been elaborately discussed by M. A. Castan in a Mém. in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. des Inscrip.* t. xiii. (1885), pp. 118-132, where all the references to its cult are collected out of classical and patristic sources. Victor's History is useful too for glimpses of North African ritual. In lib. ii. 17 we have an account of the healing of a blind man, named Felix, by the hands of Eugenius, bishop of Carthage. In that chapter he describes the ritual of the feast of Epiphany, while there are frequent references to the singing of hymns or psalms at funerals. The History relates some curious miracles with great precision. The most notable are that of Felix just mentioned, and another which has given occasion for much controversy, in which Gibbon has taken part. The story is told by Victor in *Hist.* lib. v. 6. The inhabitants of Tipasa refused to hold communion with the Arian bishop. Hunneric sent a military count, who collected them all into the forum and cut out their tongues by the roots, notwithstanding which they all retained the power of speech. This remarkable fact has been discussed by Gibbon, cap. xxxvii., by Middleton in his *Free Inquiry*, p. 313-316, and by many others. See article on HUNNERIC in Vol. III. p. 181, where the evidence for it is fully discussed. The History of Victor is usually divided into five books, the first of which tells of the persecution of Genseric, from the conquest of Africa by the Vandals in 429 till Genseric's death in 477. The second, fourth, and fifth deal with the persecution of Hunneric, A.D. 477-484, while the third book contains the confession of faith drawn up by Eugenius of Carthage, and presented to Hunneric at the Conference of 484 (cf. Gennadius *de Vir. Illust.* num. 97). The third book or the Confession is notable because the celebrated text I. John v. 7, concerning the three Heavenly witnesses first appears there (lib. iii. 11). (See on this point Porson's letter to Travis, and Gibbon's notes on cap. xxxvii.). The life and works of Victor have been the subject of much modern German criticism, which has not however added a great deal to our knowledge, the points dis-

cussed being far too minute for general interest. The student of such discussions may refer to Papencordt's *Geschichte der Vandal. Herrschaft in Afrika*, Berlin, 1837, pp. 366-370; Ebert's *Literatur des Mittelalters im Abendlande*, Leipzig, 1874, t. i. 433-436, who fixes the date of the composition of the History about 486; and Teuffel's *Hist. of Roman Literature*, trans. by Wagner, t. ii. p. 509. The latest piece of criticism is a very elaborate one. It is contained in A. Schaefer's *Historische Untersuchungen*, Bonn, 1882, where Aug. Auler contributes (pp. 253-275) an article in which he maintains, with much learning and acuteness, that Victor was born in Vita, that his see is unknown, that he was consecrated bishop after the persecution, that he wrote his history before 487, and that this History is a piece of tendency-writing and untrustworthy. Like a true German he cannot recognise in the action of Genseric against the Catholic party anything but a legitimate measure of state repression, like Prince Bismarck's Cultur-Kampf. The bibliography of Victor is given down to date in Potthast's *Bibliotheca*, s. v. p. 561. The best of the older editions of the History is that of Ruinart, which has been reprinted, with its elaborate dissertations, in Migne's *P. L.* lviii. The History has been at least three times republished within the last thirteen years, by Hurter at Innsbruck in 1873, among the *Opuscula Selecta SS. PP.*; by C. Halmius in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Auct. Antiquiss. t. iii. pars prior, Berol. 1879; and lastly by Michael Petschenig in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptt. Ecclesiast. Lat.* t. vii. Vindob. 1881, with which may be compared an elaborate account of the manuscript authority for the text by the same writer, *Ueberlieferung des Victor von Vita, Sitzungsber. d. Kais. Akad. d. Wissensch. in Wien, phil.-hist. Classe*, t. xxvi., p. 637 sqq. Petschenig abandons the old division of the text, dating from Chifflet in the 17th century. He divides it into three books, treating the Confession of Faith as an appendix to the second, and uniting the fourth and fifth into one. At the end of all the editions will be found the *Passio Septem Monachorum* and the *Notitia Prov. et Civit. Africae*, the authorship of which is uncertain; the latter is a valuable document for the geography and ecclesiastical arrangements of North Africa. Ceill. (x. 448-465) gives a full analysis of Victor's History. He also appends a complete bibliography, where he says that the History was translated into French in 1563 and again in 1664, and was published in English in 1605. [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (45), primate of the Byzacene province in 508, by whom Fulgentius of Ruspe was consecrated [FULGENTIUS (3) in Vol. II. p. 578]. (Ceill. xi. 5.) [G. T. S.]

VICTOR, of Grenoble. [VICTURINUS.]

VICTOR (46), one who induced Fulgentius of Ruspe to write against the discourse of Fastidiosus, and to whom Fulgentius addressed his refutation of that work (Fulgent. *Rusp. Cont. Serm. Fastidiosi* in *Pat. Lat.* lxx. 507; Ceillier, xi. 34, 35). [C. H.]

VICTOR (47), bishop of Capua, apart from his writings is known only by his epitaph, which

states that he died in April A.D. 554, after an episcopate of about thirteen years from February A.D. 541. He is commemorated October 17, (Ughelli, vi. 306).

Writings.—I. He is best known from his connection with the *Codex Fuldensis* (F), after the *C. Amiatinus* the most ancient and valuable MS. of the Vulgate, which was transcribed by his direction, and afterwards corrected by him. The MS. is remarkable for containing the Gospels in the form of a Harmony. In his preface he relates that a MS. without a title had come into his hands containing a single gospel composed of the four. Inquiring into its authorship, he concludes, though with some doubt, that it was identical with the work of TATIANUS, which by a blunder he calls *Diapente* instead of *Diatessaron*. Till recently so little was known of the Diatessaron that it was impossible to say if Victor was right, but on the whole it was generally supposed that he was not. It was known that the Diatessaron began with St. John i. 1, whereas F. begins with the preface from St. Luke. But Mösinger's edition in 1876 of Aucher's Latin translation of the Armenian version of EPHRAÏM (4) Syrus' Commentary on the Diatessaron (E), followed by Zahn's work (*Forschungen zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, i.) (Z) now makes it possible to know with tolerable accuracy the contents and arrangement of the Diatessaron, and to see that it is plainly the archetype of the Harmony in F. It must be remembered that the silence of E is insufficient to prove the absence in T of a particular passage, so that passages existing in F may also have existed in T, though unnoticed in E, and E may also not always follow the exact order in which connected passages occurred in T.

At the outset two apparent discrepancies present themselves. T begins with St. John i. 1, F with St. Luke i. 1-4, and contains the genealogy from St. Matt. supplemented with part of that from St. Luke, whereas it is expressly stated that T contained no genealogy. But the index of F shows that these are accretions which did not exist in the original form of F. In it c. i. is *In principio Verbum*, with no reference to the preface from St. Luke, and c. v. is *De generationem (sic) vel nativitate Christi*, which in like manner refers only to the last half of § 5. Removing the preface and genealogy, §§ 1-11 of F, which go down to the return from Egypt, correspond with T, the teaching in the Temple, § 12, is preceded in T by St. John i. 6-28. and followed by the mission of the Baptist, which are both blended into § 13 of F. Then in both follow the baptism of our Lord, the temptation, and the call of Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Nathanael. Then comes a considerable divergence. In F the order is:—

- § 18. Reading in the Synagogue.
- § 19. The calling of Simon and Andrew, James and John.
- § 20. The call of Matthew.
- § 21. *Journey to Judaea—Baptizing—Return to Galilee (John iii. 22—end, iv. 1-3).
- § 22. Residence at Capernaum (Matt. iv. 12-16).

* This section is omitted in index. Whether it existed in this place when the index was made or whether the omission is a slip, *quere*.

- § 23. Preaching in Galilee—Appointment of the Twelve Apostles—Beginning of Sermon on the Mount.
- §§ 24-44. Sermon on the Mount.
- § 45. Mission of the Twelve Apostles.
- § 46. Marriage in Cana.
- § 47. Healing the Leper on coming down from the Mountain.

In T on the other hand the marriage in Cana comes first, happening the third day after the temptation (E 56), then followed the journey to and return from Judaea, the call of the Apostles and of James the publican and the healing of the paralytic succeeded, in what order is uncertain, and then came the plucking of the ears on the Sabbath, which is § 69 in F. Apparently however this section was elsewhere in the original form of F, or was omitted, as it is omitted in the index. Then in T follows the Sermon on the Mount, and the order of F and T are the same for the next few sections, from § 48, healing the centurion's servant, to § 54, healing the demoniac among the Gerasenes, except that nothing in T, as far as we know, corresponded to §§ 49, 51 of F, the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, and the healing the sick at even, § 50 being the raising the widow's son at Nain. Then § 55 is the healing the paralytic, already related in T; § 56 healing the Ruler's son omitted in T, probably identified with the healing of the centurion's servant; § 57 call of Levi, probably previously related in T as the call of James; §§ 58-60 come later in T, while § 61, the raising of Jairus' daughter, in T follows § 54. The next sections in F are:—

- § 62. The healing of two blind men and a demoniac (Mark ix. 26-33).
- § 63. The Pharisees saying, "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub."
- § 64. Martha and Mary.
- § 65. The mission of his disciples by the Baptist.
- § 66. The denunciation of Chorazin and Bethsaida.
- § 67. The return of the Apostles.
- § 68. The sending of the 70 (72).
- § 69. The disciples pluck the ears on the Sabbath.
- § 70. The healing the man with the withered hand.
- § 71. The prayer on the mountain.

Of these there is no trace of 62, 66, 67, 70 and 71 in E; 69 in T immediately precedes the Sermon on the Mount. It is omitted, as already mentioned, in the index of F. The order of the parallels in T to the other sections apparently was § 54 followed by § 61, then came §§ 64, 65, 63; then the supper in Simon the Pharisee's house (Luke vii. 36-50), which in F comes long afterwards, § 138, Mary the sister of Lazarus being identified with "the woman that was a sinner"; then § 68, and then the omitted §§ 58-60. From § 72, the parable of the sower, to § 94, the tribute money, F and T run parallel, except that in the latter there is no trace of four sections of F, and that the healing of the leper, § 47 in F, in T comes between § 88, the Woman of Samaria, and § 89 the Pool of Bethesda. Further, F omits the healing of the blind man (Mark viii. 22), which in T followed § 89, where F inserts the feeding of the 4000. Then follows another divergence. In F the order is:—

- § 95. The dispute among the disciples which of them should be the greater.
- § 96. The disciples rebuked for forbidding one casting out devils in our Lord's name.

- § 99. Parable of the lost sheep and the lost piece of money.
- § 98. Parable of the Prodigal son.
- § 99. The question of Peter, "How oft shall my brother sin against me"?
- § 100. Parable of the unmerciful servant.
- § 101. The question and answer about divorce.
- § 102. Blessing little children.
- § 103. The Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, and the parable of the barren fig tree.
- § 104. Healing of the woman with an infirmity of eighteen years.
- § 105. The feast of tabernacles (John vii. 2-30).
- § 106. The parable of the foolish rich man (Luke xii. 13).

In T, apparently, the order (which is difficult to determine, E being here very meagre) was 101, 97, 98, 96, 99, 100, 103, 105, 106, omitting 95, 102, 104. They may, however, have existed in T, as the only trace of 106 in E (*ad iudicem* dives venit, p. 168, referring to "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?") is so slight as to be overlooked by Zahn. Here again the index and text of F are at variance, probably showing that the order of the archetype has been disturbed, 104 and 105 there preceding 103, and the headings of 96, 97 being repeated instead of those of 106, 107. From this point the order of T, as far as it can be traced, corresponds to the end with that of F, except that in F the parable of the unjust steward, § 109, which in T follows that of the prodigal son, is placed between that of Lazarus and Dives, and the vineyard; that in F the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, § 117, comes between the miracle of Bartimaeus and the cleansing of the Temple, thus being thrown back to the autumn before the final Passover instead of following, as in T, the anointing at Bethany, and that, as already noticed, § 138 combines the supper in Simon the Pharisee's house with the anointing.

Besides the correspondence in the order of the sections, which was apparently closer in the original form of F, there are other remarkable coincidences. For instance, it would scarcely have occurred to two independent harmonists to make the journey through Samaria (John iv. 4) one from Galilee to Judaea instead of from Judaea to Galilee, the first three verses having been previously used by both (F, § 22, T, § 13) to describe the return to Galilee after the second visit to Judaea, to place the conversation with Nicodemus after the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, or to insert Herod's threats (Luke xiii. 31) between the Transfiguration and the healing of the demoniac. Again, in both (F, § 105, T, § 52) the first part of the account of the Feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 2-31) is torn from its context and inserted among a mass of matter similar in both, while the rest of the chapter begins the long extract which in both runs without a break to the end of chapter xi., the *pericope adulterae*, which is naturally wanting in T, being in F placed most awkwardly after the discourse with Nicodemus, and the mention of the Feast of the Dedication (John x. 22-42) being omitted in T, whose scheme it would disagree with. The one important difference between the later parts of F and T is that the compiler of T boldly severs the cleansing of the temple from the triumphal entry into Jerusalem and places it at the penultimate visit, while F

is not so bold, and thus places the triumphal entry not before the final passover, but before the penultimate visit. In both, however, the narrative of the cleansing is followed immediately by the parable of the Pharisee and the publican. Even the variations of F show its want of originality. For instance, the marriage at Cana has been displaced. The notice that it was the beginning of miracles is inconsistent with its following the miraculous draught of fishes (§ 19); in its present place it immediately follows the sending of the disciples, who notwithstanding are present at it, and again the next paragraph begins abruptly "When he had come down from the mountain."

We may therefore conclude that the archetype of F was formed by taking T and substituting for each Syriac fragment in Tatian's Mosaic the corresponding fragment from the Vulgate, the adapter occasionally altering the order and inserting passages missing in T where he found a convenient opportunity. The discrepancies between the index and text in F show that it underwent further changes after assuming a Latin shape, but it is impossible to say how far the differences between it and T proceed from such subsequent alterations or are due to the original adapter. The date of the adaptation is uncertain, the limits being A.D. 383, the date of the Vulgate being brought out, and A.D. 545, the date of F. The discrepancies between index and text show that it must have been considerably before the inferior limit, while on the other hand it must have been made after the version had become well-known and popular, which was not till long after it appeared. On the whole, therefore, the most probable date seems to be midway between the limits, or the second half of the fifth century, say about A.D. 470. The notices in Gennadius (*de Vir. Ill.*), who wrote during this period, collected by Zahn (312, 313), show that either he was himself a Syriac scholar or was acquainted with one, and at that time pilgrimages from the West to Egypt and the Holy Land were frequent. To substitute in Tatian's Mosaic the proper fragments of the Vulgate would require a much less thorough knowledge of Syriac than an independent translation would imply.

F also contains the rest of the New Testament with the Epistle to the Laodiceans in the following order: the Pauline Epistles (the Philippians being followed by 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, Laodiceans, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews), the Acts, the seven Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, the whole concluding with the verses of pope Damasus on St. Paul. To each book, except the Laodiceans, is prefixed a "brevis" or table of headings, and to each of the Pauline Epistles except the Hebrews, to the Acts and to the Apocalypse, a short preface. In addition there are prefixed to the Pauline Epistles a table of lessons from them, a general preface or argument of them, a long special argument of the Romans, and a concordance of the Epistles giving references to the various passages which treat of each particular doctrine. To the Acts is prefixed an account of the burial-places of the Apostles. There is a short general preface to the seven Catholic Epistles, and also the remarkable preface purporting to be St. Jerome's, which contains the

accusation, referred to by Westcott and Hort (*G. T. ii. Notes on Select Readings*, 105), against the Latin translators of omitting the "Patris Filii et Spiritus testimonium" in 1 John v. 7, 8, while the text itself is free from the interpolation. Besides this there are other places where, as in the Gospel, the text and supplementary matter no longer correspond exactly, showing that changes have occurred since the former was composed. For instance, the General Argument to the Pauline Epistles reckons but fourteen in all, including the Hebrews, and therefore excluding that to the Laodiceans, though it stands in the text. Again, the preface to the Colossians, "Colossenses et hii sicut Laodicienses sunt Asiani," must have been written when the Laodiceans preceded the Colossians, but the transposition might perhaps be due to Victor himself.

The whole MS. was carefully revised and corrected by Victor, in whose hand are three notes, one at the end of the Acts, and two at the end of the Apocalypse, respectively recording that he had finished reading the MS. on May 2 A.D. 546, April 19 A.D. 546, and a second time on April 12 A.D. 547. In the same hand are occasional glosses, the most remarkable being the explanation of the number of the beast in the Revelation as Teitan. The MS. was edited in 1868 by E. Ranke, whose preface gives a full description of it and its history, and the Harmony only is printed in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 255.

II. Victor was the author of several Commentaries on the Old and New Testament, partly consisting of extracts from various fathers, and partly original. Pitra (*Spic. Sol.* i.) has edited fragments of some on the Old Testament, contained in an *Expositio in Heptateuchum*, by Joannes Diaconus. The first, entitled *Responsions*, contained extracts ascribed (erroneously according to Lightfoot, *Ap. F.* Part II. ii. (1) 1002), by Victor to Polycarp, of which two are given by Pitra (p. 266) and five more (reprinted by Lightfoot, *ubi supra*), were printed by Feuardent in his notes on Irenæus from a catena of the Gospels now lost. Another work is the *Reticulus*, or *On Noah's Ark* (p. 287), containing an extraordinary calculation to show that its dimensions typify the number of years in the life of our Lord. Many other quotations from unnamed works of Victor occur in the Catena, containing extracts from various other writers, including quotations from four works of Origen, otherwise unknown. On the New Testament he wrote a Commentary, eleven fragments of which preserved in the *Collections* of Smaragdus are collected by Pitra (*Patr. Lat.* cii. 1124), according to whom a St. Germain MS. of Rabanus Maurus's *Commentary on St. Matthew* marks numerous passages as derived from Victor. Perhaps the most curious is the reason for the change of name from Saul to Paul, as if from *παῦλα*, because he ceased to persecute. Another, "Principem hujus saeculi latuerunt ista tria mysteria, id est, virginitas, partus, et passio," comes mediately or immediately from Ignatius (*Eph.* 19, see Lightfoot, *Ap. F.* Part II. ii. (1) 76.). Fragments of *Capitula de Resurrectione Domini* are given in *Spic. Sol.* i. (liv. lix. lxii. lxiv.), in which Victor among other matters touches on the difficulties in the genealogy found in St. Matthew, and the

discrepancy between St. Mark and St. John as to the hour of the Crucifixion. Of the last he gives first the explanation of Eusebius in *Questiones ad Marinum*, and then one of his own.

III. Victor's most celebrated work was that on the Paschal Cycle mentioned by several chroniclers and praised by Bede (*De Rat. Tempa.* 51), whose two extracts are given in *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 1097, xc. 502. The rest of the work was supposed to be lost till considerable extracts from it contained in the above mentioned *Catena* of Joannes Diaconus were published in the *Spic. Solesm.* (i. 296). It was written about A.D. 550, to controvert the Paschal Cycle of VICTORRIUS, according to which Easter Day would have fallen in that year on April 17, while Victor, considered that April 24 was the correct day, in accordance with the Alexandrine computation which he defends. In fact, after 5 metonic periods the discrepancy of A.D. 455, which was the cause of the composition of the Cycle of Victorrius, had recurred. The new fragments do not add much to our knowledge of Victor's arguments. It should be noticed that by "Mensis Martius," and "Mensis Aprilis secundum Alexandrinum" he means the Egyptian months Phamenoth and Pharmuthi, beginning on February 25, and March 27 respectively. He places the beginning of the world at the vernal equinox, for much the same reasons as Virgil in the *Georgics*, and observes that the darkness at the Crucifixion must have been miraculous, as a total eclipse could occur only at new moon. Several curious explanations of the mystical properties of numbers, resembling that already mentioned, are given. [F. D.]

VICTOR (48) TUNUNENSIS, an African bishop and chronicler of the sixth century. He was also a zealous supporter of the *Three Chapters*, for whose sake he endured much persecution after A.D. 556 and till his death about 567, both in his own province and in Egypt. He wrote a *Chronicle* which began at the Creation of the world and ended at the second year of the reign of Justinus II. A.D. 566. We have now only the portion which comprises 444-566. The *Chronicle*, as we have it, deals almost exclusively with the history of the Eutychian heresy, and the controversy about the *Three Chapters*. He also gives details about the Vandal persecution, the memory of which must have been still fresh in his youth, and various wonderful stories telling against Arianism as that of an Arian bishop who dared to change the baptismal formula, saying "Barbas baptizes thee in the name of the Father, through the Son, and in the Holy Ghost," whereupon the baptismal water disappeared out of the font and the vessel itself was smashed. The Catechumen immediately resorted to the Catholic church for the reception of the sacrament. The *Chronicle* is very useful for illustrations of the social and religious life of Cent. vi. Canisius first printed it in 1600. It is reprinted in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* t. lxxviii. with Galland's preface. Cf. Isidor *de Vir. Illust.* cap. 38; Cave's *Hist. Lit.* i. 415; Hodgkins, *Invaders of Italy*, iii. 35 and *passim*, quotes the *Chronicle*. A work on *Penitence*, included among the works of St. Ambrose, is attributed to Victor; Ceill. v. 512, x. 469, xi. 302. [G. T. S.]

VICTOR (49), bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux, succeeded Heraclius, but we do not know the year of his accession; it was after A.D. 541. From Sagittarius, bishop of Gap, and Salonius, bishop of Embrun, he received much persecution. [SAGITTARIUS.] He was present and subscribed at the council of Paris, A.D. 573 (Labbe, *Conc.* v. 920), and signed the synodical letter to king Sigebert (*Ib.* v. 922); he was at the council of Mâcon, A.D. 581 (*Ib.* v. 971). The date of his death is unknown (*Gall. Chr.* i. 707). [J. G.]

VICTOR (50), bishop of Palermo, is summoned to Rome by Gregory the Great in the first year of his pontificate, A.D. 591. Two years later the abbot Marinianus and the notary Benenatus are commissioned to inquire into his conduct to one Bonifacius. In A.D. 599 the Jews of Rome complained to Gregory that Victor had forcibly seized some synagogues at Palermo. Gregory at first ordered them to be restored, but, it appearing they had been already consecrated, ordered Victor to pay a price for them to be fixed by arbitration. The MSS. and other things belonging to the synagogues which had been carried away were to be restored. Three other letters of Gregory are addressed to Victor (lib. i. ind. ix. 72, lib. iii. ind. xi. 27, lib. viii. ind. i. 25, lib. ix. ind. ii. 55, lib. v. ind. xiii. 6, lib. vi. ind. xiv. 42, lib. ix. ind. ii. 92, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 526, 624, 927, 993, 727, 850, 1018). [F. D.]

VICTOR (51), bishop of Phausiana or Fasiana in Sardinia, was appointed in consequence of Gregory the Great's remonstrances, after the see had been long vacant. In A.D. 599 he is addressed with the other five suffragans of Sardinia [VINCENTIUS (18)]. He was successful in the missionary work for which he was appointed among the heathen Barbaricines [VITALIS (13)] and others. For his complaints of the officials see INNOCENTIUS (37). (*Epp.* iv. 29, ix. 8, xi. 5, 22.) [F. D.]

VICTOR (52), primate of Numidia. Two letters of Gregory the Great are addressed to him and Columbus, another Numidian bishop, jointly, and a third to him alone, a separate letter being written to Columbus on the same business, in A.D. 594, 598, and 602. The first relates to the measures to be taken to check the recent increase of Donatism, the second to the complaints made by bishop VALENTIO, and a third to those against PAULINUS (19). (*Epp.* iv. 35, viii. 28, xii. 29.) [F. D.]

VICTOR (53), ST., presbyter in Champagne in the 6th or 7th century, was, according to his anonymous biographer, sprung from a noble family of Troyes. He entered the ranks of the clergy, and lived the solitary life somewhere in that country, perhaps at Archiacum (Arcis-sur-Aube). The place of his burial, "in loco amoenus," is also uncertain. The day of his death and commemoration is given as Feb. 26. The biography published by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 665-67) has neither name nor date, though they consider it ancient. His supposed relics were transferred in the 9th century to the monastery of Moutier-Ramey; and in the 12th century, Bernard of Clairvaux, being asked by the abbat

of Moutier-Ramey to compose an office in honour of Victor, wrote a discourse and hymn still existing (*ibid.* 664, 667, 668; Ceillier, xiv. 458).

[S. A. B.]

VICTOR (54), elected bishop of Carthage July 16, 646. He at once sent a synodical letter to pope Theodore, announcing his election and declaring against the Monothelite heresy (Mansi, x. 943; Hefele, sec. 304; Ceill. xii. 925).

[G. T. S.]

VICTORIA (1), wife of presbyter FELIX (228), Cyp. *Ep.* 24.

[E. W. B.]

VICTORIA (2), martyr in Numidia in the persecution of Diocletian. [FORTUNATIUS (13); DATIVUS (3).]

[C. H.]

VICTORIA (3). [TWENTY MARTYRS.]

VICTORIA (4), confessor of Culusitana in Proconsular Africa under Hunneric. (Vict. Vit. *Persec. Vandal.* lib. v. 3.)

[C. H.]

VICTORIANUS (1), bishop of Carcavia, or Carcavia, a place of unknown site in Byzacene, present at the council of Cabarsussum in 393, and one of the twelve ordainers of Maximianus, condemned by the council of Bagaia (Aug. c. *Cresc.* iii. 19 § 22, 53 § 59, iv. 4 § 5, 13 § 15, c. *Gaud.* ii. 77, *Ep.* 108, 115) [MAXIMIANUS (2), Vol. III. p. 869].

[H. W. P.]

VICTORIANUS (2), bishop of Musti, to which Turris, or Turis, seems to have been joined. He was opposed at Carth. Conference A.D. 411 by Felicianus, Donatist bishop of Musti, and Donatus of Turis, who does not appear to have been present. (*Carth. Coll.* i. 121, 134; Aug. *Brevic. Coll.* i. 12.) A bishop of this name attended the council of Carthage A.D. 401 (Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* iii. 10).

[H. W. P.]

VICTORIANUS (3), a presbyter who wrote to St. Augustine for advice as to his conduct during the danger of barbarian invasion. He replied to him, pointing out (1) the general prevalence of the danger from which not either Italy, Gaul, or Spain, and even scarcely any part of the world was exempt; for even in the Egyptian desert some monasteries had been attacked. But in Africa the outrages of the Circumcellions were equal to those of the barbarians; for not only did they lay waste property, and inflict grievous bodily injuries, but they also compelled many to submit to rebaptism. 2. He ought to remember how all this had been foretold in Scripture, especially by our Lord, and also in the books of Daniel, Ezekiel, and Maccabees, and in the writings of St. Paul. If the question of desert be entertained, no one could deserve their punishment less than the three "children," or than Daniel himself; yet he was forward to confess his own sins, and those of his countrymen, and to acknowledge that both he and they had deserved what betel them. He exhorts Victorianus to teach his people not to murmur against God; that after all people must die in some way or other; and that a long illness is more distressing than a sudden death. The worst case is that of virgins dedicated to God; yet even instances are known, as that of the daughter of Severus

in which women carried off by barbarians, have been restored through the prayers of their friends. He ought therefore to pray and urge others to do so also; either that such women may not suffer violence, or that if it be suffered, it may not be imputed to them as sin. Purity resides not in the body, but in the soul. He therefore exhorts him to study Scripture carefully (Aug. *Ep.* 111.). [H. W. P.]

VICTORIANUS (4), a magistrate or "proconsul" of Carthage, under the Vandal domination, martyred under Huneric for refusing to join the Arians (Victor. *Vit. Persec. Vandal.* lib. v. 4). [C. H.]

VICTORIANUS (5), priest. [SABINUS (14).]

VICTORICUS (1), twenty-sixth bishop in Conc. Carth. ii. *de Pace*, Cyp. *Ep.* 57; thirty-fifth in iv. *de Basilide*, Cyp. *Ep.* 70; twenty-fifth in vii. *de Bap. Haer.* iii.; *Sentt. Epp.*, bishop of Thabraca in Numidia Proc., now Tabarka and Cap Roux, on river Tusca, a colony; its forests (Juv. 10, 194). Its port is now Ea Calle (Mommsen, p. 513). Its bishops at Conc. Carth. A.D. 388, and Coll. Carth. A.D. 411 (Morcelli). [E. W. B.]

VICTORICUS (2), disciple of St. Cyprian, martyred with Lucius, Montanus, and others. [FLAVIANUS (27).] (Tillem. iv. 206, 647.) [C. H.]

VICTORICUS (3), disciple of St. Patrick in Tirechan's list (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 378 n. 22); probably the man seen in S. Patrick's vision bearing innumerable letters, and specially the one with "Vox Hibernicorum" as related in St. Patrick's *Confession* (*Book of Armagh*, f. 24). [J. G.]

VICTORINUS (1). The tract against heresies by Pseudo-Tertullian closes with the notice of the heresy of Praxeas "quam Victorinus corroborare curavit." It has been suspected, and apparently with reason, that there is here a corruption of reading, and that under "Victorinus" the name of a Roman bishop is concealed. Those who suppose that Victor was the bishop referred to by Tertullian (*adv. Prax.* cap. 1) believe that Victor is also the person here intended. In the article MONTANISM (Vol. III. p. 941 a.) it has been contended that rather Zephyrinus is meant. Oehler (*Tertullian* ii. 765) makes a conjecture as to the possible origin of the corruption. [G. S.]

VICTORINUS (2). Mart. Carthag. A.D. 250. See ARISTO. [E. W. B.]

VICTORINUS (3), martyr in Egypt from Corinth with NICEPHORUS (2) under Numerian, c. 284. [C. H.]

VICTORINUS (4), ST., of Pettau, bishop and martyr. This saint appears to have been by birth a Greek, and was (according to the repeated statement of Cassiodorus) a rhetorician by profession before he became bishop of Pettau (Petavio), in Upper Pannonia. He is believed to have suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Diocletian. St. Jerome (who is the chief authority concerning him), mentions him several times, and even where his criticisms are adverse,

with words which show respect. He enumerates among his works (*Catal. Script. Eccles.* 74), commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Habakkuk, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, the Gospel according to St. Matthew, and the Apocalypse, besides a treatise "adversus omnes haereses." He says, however, in the same place, that he knew less Latin than Greek "unde opera ejus, grandia sensibus, viliora videntur compositione verborum." Elsewhere, he seems to criticize him in a more disparaging way, as in the epistle to Magnus (tom. iv. p. 65), "Victorino martyri licet desit eruditio, non tamen deest eruditionis voluntas;" and in the second epistle to Paulinus (tom. iv. p. 567), "Inclyto Victorinus martyrio coronatus, quod intelligit, eloqui non potest." He occasionally cites the opinion of Victorinus, both in his own Commentaries (*in Eccles.* iv. 13; *in Ezech.* xxvi.) and elsewhere, but he considered him to have been affected by the opinions of the Chiliasts or Millenarians (see *Catal. Script.* 18, and the passage cited from the Commentary on Ezekiel), and he also states that he borrowed extensively from Origen. Still, when he mentions him in the character of a translator of Origen, he mentions him in such company as that of St. Hilary and St. Ambrose, speaking of them collectively as "quasi columnas ecclesiae" (*Apol. adv. Ruf.* tom. iv. p. 351; *de Error. Origen.* tom. iv. p. 346). It may have been in consequence of his Millenarian tendencies, or of his relations to Origen, that his works were classed as "apocrypha" in the "Decretum de libris recipiendis," which Baronius (ad ann. 303) erroneously refers to a synod held under Gelasius.

Of the works of St. Victorinus little or nothing is left: nothing, indeed, which can be attributed to him with any certainty. The poems which have had his name attached to them are attributed to him without any authority better than that of Bede: while the two lines quoted by Bede as the work of Victorinus were clearly written by some one who had a tolerable knowledge of Latin.

The scholia on the Apocalypse published in La Bigne's *Bibl. Patr.* i. 1245, answer well enough to what Cassiodorus (*de Inst. Div. Lit.* 9, p. 544, ed. Bened.) tells us of the Commentary of Victorinus on that book: that it was a collection of notes on difficult passages. But these notes oppose the Millenarian opinion, and cite Theodore, the ecclesiastical historian of Justinian's reign. Hence, even if the body of them be the work of St. Victorinus (which is quite uncertain), they must be seriously interpolated. So with the "Scholia of Victorinus on the Apocalypse" in Gallandius, *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. iv. The two, as Routh remarks (*Rel. Sacr.* iii. 482), are closely akin, and each may be emended from the other, while the resemblances to the fragment next to be mentioned make it probable that they are by the same author. But the explanation of the "number of the beast" by the name of Genseric, given in the scholia in Gallandius, shows that there also have been revised, at least, by a later hand than that of St. Victorinus.

A fragment, "de fabrica mundi," was edited by Cave (*Script. Eccles. Hist.* i. 148) from a Lambeth MS., and has been re-edited by Routh, with other fragments extracted from St. Jerome

and notes (*Rel. Sacr.* tom. iii. pp. 453 et sqq.). This fragment seems to satisfy the conditions of a composition of St. Victorinus as described by St. Jerome in everything but its intrinsic value. It is obscure; it is the work of an author who did not know Latin (for, even allowing for the corrupt state of the MS., the Latin of the writer is singularly bad); and it may be taken to favour the Millenarian opinions. But it is difficult to suppose that this fragment is really the work of an author whom St. Jerome classed with St. Hilary and St. Ambrose, indeed, if it is a fair specimen of the work of which it once formed a part, the loss of the rest can hardly be matter of regret. It is possible that it may be a portion of the commentary on Genesis, but it is perhaps more probable that both this fragment and the scholia on the Apocalypse are the work of another Victorinus, and that all the works of the bishop of Pettau have been lost.

[H. A. W.]

VICTORINUS (5), a Numidian bishop mentioned in the letter of Constantine A.D. 330 (*Mon. Vet. Don.* xxvi. p. 215 Oberthür, p. 189 Dupin).

[H. W. P.]

VICTORINUS (6), called CAIUS MARIUS (by Jerome, *Commentary on Galatians, Proleg.*), and also MARIUS FABIVS (in MS. of his commentary on Cicero and elsewhere, see Suringar, *Historia Scholast. Lat.* p. 153, note): known also as AFER, from the country of his birth, is to be distinguished from two Christian writers called Victorinus, mentioned by Gennadius (*de Scriptor. Eccl.* capp. 60 and 88), as well of course as from Victorinus of Petau, the commentator on the Apocalypse, and also from the Grammatical writers Victorinus Maximus and Quintus Fabius Laurentius Victorinus (see Launoy, *Opp.* tom. ii. P. 1, pp. 645 sq. *De quinque illustribus Victorinis*, and J. E. B. Mayor's *Clue to Latin Literature*, pp. 172-3). He was a celebrated man of letters and rhetorician in Rome in the middle of the 4th century. "Victorinus rhetor et Donatus grammaticus Romae insignes habentur," says Jerome, in his "Chronicon" for the year 358. He had the instruction of the most distinguished classes, and was altogether in such high reputation that a statue was erected in his honour in the forum of Trajan. (S. Augustine, *Confessions*, viii. 2, "doctissimus senex et omnium liberalium doctrinarum peritissimus quique philosophorum tam multa et legerat et didicaverat et dilucidaverat, doctor tot nobilium senatorum qui etiam ob insigne praeclari magistratus statuam in Romano Foro meruerat et acceperat," Jerome *Chronicon, ut supra*, and Boethius, *In Topica Cic. Commentar. ad init.* "Victorinus plurimae in disserendo notitiae.")

Among his writings belonging to the pre-Christian period of his life, there remain to us, 1. An "Ars grammatica," of which very little is original (see Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, vol. vi. praef. pp. xv.-xvii., and C. Thiemann, *Jahr. für Class. Philologie*, vol. 107, pp. 429-432).

2. A little treatise "de Metris Horatianis" (Keil, vol. vi. praef. pp. xvii, xviii).

3. A commentary on Cicero's treatise on Rhetoric "de Inventione" (Suringar, *Hist. Crit. Schol. Lat.* pp. 155-161). It is printed in Orelli's *Cicero*, vol. v. (Turin, 1833). It was written when he was in close relation to Chris-

tianity, if not after he became a Christian. (See B. I. p. 59, l. 42, Orelli.)

This appears to be all that remains to us of this period of his life, and in regard to his grammatical and metrical works, there is great difficulty in distinguishing what belongs to him from the work of other authors of the same name. Indeed, from every point of view, and in every stage of his life, this author presents almost insuperable difficulties to his commentators.*

There is nothing in these remains to account for his celebrity, and his commentary on Cicero presents anticipations of the intense obscurity of his later theological writings.

Besides these works we hear of others which have perished.

1. Translations of writings of the Platonists. (*Aug. Conf.* viii. 2.) His later theological works assure us of his familiarity with the philosophy of the Neo-Platonist Schools.

2. Other commentaries on Cicero. (See Suringar, *op. cit.* pp. 156-160, for further references.)

3. A translation of Porphyry's *Isagoge*, employed by Boethius (*Isidorus, Etymol. (al. Origines)* ii. 25, § 9).

4. Logical works, *De syllogismis hypotheticis* and *De divisione definitionum*. (*Isidor. Etymol.* ii. 28, § 25 and 29. For further references to these works, see Prantl, *Gesch. der Logik*, i. pp. 661, 662.)

Victorinus' conversion is the subject of the well-known narrative in St. Augustine's *Confessions*. (B. viii. capp. 2-5.) In extreme old age the zealous study of scripture and Christian literature^b brought him to the conviction of the truth of the Christian religion. He told Simplician, afterwards bishop of Milan, that he was a Christian, and when Simplician refused to regard him as such till he saw him "in the church," asked him in banter "whether walls, then, make Christians"?—a characteristic question from one disposed to regard Christianity rather as another school of philosophy than as a social organization. The fear of his friends, however, which kept him from making profession of his faith, was removed by further meditation, and after being enrolled as a catechumen for a short time, he was baptized, and by his own deliberate choice made his preliminary profession of faith with the utmost publicity. St. Augustine gives us a vivid account of the excitement and joy his conversion caused in Christian circles at Rome.

The date of his conversion is uncertain. It was at least before the end of the reign of Constantius, A.D. 361 (vid. subter). But he continued to teach rhetoric, etc., in Rome till the year 362, when Julian's edict forbidding Christians to be public teachers made his position inconsistent with his religious convictions. (*Aug. Conf.* l.c.) Then "choosing rather to give over the wordy school than God's Word," he withdrew, and as St. Jerome emphasizes the great age which he

* See a pathetic complaint of a 16th century editor, quoted by Keil (vol. vi. praef. p. x.), "Torsit pro exiguitate sua hic nos Victorinus satis misere."

^b He seems to speak of himself (*ad Justin. Manich. init.*) as one "qui multa lectione, continui laboris indefessis vigiliis, tenuerit quid ad fidem legis debeat confiteri."

had attained before his conversion, it is not surprising that we should hear nothing more of him. He lived, however, long enough to write a number of Christian treatises and commentaries, and it is even possible that Jerome alludes to him as still alive on the breaking out of the disputes connected with the name of Jovinian in 382. (See *Prolegomena* to Victorinus in Migne's *Patrolog. Lat.* vol. viii. p. 994, for reference and question of reading.)

The following is a list and brief notice of his Christian writings. (For further information on editions, etc., the *Prolegomena* in Migne's edition can be consulted):—

1. The Anti-Arian treatise, "Liber de generatione Verbi Divini" written in reply to the "Liber de Generatione Divina" addressed to Victorinus by Candidus the Arian.

2. The long work "Adversus Arium," in four books, elicited by Candidus's brief rejoinder to the former treatise. [See CANDIDUS (4).] The second book of his treatise alludes to Constantius as still emperor (B. ii. cap. 9). It must have been written therefore not later than 361. The first book (cap. 28), according to the better reading (see Migne's *Prolegomena*, § 7), speaks of the Nicene Council as having occurred "forty years before" (ante xl. annos), and should have been written, therefore, about 365. It is possible the first book may have been actually written after the second, or the expression may be simply inexact.

3. The "De $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ recipiendo," a summary of the last-named work.

4. Three "Hymns" on the subject of the Trinity which have not even the claims to rhythmical structure possessed by St. Augustine's "Psalmus contra partem Donati." They consist mainly of formulas and prayers intended to elucidate the relations of the Trinity. On the contents of the above writings, enough will be said below.

5. Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, Philippians, and Ephesians.

Without having much continuous merit as commentaries (see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 227), these writings contain a great number of points of doctrinal interest to be noticed below. They are probably the first Latin commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles. (See Jerome, *Commentar. in Gal. Prologus*.)

6. An anti-Manichaean treatise which may with reasonable certainty be ascribed to Victorinus (Migne, *Prolegomena*, § 3), entitled by Sirmond, who first edited it in 1630, "Ad Justinum Manichaeum contra duo principia Manichaeorum et de vera carne Christi." It is the first treatise against the Manichaeans which exists, and insists with considerable insight on the inconsistencies of their dualism.*

7. A little treatise of a very strange character, edited by Sirmond in company with (6), and entitled "De Verbis Scripturae Factum est vespere et mane dies unus."^a

Besides these we may notice the *De Physicis*, ascribed to our author by Cardinal Mai (see his

* It is, however, curious to find a Christian appealing to Roman pride against an Oriental "sacrilege" (a Persico vel Armeniorum sacrilegio), cap. 16.

^a It seems, in asserting the substantiality of darkness (cap. 2), to contradict the previous treatise (cap. 10).

remarks in Migne prefixed to the treatise, p. 1295). It is a plainly and ably-written treatise on the Creation, Fall, and Recovery of Man. But the style does not suggest the authorship of Victorinus, and the character of the quotations from the New Testament seems also to argue a different author (see below, p. 24, note w). Again, there is a poem on the Maccabees sometimes, but certainly erroneously, ascribed to Victorinus (see under *Hilary of Arles* [HILARIUS (17)], p. 71), and correct reference in JULIANUS, p. 504).

We have some allusions in his extant works to others which have perished, e.g. on Eph. iv. 10 (lib. ii. *init.*) there is an allusion to a commentary on the Corinthians. Cardinal Mai refers to a commentary on Leviticus by Victorinus extant in the Vatican (see Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrés*, vol. iv. p. 328, note 2).

All these writings of Victorinus (with the exception of the commentaries which make a nearer approach to lucidity) are intensely obscure. It is matter of astonishment that one who had Victorinus' reputation as a rhetorician should have been so wholly incapable of giving clear expression to his thoughts. His intense obscurity in treating theological subjects of themselves recondite, aggravated by the extremely corrupt condition of the text as hitherto edited,^e the barbarous mixture of Greek and bad Latin in which he often writes, his prolixity and his repetitions, have been the causes of his being ignored more than is at all justified by his substantial merits. He has wearied the very few people who have tried to read him beyond their patience, and they have almost wholly missed his significance. Those who have read him have mostly done nothing but complain of him. "He wrote," says Jerome, "in a dialectical style some very obscure books, intelligible only to the learned" (*De Vir. Illustr.* ci.). He condemns him, moreover, as a man so occupied in secular literature as to have ignored Holy Scripture (*Epist. ad Galat. Prologus*), a judgment reversed by Augustine (*Confessions*, viii. 2) and the evidence of his works. Petavius, besides accusing him of an heretical tendency,^f matched him with Heraclitus as δ σκοτεινός, and condemned him as "incommoda balbutientem" (*De Trin.* i. v. § 8). Such commentators as he has had show scant patience with him (see Migne's edition, p. 1179, note 3; 1245, note 3; 1265, note 4). He is "obscurissimus," "barbarus," "ferreus." Tillemont would not trouble himself to search his works (*Mém. Eccl.* vol. x. p. 799, l. 4). Ceillier (*Auteurs Sacrés*) commends him with an utter want of appreciation of his peculiar position. Dorner ignores him. But there is one notable exception to these severe judgments on Victorinus' style and matter and

^e A great number of corrections of the text can be made by any reader, e.g. *Adv. Ar.* i. cap. xxiii. (p. 1056 in Migne, 7th line from bottom) $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ for $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ cap. xlv. (17th line from bottom of p. 1074), "recipienda virtutem," for "recipienda, virtutem," cap. xlix. l. 11, nullam for unam. [A better text exists in a hitherto unedited MS. (No. 1684, Phillips' Library, Cheltenham) of the 10th or 11th century. It has been used for this article.]

^f He is ably defended against Petavius' careless denunciation by the Ballerini, *Dissertationes de S. Zenone*, ii. cap. 1, § 8. Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. xi. p. 111.

these ignorings of his significance. Thomassin, whose theological judgment is a weighty one, speaks of him as a man "inferior to none in the profundity of his insight into the inmost mysteries" of the Divine Being, and the relation of the Persons of the Trinity to one another (*De Incarn. Verbi*, B. ii. cap. i. § 6).

This judgment will put us on the right lines for estimating his position and his powers. He has no special merits as a commentator, nor the capacities of a dogmatic theologian in the ordinary sense. He does not manipulate skilfully the stock anti-Arian arguments. He combats, in general as badly as possible, the objection to the *gouoovios*, on the ground of its being an unscriptural term (*Adv. Ar.* i. 30, p. 1063 B.C.²; and ii. 8, 9, pp. 1094-5). He has none of the controversial power and vividness of an Athanasius or an Augustine.³ Almost all his importance lies in his metaphysical and speculative capacities, and in his belief in the power of the intellect to give a rational presentation of the Trinitarian Creed, etc. He does indeed feel the danger of such speculation. "It is madness," he says (*Adv. Justin.* 2, 1000 C), "to suppose that while we are almost unknown to ourselves, we should have either the capacity or the leave to investigate what lies beyond ourselves and the world." He rebukes Candidus for writing about God "tam audenter." He would have him keep himself to the Scripture.⁴ "Magnam tuam intelligentiam quis fascinavit?" he asks. "De Deo dicere, supra hominem audacia est" (*De Gen.* i. p. 1019, C, D). He ends his own first answer to Candidus with a striking prayer to God to forgive his sin involved in writing about God (*De Gen.* ad fin.). But the "fascination" of such subjects he feels himself to the full, and, on the whole, he is sure that they are within the power of the illuminated Christian intellect. "Lift up thyself, my spirit," he cries, "and recognise that to understand God is difficult, but not beyond hope." (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 6, 1102 D.)

The special character of his theology may be further explained by two epithets. 1. Though post-Nicene in date, it is *ante-Nicene* in character.⁵ The doctrine of the subordination of the Son is emphasized by him, and this very subordination doctrine is used against Arianism without the least suspicion of its being itself open to the charge of any Arianizing tendency. He sees, as boldly as the earlier theologians, anticipations of the Incarnation in the Theophanies of the Old Testament (*Adv. Ar.* iv. 32, 1136 C). He retains the ante-Nicene interpretations of crucial texts—"My Father is greater than I" (St. John xiv. 28), etc. "What has come into being in Him was life" (St. John i. 3).⁶ He keeps the functions of

the Incarnate in the closest possible relation to the Cosmic function of the Pre-Incarnate Word.

2. His theology is *Neo-Platonist* in tone. Here we get to the really special interest attaching to Victorinus' works. He had grown old before his conversion in the Neo-Platonist schools. When he was converted, he applied many principles of the Plotinian philosophy to the elucidation of the Christian mysteries. His importance in this respect has been entirely overlooked in the history of theology. He preceded the Pseudo-Dionysius. He anticipated a great deal that appears in Scotus Erigena. If he is sometimes more Neo-Platonist than Christian, this is no doubt due in part to his mind having lost the flexibility of youth and middle age before he applied himself to Christian theology.

- Here shall be given—
- I. A summary of his theological system.
- II. An estimate of its relation to Neo-Platonism.

III. A specification of further points in his theology which demand notice.

IV. A notice of his importance in relation to the ante-Hieronymian versions of the Latin Bible.

1. The following is a summarized statement of his mode of conceiving the relations of the Trinity and the processes of creation and redemption.

Candidus had objected to the orthodox doctrine that in asserting *generation* in God, it asserted *change* ("omnis generatio per mutationem est"), and thus contradicted the essential idea of God; further, he had contended that the idea of a "genitus Deus ex prae-existente substantia" is in contradiction to the "simplicity" of the Divine substance. Dwelling on ideas such as these of the Divine immutability and simplicity, he believed himself, in fighting against the Catholic doctrine, to be contending for the dignity of God, "the infinite, the incomprehensible, the unknowable, the invisible, the unchangeable" (Candidi Arian. *Lib. de Gen. Div.* 1-3; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* viii. 1015).⁷ To this Victorinus's reply is central and final. Your transcendent and immutable God is so conceived that He can come into no possible relation to anything beyond Himself. To become a creator at a certain moment in time—to act in creation, as much involves *change* as the act of generation. If you admit, as you must, that God can create without change, you must admit equally that he can generate. You have admitted a "motus" which is not "mutatio" (*De Gen.* 30, 1035, A B). But this proceeding forth of God in the action of creation is only not a "change" in the Divine Essence, because it has its origin and ground there. It has been the eternal being of God to proceed forth, to move, to live. This eternal motion, eternal transition in God, it is that we, speaking in the necessarily inadequate terms of

² These references are to the pages or columns of the 8th volume of Migne's *Patrologia*.

³ We may, however, notice that he states vigorously, and for the first time, the dilemma based on Christ's claim of union with the Father. "Hoc dicens Deus fuit, si mentitus non est: si autem mentitus est, non opus Dei omnimodis perfectum." *De Gener.* i. 1020 C.

⁴ He uses here the ordinary Christian language about the authority of Scripture: but cf. *Adv. Ar.* ii. 3, 1091 C.

⁵ Dr. Newman refers to him in this connection. See *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical*, pp. 247, seq.

⁶ See on St. John xiv. 28 (*Adv. Ar.* i. 13, p. 1047 C). "Major Pater quod ipse dedit ipsi omnia et causa est ipsi Filio ut sit, et isto modo sit." "Filius autem esset,

accept," cf. his comment on Philipp. iii. 21 (p. 1227, A B), with reference to 1 Cor. xv. 28 (the subjection of the Son)—a very ambiguous passage, but of great interest. "Verbum subditum est Deo, est enim Deus potentior. Ille est qui mittit. Hic qui mittitur. Hic per quem operatio est, Ille operator." Cf. his interpretation of Gabriel's Message to the Blessed Virgin, *Adv. Ar.* i. 58, p. 1054 D; and on St. John i. 3, 4, *Adv. Ar.* i. 4, p. 1042 B, etc.

⁷ This little treatise concludes with an interesting statement of the position of the Arian Christ, cap. 10, 11.

human discourse,^m call the "eternal generation of the Son." (*De Gen.* 1, 1019 D; *De Gen.* 29, 1034 B.; *Adv. Arium*, i. 43, 1074 A B. The "esse" of God is equivalent to "moveri," "et moveri ipsum quod est esse.")

This fact Victorinus endeavours to express with certainly wearisome reiteration, in a great variety of formulas. But again and again he emphasizes, as a fact which is to be received on faith and then recognised by reason,ⁿ that whatever the feebleness of human language may suggest (and he uses it himself sometimes very unguardedly, even once using the word "junior" of the Son), the process is utterly out of all conditions of time or succession. It belongs to the eternal law of the Divine Being.^o (Cf. *Adv. Arium*, i. 34, 1066 D, "semper generans generatio"; iv. 21, 1128 C, "sine tempore hoc accipi"; *Hymn*, i. 1141 C, "re prius, non tempore"; cf. *De Gen.* 20, 21, 22. For careless language see *Adv. Ar.* i. 20, 1053 D, again "creatus" of the Son; *Hymn*. iii. 1144 C.)

This "generatio" is expressed not most frequently, but perhaps in such a way as to afford the best starting-point in exposition, as the eternal utterance of the Divine Will, moving eternally into actuality: the will of God not for one instant failing of its absolutely self-adequate effect. "Every act of will is the progeny of that which wills." Thus of the Father's will, the Word or Son is the summary or universal effect. Eternally He issued forth (prosiliiit), the eternal manifestation of the Father's self; one with the Father. "The Father is God, and the Son is His will, both one, not by union, but by simplicity of essence, the will proceeding forth into actualized capacity (in potentiam actuosam), but not withdrawing from the Father's own substance and identical motion" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 31-32, 1064 A B C). "If anyone thinks deeply on this he will find that God and His will are inseparable, and yet in a way separable. . . . The conceived will issues and is expressed by a sort of mental birth. For the thoughts of the mind are, as it were, the offspring of the mind. Thus as God in his universal thought has but one will, therefore one and only begotten is the Son. He thought not one thing first and then another." The eternal act of thought or will has one eternal Object (*in Epist. ad Ephes.* i. 1, 1236 B.C). Thus the generation of the Son is, according to Victorinus, "non a necessitate naturae sed voluntate Patris. Ipse se ipsum circumterminavit" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 31).^p

^m *Adv. Ar.* ii. 3, 1091 A, circa prima et summa verba deficient; cf. *de Gen.* 28, 1033 D, 1034 A, we have no celestial language: accordingly "a nostris actionibus nominamus; actiones Dei, existente tamen illo super omnia."

ⁿ *Ad Ephes.* iii. 18, 1269, C, "Ordo est ut prior fides sit: qui enim credit is ad scientiam venit."

^o All life is a *now*. "Non enim vivimus praeteritum aut vivimus futurum, sed semper praesenti utimur." In this respect our life is an "imago aeternitatis," quae "semper per praesentiam habet omnia et haec semper." (*Adv. Ar.* iv. 15, 1124 A.)

^p See on this question Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, p. 24, note 6; Newman's *Arians*, cap. ii. § 4; Athanasius' *Treatises against Arianism* (Library of Fathers), references in Index under head of "Will." Athanasius would not necessarily have condemned the expression in this context.

As the Son is thus conceived of as the eternal object of the Divine will, so he is the eternal and adequate object of Divine self-knowledge. As the Father eternally wills, so the Father eternally knows, Himself in the Son. The Divine knowledge, like the Divine will, must have its adequate object. God knows Himself in the Son; for the Son is the expression of His own being. The Son is thus the "forma" of God and His limitation. This is a thought which constantly recurs. It is not that God is limited from outside, but that the infinite and the indeterminate in expressing Himself, limits or conditions Himself. He knows Himself in the Logos or determinate, definite Utterance; and thus the unconditioned, the absolute, the Father, limits or conditions Himself in that eternal utterance by which He knows Himself. Knowledge is thus conceived of as limitation or form; it is an eternal abiding relation of subject and object. Once for all the Father knows Himself as what He is in the Son. The Son is thus an object of knowledge both distinct from the Father (foris) and one with the Father—distinct from Him because the object of knowledge stands over against the subject; one with Him because He is the Father's own essence, and in knowing Him the Father knows Himself. This is constantly expressed. In all acts of knowledge there is an "alteritas nata" — "Cognoscentia foris est ab illo quod cupit cognoscere," but yet there is a unity of the knowing and the known; so when the Divine Being eternally moves out to the knowledge of Himself, there is the same distinction and unity. "In isto, sine intellectu temporis, tempore . . . est alteritas nata, cito in identitatem revertit" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 57, 58, 1083 D, etc.). Thus the "intelligentia" which is the Son, proceeds from and is one with the "esse," which is the Father (*Adv. Arium*, iii. 4, 1102 A, etc.). For all this conception of the Son as knowledge or "forma," a multitude of references can be given (*Hymn*. iii. 1145 A; *Adv. Ar.* i. 53, 1081 D; iv. 11, 1121 A; iv. 19, 1127 B.C). The Father is "incognitus," "interminatus," considered (as He cannot be) in Himself,—the Son "imponit terminum," "definit," etc. He is both "definitus et definitur" iv. 19, 20, etc. See also St. Irenaeus c. *Haeres.* B. iv. 4 § 2 Immensus Pater in Filio mensuratus: Mensura Patris Filii. Cf. Synesius *Hymn* iii. (to the Son) ὄρος ἐὶ φύσιων, τὰς τεκτοίνας καὶ τεκτομένας. Cf. *Hymn* v. ὁ πατρὸς μορφή.

It is only stating this same principle in broader terms to say that the Son is to the Father as effect to cause (*Adv. Arium*, iv. 3, 1115 A), that is to say, He is the revelation of all the Father is. What the Father is, the Son expresses, exhibits, manifests. As outward intelligence and life express our inner being, so the Father, the inner being, is expressed in the Son. The Father is the *esse*, the *vivens*, the Son the *Vita*, the actualized life. (*Adv. Arium*, i. 32, 42.) Substance can only be known by its manifestations in life (iii. 11, 1107 B.) The Father is the "motio," the Son the "motus." What the Father is inwardly (in abscondito) the Son is outwardly (foris). He is the "substantia quaedam subsistens in qua apparet et demonstratur quod occultum et velatum est in alio." The Father is "silentium," "cessatio," "quies." The Son is the "progressio, quod non dimittens unde pro-

greditur, magis est apparentia." Thus in the broadest sense He is the utterance of the Father. (*Adv. Arium*, i. 52, 1081; iii. 7, 1103 d. Cf. Irenaeus iv. 6 § 6: Invisible Filii Pater, Visibile Patris Filius.) This again is frequently expressed by describing the life of God as the eternal actualizing of what is potential. All things are potentially in the Father, actually in the Son. The Son is the "image" of the Father, because He does not, like a creature, express the Father's power or wisdom, but expresses, actualizes the Father's self. (Cf. *Adv. Arium*, i. 19, etc. "Quod est esse, Pater est: quod species, Filius: esse autem speciei imago est ejus quod est esse," "imago substantia est ejus et in qua est imago . . . in declarationem intus potentiae. Hinc Pater Qui intus: filius qui foris.") It is only this same idea which Victorinus expresses in the phrase the Father is to the Son as $\delta \mu\eta \acute{\omega}\nu$ to $\delta \acute{\omega}\nu$. The Father is $\delta \mu\eta \acute{\omega}\nu$ in the one of the four possible senses⁹ of the "not being" (*De Gen.* 3): He is the super-essential, the transcendent: that which is prior to all substantialization. This idea finds a great variety of expressions. He is the *πρωτόν* or *πρόον*, the "prae-principium," the "prae-causa," "ante omnem existentialitatem," the "supra-universale," the "prae-existentia potius quam existentia"—not through lack of anything but by absolute transcendental priority of being. (*Adv. Arium*, iv. 19, 1127 B; iv. 23, 1129 D; i. 37, 1069 A; i. 39, 1070 B. This thought occupies a great part of the *Liber de Gen.*; cf. Newman's *Arians*, c. ii. § 4, p. 191.) The Son, on the other hand, is the "existentia" (actualized existence), the "universale," the "principium," etc. All this only expresses the idea which is the essence of Victorinus' thought, the idea of the Son as that in which the supreme, the unconditioned Father finds His conditioning form or realization.¹⁰ So utterly essential is He to the Being of God, that nothing can be so untrue as to describe Him as created. It were better even to deny Him begotten than to assert Him created (*de Gen.* 17, 1030 A). He is the "actio," the Father is the Being: and Perfect Being involves perfect action: "In eo quod est, inest et operari." "Generatur agere ab eo quod est esse." Action involves being and being action. The Father and the Son are one. "Unum ergo et simplex ista duo" (*De Gen.* 22). In this conception of the relation of the Son to the Father is involved at once His absolute consubstantiality and His absolute subordination. "The Father is greater" than the Son, not in virtue of having or being anything which the Son is or has not, but as He that gives is prior to Him that receives. "The Son has Life," not as a creature but "in Himself." He has it as the Father has it, but "He has received from the Father what He has, and is" (*Adv. Arium*, i. 42, vide supra p. 15, note k). Thus he is said to be "subditus." The Father is even said to be "potentior"

(*Epist. ad Philipp.* 1227 A) as He who sends commands, works, is to Him who is sent, and through whom He works. He is again described as "beatior," though the Son is "totus Deus," like the Father, and "equal in substance and power and dignity." (*Adv. Arium*, i. 13, 1047 C.) Thus the *Λόγος* is often spoken of as "ministering" to the Father, even in virtue of being that "subsistent Life through whom all things live" (*Adv. Arium*, i. 52, 1080 C; iv. 8, 1118 C).

The passages¹¹ in which the distinction between the *ἐνδιθέτος* and the *προφορικὸς Λόγος* are implied are not many or emphatic in Victorinus. He holds it in no such emphatic sense as Tertullian. The Son is eternally Son and self-subsistent. That "effluentia" "Filietas" is out of all time, absolute (*Adv. Arium*, i. 27, 1060 D). "Catholica disciplina dicit et semper fuisse Patrem et semper Filium" (*Ad Phil.* 1210 A). Yet Victorinus admits there is a sense in which he may be called "maxime filius" in Humanity (1061 A), and speaks of Him as getting the name of Son, the "Name above every Name," only in His Incarnate exaltation (*Ad Philipp.* 1210 C D, ita ut tantum nomen accesserit, res eadem fuerit).

Victorinus' thought expresses itself thus naturally in the doctrine of the generation of the Son and His co-essential equality with the Father. But his thought does not so easily adapt itself to formulas which express the Being, Procession and Substantiality of the Holy Ghost. He intends to be perfectly orthodox. He accepts the Faith, even though he finds it difficult to formulate. The Holy Ghost then proceeds very emphatically in his teaching "from the Father and the Son." "Sicut a gremio Patris et in gremio, Filius; sic a ventre Filii Spiritus; *ἀποούσιον* ergo tres; et idcirco in omnibus Unus Deus." Again: "Ex Filio Spiritus Sanctus, sicut ex Deo Filius conrationaliter, et Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre." Again: "A filio habet quod est" (*Adv. Arium*, i. 8, 12, 13, 16, 1044 C, 1046 D, 1048 A, 1050 C). Elsewhere he says of the Holy Spirit that "Ex Deo Patre omnia habet, *τῷ Λόγῳ*, hoc est Jesu Christo tradente illi omnia quae habet a Patre" (*Adv. Arium*, i. 47, 1077 B, cf. iii. 8, 1105, A, B, and iii. 15, 1111 B). Once again He is "a Patre per Christum et in Christo" (*Adv. Arium*, iv. 33, 1138 A). Thus the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son: He is subsequent in order to the Son. On the other hand, as "Spirit of the Father" there is a sense in which He precedes the Son; that is to say He, as that which God is—Spirit, is that in which the Father begets the Son. He conveys the Father's Life to the Son. He is the "progressus," as well as the "regressus" of God: and thus in one passage He is mysteriously described as "the Mother of Jesus" in His eternal life.¹² But the passage is

⁹ Quoted by Dr. Newman; see "Tracts," quoted above, p. 15.

¹⁰ Also apparently in the flesh: "et supra et deorsum," 1084, C D. This strange expression receives, when viewed in its context, some elucidation from passages in Victorinus' contemporary, Hilary of Poitiers. See Dorner, *Person of Christ* (Clark's edition), vol. ii. pp. 403-405. The Word (the "Virtus altissimi") and the Spirit produce in conjunction the human nature.

¹¹ Vide infra, p. 20 note d and p. 22 note m.

¹² This is by no means strictly adhered to, e.g. *adv. Arium*, iii. 18: 1113 C. The Father is described as "actualis existentia," "substantialitas." The Son is "actus existentialis."

¹³ It must surely be regarded as very remarkable that the Divine relation of love finds almost no expression in Victorinus.

apparently intentionally veiled in obscurity" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 16, 1050 c; i. 58, 1084 c).

In all this the distinction of Son and Spirit is carefully maintained, but yet the essential duality which is in God—the distinction of that which is, from that which proceeds forth—the distinction expressed in all the antitheses referred to above, is clearer to Victorinus than the Trinity of relations. The Son and the Spirit seem to him more utterly one than the Father and the Son. They are "existentiae duae," but they proceed forth "in uno motu" and that "motus" is the Son: so that the Spirit is as it were, contained in the Son (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 8, 1105 A).

Thus Victorinus sometimes speaks as if the Spirit were the Son in another aspect (he even says "idem ipse et Christus et Spiritus Sanctus," see *Adv. Arium*, iii. 18, 1113 D and i. 59, 1085 B). He has also a subtle mode of speaking of the Spirit as the "Λόγος in occulto," and Christ Incarnate as the "Λόγος in manifesto;" Logos and Spiritus being used interchangeably; or again Christ is the "Spiritus apertus," the Spirit the "Spiritus occultus" (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 14, 1109 B C). Again the Spirit is the "interior Christi virtus" (iv. 17, 1125 c) in whom Christ is present (1109 c). The confusion seems to spring from the use of "Spiritus" as meaning the Divine Nature. But in intention and generally the two persons are kept distinct. If Christ is the "vox," the Spirit is the "vox vocis" (*Adv. Arium*, iii. 16, 1111 c, i. 13, 1048 A), or again, as the Son is Life the Spirit is Knowledge ("vivere quidem Christus, intelligere Spiritus," *Adv. Arium*, i. 13, 1048 B), or again the relations of the Trinity are expressed in formulas such as these: "visio, videre, discernere:" "esse, vivere, intelligere," expressing three stages of a great act (*Adv. Arium*, iii. 4, 5; the latter chapter should be studied).

Again, Victorinus is the first theologian to speak of the Spirit as the principle of unity in the Godhead, the bond or "copula" of the eternal Trinity, completing the perfect circle of the Divine Being, the return of God upon Himself. (*Adv. Ar.* i. 60, 1085, c, d, "sphaera," "circularis motus." Hymn 1, ad init. et fin. Hymn iii. 1144 A, "status, progressio, regressus." See also a passage somewhat more Platonic than Christian, *Adv. Ar.* i. 51, 1080 A.)

On His work in the Incarnation his language is clear (*Adv. Arium*, iii. 18, 1113 C, D), "ex ipso concipitur Christus in carne; ex ipso sanctificatur in baptismo Christus in carne; ipse est in Christo qui in carne; ipse datur Apostolis a Christo qui in carne."

In stating the doctrine of the Trinity in general, Victorinus insists with endless reiteration on the circuminsession of the Three Persons,—"omnes in alternis existentes, et semper simul *ὑποούστωι* divina affectione, secundum actionem (tantummodo) subsistentiam propriam habentes:"

† The passage in the original is spoken of the Spirit in his special quality as "Intelligentia," vide subter, p. 19. The idea recurs in mystical writers.

‡ So the words "genitus," "procedens," are not kept strictly to the second and third Persons of the Trinity respectively. The Spirit is said once (*Adv. Arium*, iv. 23, 1138 A), to be "genitus," and the "processio" of the Son is frequently spoken of, e.g. i. 27, 1066 D; i. 14, 1048 B.

"uterque in utroque" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 15, 16, 1050 A, c, cf. iii. 9, 10). They are one with a unity which transcends number—"ante unum quod est in numero, plane simplex": "unde et Pater et Filius et Spiritus non solum unum, sed et unus Deus" (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 1, 1098 D). Yet in the unity there is a distinction of the Three which to Victorinus seems not adequately expressed by the phrase "tres personae." He would render the Greek *ὑποστάσεις* by the Latin *subsistentiae*, and speak of *tres subsistentiae de* (or "ex") *una substantia*, or say that "Ipsum quod est esse, subsistit tripliciter" (x. 41, ii. 4, iii. 4, 1072 A, 1092 D, 1101 D). We have in the hymns a number of formulae of the Trinity, but it must be admitted that Victorinus lets himself play with language in a way which brings him now and again perilously near to nonsense. The formulae of the third hymn will be found perhaps most suggestive.

One quotation shall be given to conclude this subject, illustrating the completeness of Victorinus's Trinitarian Theology; the words are those concluding the four books against Arius—"Existit Christus sua existentia, et Spiritus Sanctus sua; sed ambo una substantia, ex quo omnes, id est tota Trinitas una, atque eodem modo juncto Patre cum Filio, Filioque cum Spiritu Sancto. Atque ista ratione Patre cum Spiritu Sancto per Christum juncto, singulis quidem existentibus, unum omnis Trinitas est, atque existit illud *ὑποούστωι*, cum sit omnibus una eademque substantia. Haec nobis salus est, haec liberatio, haec totius hominis plena salvatio, sic Patrem omnipotentem Deum credere, sic Jesum Christum Filium, sic Spiritum Sanctum. Amen."

To pass from Victorinus's doctrine of the Trinity to his conception of the relation of God to Creation.

All things are conceived as pre-existing in God—potentially in the Father, actually in essence in the Son. In Him dwells all the fulness bodily, that is (according to Victorinus) in the Eternal Word dwells all existence substantially—*ὁδριακῶς*. Whatever came into being subsequently in time, in Him was eternally Life. Thus the Λόγος is the "Λόγος of all things"—the universal Logos—the seed of all things, even in His Eternal Being, containing all things in Himself in archetypal reality. (*Adv. Ar.* i. 25, 1059 A; ii. 3, 1091 B; iii. 3, 1100 c. and iv. 4, 1116 c, where the Word is almost identified with the Platonic "ideas"; at least He contains the ideas in Himself, as "species" or "potentiae principales.")

It follows that the Son is very mainly considered as existing with a view to Creation. He exists as the "Λόγος of all that is" with a view to the being of whatever is ("ad id quod est esse iis quae sunt"). It is His essence to move, as it is the Father's to repose. And the "motus" in virtue of which He is, is still pressing outward, so to speak, from the "fontana vita" of

* The Son is spoken of as "Medius in Angelo [Angulo *Cheltenham MS.*] Trinitatis," *Adv. Ar.* i. 56, 1083 A.

† It must be admitted that a great number of passages in Victorinus bearing on the Trinity are really unintelligible, and not the most charitable belief in the corruption of the text can acquit him of reckless use of language.

the Father. The Son "festinat in actionem."^a This is His "going forth"—His "proceeding forth" in Creation which culminates in "the extreme point of His going forth," the Incarnate Life. (*Adv. Ar.* i. 24, 1057 D, 1058 C. 33, 1066 C, 34 1067 A, 22 1056 C). He proceeds forth, then, or "descends" as a river of life distributing Life (*spargens vitas*) to all the countless forms of creation, according to the distributive energy and wisdom of the Holy Ghost, the "divider" or distributor of the gift of Life (*Adv. Ar.* i. 26, 1060 A Hymn. 1, 1141 D. iii. 1143 C). In thus "descending" the Son who in the Divine Nature is impassible, becomes possible in His relation to the lower forms of life.^b All in Him is pure action, absolute energy, positive, unchangeable Life. But as the river of water is affected by the varying materials which form its bed and distribute its waters, so the Life of the Word is affected by the infinite varieties in the capacities of material and created beings to receive Life. He subjects Himself to their infirmities in condescending to their capacities.^c For He Himself is their Life—the inner principle of their substantiation; He is "made all things" (*effectus omnia*) in Him all things consist—"Insubstantiata sunt omnia *ὄντα* in Jesu, hoc est, *ἐν τῷ Ἀδῶμ*."^d He is the Unity of Nature—which is one not as a heap of detached grains, but as a vitally coherent and united body, one with its head Christ, bound together by the chain of the life of God (*Adv. Ar.* i. 24, 1057 D; i. 25, 26, 1059 B; i. 44, 1074 C D; i. 45, 1075 B C. i. 47 1077 A B. iv. 31 1135 C D). This relation of Christ to Nature finds a number of expressions. He is its "elementum" and its "receptaculum"; its "habitaculum" and its "habitor";^e even its "locus." He is the "unum totum" with which the universe in its manifoldness "clauditur et ambitur" (*Ad Justin.* 4, *Adv. Ar.* i. 25, 1059 A; i. 37, 1069 B).

All this, it must be said by anticipation, is somewhat Neo-Platonic in tone. What is to follow is almost pure and undiluted Neo-Platonism. Victorinus follows Neo-Platonic emanationism in even describing the process of Creation, as a drawing out of the Plenitude of God into a chain or gradation of existences. "Deus Jesus Spiritus *νοῦς* anima angeli et deinde corporalia omnia subministrata" (*Adv. Ar.* i. 25, 1059 B; i. 61, 1086 B C; iii. 11 1107 C D). He follows Neo-Platonism in his occasional conception of

^a He is more properly "Creator" than the Father: "Creator non convenit Deo," *Ad Ephes.* 1266 A. But this is Platonism.

^b In another sense, however, He is only "passible" in his humanity, *Adv. Ar.* i. 14, 1048 C; but *e contra*, iv. 31, 1136 A.

^c "Pater Filius Fons, Filius ut flumen quod excurrit ex fonte. In fonte ut manens aqua et quieta est, pura immaculata sine scatendi specie, sibi occulto motu plenitudinem suam suggerens: item ut flumen motu apertiore per diversa discurrens, terrarum quas sulcat qualitatibus et afficitur, et quodammodo patitur, sic et filius aqua sua, suaque substantia quae Patris est, semper purus, immaculatus, impassibilis, regionibus per quas discurrit, locisque vel supra-caelestibus vel caelestibus vel intracaelestibus nunc spumat ut occurrentibus saxis, quae sunt ex generibus animarum, campis quietus excurrit." 1135 C D. (*Cheltenham MS.*)

^d Not "Consubstantial" with Him, as He is with the Father. (*Adv. Ar.* i. 26, 1059 B. C.)

νοῦς and "anima" as substantial existences, the source of all particular minds and souls, through which God informed and animated the lower material world. He adopts the Neo-Platonic conception of "anima" as something capable of spiritualization, but not yet "spirit"—intermediate between spirit and matter. He follows Neo-Platonism in his conception of the "return of all things" into God. (*Adv. Ar.* iii. 1. 1098 B; iv. 11, 1121 A B; *de Gen.* 10, 1026 A B; *Adv. Ar.* iii. 3, 1100 C; Hymn. 1. 1141 A; *ad Ephes.* i. 4, 1239 B. C.)

Once more Victorinus is simply Neo-Platonic in his conception of Matter and the material world. "Matter" has no existence independent of God; in itself it is "non-existent"^d—an abstraction. But as created and fashioned and vitalized by God, to become the material world, it is both appreciated and depreciated.^e It is appreciated as a true revelation of God (e.g. *ad Justin. Man.* 2). It is depreciated with the old philosophic depreciation and horror of the material which still clings to Victorinus, and militates against alike his grasp on the Incarnation and his clear assertion of Responsibility.

We shall see this in considering his Anthropology.^f

Man is regarded as a mixed being, a spiritual anima (see *Ad Ephes.* 1, 4, 1239 C) merged in the corruption of matter. He calls the human race "animae seminatae saeculis" corrupted by the material darkness in which they are merged^g (Hymn 1 1142 A; *Adv. Ar.* i. 26 1060 A; i. 62, 1087 B). Misled by this ineradicable misconception of material life, he thinks in a wholly Platonic and non-Christian spirit^h of men as existing in an unfallen condition, in a premundane state of being, and being born into the corruption of material life at their natural birth.ⁱ Moral evil, from this point of view, must be physical and necessary. It is indeed the step to greater good—representing only the darkness by antagonism to which the soul rises to the true knowledge of the Light. For Christ the Word, Who is the source of all Life and its sustainer, pursues the degraded "anima" into the material abyss. He enters into the corruption of the material Life in order to redeem the fallen souls into their pristine purity of being; nay, not only to bring them back into what they were, but to advance them into what they never had known—the condition of spirit, the fellowship and partaking of God's spiritual being. All this is an undeniable element of Victorinus's teaching, occurring mostly in the course of his *Commentary on the Ephesians*, and lying side by side

^d It is the *μη ὄν* in one of its four senses: the *μη ὄν* which is below all actual existence: as the Father is *ὁ μη ὄν*, who is above all actual existences and their source, *De Gen.* 4 and 10. In one passage he appears to deny the "creation of matter" as a positive substance, *Adv. Ar.* iv. 31, 1136 A.

^e See on this double tendency in Neo-Platonism Zeller, *Phil. der Griechen*, part iii. div. 2, pp. 552 sq.

^f His passages on the creation of man are sometimes unintelligibly obscure, e.g. *Adv. Ar.* i. 62.

^g Satan and the demons, we should notice, are material (*Ad Ephes.* 1253 C).

^h Which is, however, Neo-Platonic—not Origenistic, as has been suggested by Card. Mai.

ⁱ The material world is created for their probation (*ad Ephes.* i. 4, 1242 A).

unharmonized with a really Christian conception of the Incarnation and Grace.

[See mostly in *Commentary on Ephes.* 1240 A B, 1242 A, 1241 A B, 1258 B D, 1259 B, 1244 B C, 1243 C, 1276 B, 1254 B. The phrase "naturales filii ira" is expounded "secundum naturam carnis geniti et materiae."]

The other main effect of Platonism upon Victorinus's anthropology is to produce a profound and unmitigated Predestinarianism. His ideology leads him (in the commentary on the Ephesians at least) to assert not only the pre-existence of the absolute "anima" in the Eternal Word, but also the pre-existence of all particular souls. All the history of the soul in its descent into matter, and its recovery therefrom through the Incarnate Christ, is only the development of the idea of the soul which pre-existed eternally, individually and substantially in the Mind and Will of God. (*Comment. in Ephes.* 1245 C, 1243 C, 1238 C, 1239 B, 1242 B. What exists in God's thought must exist substantially.)

But these Platonizing elements in the teaching of Victorinus do not occupy all the ground. They lie side by side with the stock conceptions of Christian truth, no less emphasized sometimes than the Platonic views. Thus the common view of sin and responsibility and the origin of evil in the corrupt choice of the free will is emphasized several times (e.g. *ad Justin. Man.* 16, 1008 B.), and it would seem that, much as the mode of conceiving Redemption which Victorinus adopts would lead to Universalism, he is not a Universalist. (*In Ephes.* 1281 A. B.; cf. 1282 C. D.; 1286 B. C. On Universalism, see *ad Phil.* 1221 B, "universos, sed qui sequerentur"; *ad Ephes.* 1245 B, "non omnia restaurantur sed quae in Christo sunt"; cf. 1274 C, "quae salvari possent." This interprets such passages as 1252 C.)

Again, though on one occasion the view given of the Incarnation is vitiated by the notion of the essential corruption of matter (*Adv. Ar.* i. 58, 1084 C) in general the Incarnation teaching is strikingly sound, and repudiates by anticipation a good deal of fifth-century heresy. God the Son enters into conditions of real humanity. He takes human nature whole and complete into the unity of a single Person (it is an "acceptio carnis," not a proper "generation" of a person), and He lives, God in Manhood. ["*Deus in homine*" (homo = manhood) *Adv. Ar.* i. 14, 1048 D; i. 45, 1075 B; in *Philipp.* 1208 C, 1224 C. He however uses an Adoptionist phrase, *Adv. Ar.* i. 10, 1045 C.] The humanity which He takes is emphasized as universal ("universalis caro, universalis anima: in isto omnia universalia erant," *Adv. Ar.* iii. 3, 1101 A.).

Thus the Passion in which He suffers for man's redemption is universal, because He suffers as representative of the race He is to recreate. ("Quia Corpus Ille catholicum ad omnem hominem habuit, omne quod passus est catholicum fecit; id est, ut omnis caro in illo crucifixa sit." *Ad Phil.* 1196 D, 1221 B, and *Adv. Ar.* iii. 3, 1101 A.) The effect of Christ taking humanity is to make the whole of that which He assumed — soul and flesh — vital with new capacities of life. The "Word made flesh"

J If the *De Physicis* is Victorinus's work, this would need saying more strongly. Free will is prominent there.

makes the flesh He took to be life in Him who is the Life ("Omne quod Christus est vita aeterna est," etc., *Adv. Ar.* iv. 7, 1118 A; cf. language about Eucharist quoted below). And in this humanity — spirit, soul and body — which Christ took, He is glorified and exalted (*Adv. Ar.* iv. 7, 1118 B; cf. *ad Eph.* 1259 B "aeterna caro," "corporalis majestas"). Through it^k He lives in His people, so that they become what He is, through Him. They become part of the Christ. The Church is Christ (*Ad Gal.* 1173 C. D.; cf. 1184 B.). And we are to be glorified, body and soul, in Christ (*Ad Philipp.* 1226 A. B., 1227 A; cf. *Ad Ephes.* 1255 B, "resurrectio Christi, resurrectio nostra").

It need only be added in this connection that Victorinus uses suggestive language about the sacraments and ministry of the Church, in relation to the communication to us of the life of Christ, e.g. (on baptism) *Ad Gal.* iii. 27, 1173 B. and 1184 B; *Ad Ephes.* v. 25, 1287 C. (on the Eucharist) *Adv. Ar.* ii. 8, 1094 C ("quod accipimus Corpus Christi est, ipse autem Christus, vita est . . . divitiae in Christo corporaliter habitant"; cf. *Adv. Ar.* i. 30, 1063 B. "Corpus ipsius Vita est, Corpus autem Panis." "Panis ἐπιούσιος," in the Lord's Prayer, is interpreted as "panis ex ipsa aut in ipsa Substantia, hoc est vitae panis," and referred to the Eucharist, and, in the same way, "populus περιούσιος" is given an Eucharistic reference, as meaning "populus circa Tuam Substantiam veniens." See quotation from old African Liturgy, p. 25; and (on ministry) *Ad Ephes.* iv. 12, 1275 C.

II. It has been pointed out above where Victorinus is allowing himself to retain Neo-Platonic ideas; it is necessary further to explain in what general relation his teaching stands to the Neo-Platonic system, because his chief claim upon the attention of students will be found to depend upon his having been the first systematically to convert the results of that system to the uses of Christian theology, and upon his having shown himself able in one or two cases to develop as against Arianism the really higher philosophical truth latent in Catholic doctrines.¹

The idea of a being or beings mediating between the supreme God and the lower world was common to almost all the later schools of ancient philosophy. (See Zeller, pp. 219, 220.) Eusebius of Caesarea had already seen in this a common ground for philosophers and Christians. (See Gwatkin's *Studies of Arianism*, p. 22. Cf. St. Athanasius *De Incarn.* cap. xli.) It appeared in Plotinus's theory of the *νοῦς* and *anima*, which with the One, the God, make up what is called "the Neo-Platonic Trinity." Now a good deal of Victorinus's language, in which he seeks to express the relation of the *Λόγος* to

^k Victorinus, however, in one place speaks as if Christ only metaphorically imparted His flesh to His people (*Ad Eph.* 1288 C), and he speaks of Christ's humanity as "totus spiritus factus" (*Ad Eph.* 1274 A).

¹ Of course it would be out of place here to give any general account of Neo-Platonism with a view to comparing it with Christian Theology. Far the best account of the Neo-Platonic system is that given by Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, part iii. div. iii., to which reference will be made in the text. There are many passages in Victorinus's writings where the meaning depends on allusions in detail to Neo-Platonic phraseology. These cannot be considered here.

the Father, is based on Plotinus's language about the relation of the *voûs* to the One.¹¹ But the *voûs* in Plotinus is (a) (like the Arian *Λόγος*) but the imperfect, inadequate image of the One, so that the One never realizes itself perfectly at all, and (b) its production out of the One is an irreconcilable contradiction. The one God is conceived of as impersonal, without will or consciousness or motion; it is abstract and lifeless; and it is only by bold contradiction that it can become productive or generate (see on this consciously realized contradiction, Zeller, pp. 496-498). To meet both these difficulties Christianity—at least Catholic, anti-Arian Christianity—supplies Victorinus with abundant material. Christianity takes up personality, will, love, motion into the inmost heart of the Divine Being, and thus as a Christian, Victorinus is able to fill the Neo-Platonic formulas with the powers of a new life. All lower transitions are possible because the eternal Being of the Supreme is an eternal¹² motion in Himself. Motion is not degradation; it is the life of God. Thus again that which is the eternal expression and image of God in Himself—the eternal product of His will—is not any imperfect or lower production, but the very co-equal and co-essential Word—eternally adequate to Him who is His source.¹³

Once again Victorinus's formula for the Trinity, the "status, progressio, regressus," is the reflex of a Neo-Platonic idea¹⁴—an idea first definitely formulated by Proclus but implied by Plotinus—the idea of all progress and development of life involving (1) the immanence of the caused in that which causes it, (2) the issuing of the caused out of that which causes it, (3) the return of the caused into that which causes it. This threefold relation of immanence, progress, return, the Neo-Platonist regarded as essential to the development and unity of life both in general and in detail (Zeller, pp. 787-789). This conception in its earlier stage Victorinus, whether consciously or not, adopts, and what new force it gains when it is seen to find its highest expression in the very life of God Himself! This threefold relation is seen to be the very being of God.¹⁵ The Son is eternally abiding in the Father, eternally proceeding from the

Father in His eternal Generation, and eternally pouring back into the bosom of the Father that which He receives, in that Holy Ghost, Who is Himself the life of Father and Son, the love and bond of the Holy Trinity.

It is in describing the relation of the *Λόγος* to the world, in His function as Creator, that, as we have seen, Victorinus allows himself to be too entirely moulded by Neo-Platonic ideas. On that enough has been said. His "development of the plenitude" (vide supra, p. 20), his pre-existing "anima" and "animæ," his corporeal demons, his matter the seat of corruption—all these have their source in the Plotinian system, and are only very imperfectly adapted to Christianity (see Zeller, pp. 545-557, 570-575). We may wonder that he did not use, more emphatically than he did, an element of right-minded inconsistency in Neo-Platonism, and with that system emphasize the freedom of the will (Zeller, p. 585-587).

The above must suffice as a brief account of the relation to Neo-Platonism in which Victorinus stands. It will help us to recognize the "Divine preparation" for Christianity which was involved in the independent growth of the Neo-Platonic system—so many philosophic ideas needed for the intellectual presentation of Christianity being made ready to hand—and it will enable us to vindicate for Victorinus the credit of a pioneer in claiming for Christianity the products of philosophy. He is a pioneer whose name has well-nigh passed into undeserved oblivion.

III. There are a few characteristic points in Victorinus's teaching which do not stand in any connexion with Neo-Platonism, still deserving notice. He is an intensely ardent follower of St. Paul, devoted to St. Paul's strenuous assertion of justification by faith. Indeed, he uses very strongly solifidian language and (by anticipation) very strongly anti-Pelagian language. This element in his teaching is most remarkably emphatic in his commentaries, e.g. *ad Gal.* iii. 22, 1172; *ad Phil.* iii. 9, 1219 c d, "non meam justitiam" tunc enim 'mea' est, vel nostra, cum moribus nostris justitiam Dei mereri nos putamus perfectam per mores. At non, inquit, hanc habens justitiam, sed quam? Illam ex fide. Non illam quae ex lege, nae in operibus est et carnali disciplina, sed hanc quae ex Deo procedit 'justitia ex fide.' Cf. *ad Phil.* iv. 9, 1231 A; *ad Ephes.* ii. 5, 1255 B. Cf. 1258 c: "non nostri laboris est, quod saepe moneo, ut nos solvamus; sed sola fides in Christum nobis salus est"; 1259 c: "nostrum pene jam nihil est nisi solum credere qui superavit omnia. Hoc est enim plena salvatio, Christum haec vicisse. Fidem in Christo habere, plenam fidem, nullus labor est, nulla difficultas, animi tantum voluntas est"; 1290 B; cf. 1290 D: "justitia non tantum valet quantum fides." Again on *grace*, see *ad Ephes.* i. 14, 1247 A, iii. 7 1264 B, *ad Phil.* ii. 13 "quia ipsum velle a Deo nobis operatur, fit ut ex Deo *et operationem et voluntatem habeamus.*"¹⁶

So strong is the solifidian tendency in Victorinus that it led him, like Luther, to a disparagement of St. James and a somewhat

¹¹ With this strong grasp on man's helplessness in himself goes his intense and (in view of his own history) touching insistence on humility. *Ad Ephes.* 1193 B.

¹² E.g. The One is the *δύναμις*, the *voûs* is the *ἐνέργεια*. The One is unlimited, formless. The *voûs* is limit, form. The *voûs* is the Image of the One: that in which the One realizes itself as knowledge, sight, etc. The One is transcendent—*ἐπέκεινα γνώσεως, ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας*. The *voûs* is *οὐσία* and *γνώσις*. The expression for the Father in Victorinus, *ὁ μὴ ὄν* (which recurs in Scotus Erigena), must have been derived from the Plotinian school: it could hardly have been original in Victorinus. Yet it does not seem to be found in Plotinus's works and scarcely in Proclus. (See Zeller, p. 793, note 4, and the general substance of the notes, pp. 479-511.)

¹³ The Neo-Platonist had recognized the eternity of the production of the *voûs* and even "anima." See Zeller, pp. 515, 516, 535. But it was outside God, His "overflow."

¹⁴ Perhaps the fact of Victorinus saying nothing about Love as the Being of God is due to his being still too much dominated by the Pagan formulas.

¹⁵ It is an exact equivalent of Proclus's later formula—the *μονή, πρόοδος, ἐπιστροφή*. See Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, vol. i. p. 350.

¹⁶ The idea has still a Platonic flavour, however, in *Adv. Ar.* i. 51, 1080 A, where the expression "deficit a potentia Patris," is used of the Son's generation.

minimizing tone as regards the efficacy of good works. (See some very remarkable passages in *Commentary on Galatians*, i. 19, 1155 B C, 1156 A B, cf. 1161 B, 1162 D.)^a

It is worth while calling attention to the evidence, suggested by a good deal of Victorinus's theology, of a closer connexion than has been yet noticed between him and St. Augustine. His strong insistence in his Trinitarian Theology on the double Procession of the Holy Spirit—his conception of the Holy Spirit as the 'Bond' of the Blessed Trinity—his emphasis on the unity of Christ and His church—his strong predestinarianism^b—his vehement assertion of the doctrines of grace—his assertion of the priority of faith to intelligence (p. 16, note n)—all these elements, important and unimportant, in Victorinus, reappear in St. Augustine, and it seems not at all improbable that the (hitherto unsuspected) influence of the writings of the old philosopher whose conversion stirred him so deeply, was a determining force upon the theology of St. Augustine.^c

IV. A word must be said on the Latin text of the Bible used by Victorinus. No adequate use seems yet to have been made of the very large bulk of quotation which is to be found in his writings.

Sabatier^d (*Bibl. Sac. Lat. Versiones antiquae*, tom. iii, Remis 1749) makes occasional reference to him, but omits to notice at times his most remarkable quotations, and wrote before Cardinal Mai's publication of the Commentaries, etc.

Some specimens of his quotations, not noticed by Sabatier, may be given:—

St. John i. 1 is quoted as "*Ἄλογος erat circa Deum*," and it is added "*Romani apud Deum dicunt*," *Libri de Gen.* 20, 1030 c. Elsewhere he uses "*circa Deum*" and "*ad Deum*" (*Adv. Ar.* 1, 3). These do not seem to be merely his own renderings. ("*Ad Deum*" is noticed by Sabatier).

In Phil. ii. 30 (p. 1216) *exponens in incertum animam suam* is a better rendering than the Vulgate *tr-dens* and the St. Germain *parabolatus de anima sua*. Ibid. iii. 20 (p. 1225) he uses *Salutaris for Saviour*, a term not found in other authorities in this place. Cf. Rönseh, *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 100, 1875. Ibid. iv. 3 (p. 1228) *unijuge* is a remarkable rendering of *σύν(υ)γε*.

^a It may be worth while noticing that Victorinus appears to speak as if the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin were an open question: "*cum Virgo Maria sit vel fuerit*,"—but that is perhaps laying too much stress on a word.

^b Restrained in him, as in Augustine, by antagonism to Manichaeism, which forces him to assert free will in man.

^c There are one or two contributions to the history of heresies, made by Victorinus, which it is worth while noticing. *Ad Gal.* i. 19, we have an account of a Judaizing or Ebionite sect called the "Symmachians"; see p. 1155 B and 1162 D. They made a point of the Apostolate of James, the Lord's brother. See also for heresies in regard to Christ's person an interesting passage, *Adv. Ar.* i. 45, 1075 B C; cf. i. 28, 1061 B C. He calls the definition of Nicaea "a wall and a defence," ii. 9, 1095 D. We notice also that he probably is the first to use "paganus" for the heathen. *De recip. ὁμοουσιῶν*, i.; *ad Gal.* 1158 c. For the origin of the term *godfather*, see *ad Gal.* 1184 B.

^d Before whom Simon and Mill had made slight notice of him. See Migne, *Prolegomena*, p. 997.

Ibid. iv. 6, 7 (p. 1229) reads thus: "*Nihil ad sollicitudinem redigatis, sed in omni precatione et oratione cum bona gratia petitiones vestrae innotescant apud Deum. Et pax Dei quae habet omnem intellectum custodiat corda vestra, item corpora vestra in Jesu Christo.*"

St. Luke ii. 14: *Pax in terra hominibus boni decreti* (p. 1306).^w

Ephes. iv. 14 (*πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλανῆς*), *ad remedium erroris* (p. 1276 B). This reading is found also in other authorities. Ibid. vi. 14, *et omnibus effectis stare* supports the correct reading of Jerome's text, *et omnibus perfectis stare*.

Titus ii. 14. Besides the version *populum abundantem* (p. 1094 D), a remarkable rendering of the word *περιοσίον* is given as occurring in a Eucharistic office ("the prayer of the oblation"), which he more than once refers to. (See *Adv. Ar.* 1, 30, 1063 B, and ii. 7, 1094 D.) It is as follows—"Munda tibi populum *circumvalem* emulatorem bonorum operum, *circa tuam substantiam venientem*" (p. 1063 B, *vide supra*, p. 22). [C. G.]

VICTORINUS (7), an African bishop, but of what see unknown, who, after the death of the primate of Numidia, took upon himself to summon a council for the purpose of restraining the irregularities of Cresconius, bishop of Villa Regia, already censured by the council of Carthage, A. D. 401. He sent out a notice (*Tractatoria*) for this purpose, which reached Augustine late in the day on Nov. 9, but found him too much occupied by business to attend to it immediately. But he soon wrote to Victorinus, pointing out to him (1) that as the summons was addressed to the bishops of Mauretania, it ought to be sent to the primates of that province. (2) That the order in which the bishops of Numidia were named was incorrect, for that his own name was placed third on the list, whereas there were many bishops senior to him, who might be offended by this mistake. (3) That Xanthippus, bishop of Tagora, claimed the place of primate, and that if so, it was his duty to issue notices of this kind. Even if the question between him and Xanthippus could be arranged, the name of Xanthippus ought on no account to be omitted. (*Aug. Ep.* 59; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. 10-11.)

[H. W. P.]

VICTORINUS (8), a subdeacon of Malliana, Manliana, Maliana, or Miliana, a town of Mauretania Caesariensis, 16 miles from Tigara, on the slope of the Atlas mountain range (*Ant. Itin.* 18, 4; *Ptol.* iv. 2, 24; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 29). St. Augustine wrote to Deuterius, bishop probably of Caesariensis (Jol.), to inform him that he had convicted Victorinus both by evidence and by his own confession, of Manichaeism. He adds that he had caused him to be banished from the city,

^w These words conclude a long quotation thoroughly independent of any known version. They occur in the *De Physicis*. Victorinus's authorship of the treatise seems, as has been said, on other grounds improbable. And where the same passage is quoted by Victorinus and in the *De Physicis*, the quotations do not tally. *De Phys.* c. 17, "*Spiritus sanctus superveniet super te, et virtus altissimi obumbrabit te*" (S. Luke i. 35), *Adv. Ar.* i. 56, "*Spiritus sanctus adveniet in te et virtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi*" (*umbrabit*, cap. 58). But Victorinus again does not tally with himself.

and deprived him of his clerical office, but promised that he should be admitted to repentance if he consented to inform against other offenders in this way not only in Malliana but in the province at large (Aug. *Ep.* 236).

[H. W. P.]

VICTORINUS, CL. M. (9), rhetor of Marseilles (Gennad.) and poet. [VICTOR (39).]

VICTORINUS (10) also called ÆMILIANUS, a monk belonging to the times of Gregory the Great, who in one of his homilies describes his remarkable penitence (*Homiliae in Evang. hom.* xxiv. § 18 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxvi. 1257). [C. H.]

VICTORINUS (11), bishop of Tauromenium, died before A.D. 591, in which year Gregory the Great directs the subdeacon Petrus to assist his successor in recovering church property said to have been lost during his episcopate. (*Epp.* i. 73.) [F. D.]

VICTORIUS (1), proconsul of Asia, to whom Theodosius addressed an edict April 15th, A.D. 394, prohibiting consecrations of bishops or ordinations of priests by heretics (*Theod. Cod.* lib. xvi. tit. 5, leg. 22.) [G. T. S.]

VICTORIUS, of Le Mans. [VICTURIUS (1).]

VICTORIUS (2) of Aquitaine. During the pontificate of Leo the Great in A.D. 444 and A.D. 453 differences arose between the Western churches headed by Rome, and the Eastern headed by Alexandria as to the correct day for celebrating Easter. Pope LEO yielded on both occasions, but to avoid such disputes in future, directed his Archdeacon HILARIUS (18), who succeeded him, to investigate the question. Hilary then referred it to his friend Victorius, who was then at Rome, requesting him to investigate the causes of the discrepancy, and to determine how the true date was to be found; and the latter in A.D. 457 drew up a cycle for the purpose of determining the date of Easter both in past and future years. Several such cycles had been previously used (see EASTER in *DICT. OF CHRIST. ANT.* i. 591) but Annianus, an Egyptian monk, a contemporary of Archbishop Theophilus (ob. A.D. 412), was apparently the first to observe that, assuming the perfect accuracy of the Metonic cycle of nineteen years, if it was multiplied by the Solar cycle of twenty-eight years, after which the same days of the year recur on the same days of the week, a great cycle of 532 years would be obtained, and in each year of every successive period of this cycle Easter and all other feasts movable or immovable would occur on the same day of the week and month as in the corresponding year of the preceding cycle. (Georgius Syncellus, pp. 62, 63, Bonn edn.)

Victorius first treats in his preface of the causes of the discrepancy. The first is the difference of the cycles, of which he names three, the Western of eighty-four, the Cyrillian of ninety-five, and that of Hippolytus of 112 years. The Western of eighty-four for instance at its expiration gives the new moon more than a day too early, while the Calippic of seventy-six years would not be a day wrong till rather more than four periods or 304 years had expired.

Another cause of confusion was that the additional day called the Saltus Lunae added to the Epact was inserted in different years in different cycles. A further cause of divergence was that, while the Latins made March 5th and April 3rd the limits between which inclusive the first day of the Paschal month might fall, and did not permit Easter to be earlier than the 16th day of the moon, thus making March 18th and April 16th the possible limits of the 14th day, and March 20th and April 23rd, the possible limits of Easter; Theophilus and the Alexandrians, on the contrary, made March 8th and April 5th their first day limits, March 21st and April 18th their 14th day limits, and March 22nd and April 25th their Easter limits, not hesitating if the full moon fell on a Saturday to keep Easter the next day, though it was only the 15th day of the moon.

The cycle of 532 years, consisting of twenty-eight Metonic or rather seven Calippic cycles, was adopted or independently discovered by Victorius. He began it with the year of the crucifixion, which he placed on the 26th March in the consulship of the two Gemini. As the year in which he composed his cycle, the consulship of Constantinus and Rufus, which corresponds with A.D. 457, was the 430th of his cycle, its first year corresponded with A.D. 28. He at one time intended to carry his cycle back to the creation, but to avoid delay contented himself with giving only one period. The table contains eight columns. The first, in which there are many mistakes, gives the names of the consuls, the second the year of the Victorian period, the third marks the Bissextile years, the fourth the day of the week on which January 1st falls, the fifth the Epact on January 1st, in which he notes the Saltus Lunae or addition of twelve instead of eleven days in the 16th of every nineteen-year period, the sixth gives the date of Easter, the seventh gives the moon's age at Easter, while the last, probably added by a later hand, gives the Indictions.

Victorius makes March 20th and April 16th his fourteen-day limits, but as he retained the Latin rule, that Easter could not be earlier than the sixteenth day of the moon, his earliest Easter limit was March 22nd, the same as the Alexandrians; but his latest fourteen-day limit being April 16th, while theirs was the 18th, his latest Easter limit was April 24th, while theirs was the 25th.

His cycle gives from two causes a double date for Easter. In the years eleven to sixteen inclusive of each nineteen-year cycle, it gives the same date for the fourteenth of the moon as the Alexandrians. If that date fell on a Saturday, the latter would keep Easter the next day; but the Latins not till the Sunday after, in order to avoid keeping it before the sixteenth of the moon. This occurs twenty-four times in the 532 years. Again in the tenth and eighteenth years of his nineteen-year cycle, where his moon is two days older than the Alexandrians, if its fourteenth day fell on a Friday, the Latins would keep Easter the next Sunday; but the fourteenth day of the Alexandrians' moon falling on the Latin Easter Sunday, they would keep their Easter a Sunday later. This would happen eight times in the 532 years. In these cases he left it to the pope to decide the day.

The cycle of Victorius was widely, though not universally accepted in the West, and especially in Gaul. In A.D. 527, however, DIONYSIUS (19) published a new period of the Cyrillian ninety-five year cycle, which would terminate in A.D. 531; and VICTOR of Capua c. A.D. 550, wrote against Victorius's cycle and in favour of the Alexandrian method of computation. Victorius's cycle seems thereafter to have become disused in Italy, but it lingered to a much later date in parts of Gaul. It has been edited with elaborate dissertations by Bucherius, *De doctrina temporum*, where all notices of Victorius are collected. The only additional information they give is Gennadius's statement (*de Vir. Ill.* 88) that he was a native of Aquitaine. As Hilary addresses him as "Dilectissimus et honorabilis sanctus frater," he was probably in orders. A full account of his cycle is given by Ideler (*Handbuch der Chronologie*, ii. 275-285), who points out that what Dionysius did, was to continue the ninety-five year cycle, and that there is no evidence that he did anything to the Victorian cycle. The fact that his continuation of the Cyrillian cycle began in A.D. 532, which would be the first year of a new period of the Victorian cycle, if the latter commenced with the year of the birth of Christ, probably suggested the notion that he had thus altered the beginning of the Victorian cycle, and started a new period of it from A.D. 532. Victorius is by later writers sometimes called Victorinus and Victor, the last mistake again leading to confusion with his antagonist Victor of Capua.

[F. D.]

VICTORIUS (3), a poet of this name is mentioned by Sidonius Apollinaris in one of his letters (the last letter of Book v. of his epistles). The letter is addressed to the nephews of the poet, then apparently just deceased, and exhorts them to imitate their uncle's example. What the works of Victorius may have been is absolutely uncertain, though it is possible that some of his poems may be among those still extant, ascribed to poets of the names of Victorinus, or Victor, who are otherwise unknown.

[H. A. W.]

VICTORIUS (4), count or duke of Auvergne, was appointed by Euric, king of the Visigoths in Gaul, to have charge of seven states (civitates), and he built a large basilica at Auvergne (Sidon. Apoll. *Epp.* vii. 17; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 20, *Vit. Pat.* c. 3). In connection with the obsequies of St. Abraham, which he carried out, he is very highly spoken of by Sidonius, as an "amplissimus vir, quem jure saeculari patronum, jure ecclesiastico filium, excolo ut cliens, ut pater diligo" (Sidon. Apoll. *ut supr.*). But he closed his nine years' rule in Auvergne by some acts of intrigue and oppression, especially of violence against Eucherius the senator, and had to flee for safety to Rome. Following the same course there he was stoned to death in the 23rd year of Euric's reign (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 20, and *De Glor. Conf.* 33, and *De Glor. Mart.* i. 45). He flourished in the second of the 5th century (Boll. *AA. SS.* Jun. iii. 534-6).

[J. G.]

VICTRICIUS, ST., eighth archbishop of Rouen, at the close of the 4th and beginning

of the 5th centuries, is a figure of some importance. He was the friend of St. Martin of Tours (Sulpic. Sev. *Dial.* iii. 2; Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 194) and St. Paulinus of Nola, to whose letters we owe some details of his life. He came "de extimo orbis" (Paulinus, *Epist.* xviii. 4, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 238, 39), which has been conjectured to be the country of Boulogne, or even Britain, and began life as a soldier, but quitted military service for conscience' sake, a desertion which entailed such maltreatment as nearly lost him his life (*ibid.* xviii. 7, col. 240, 41). He became bishop of Rouen sometime before 390, and occupied himself with the conversion of the heathen Morini and Nervii, occupying Flanders and Brabant, who may possibly at that early time have been within the limits of his diocese. From this task he was summoned in 394 or 395 to Britain, to assist the bishops there in re-establishing peace, probably in their contest with Pelagianism (Victricius, *Lib. de Lawe SS.*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 443). An accusation of heresy, as it seems (cf. Ceillier, viii. 76), brought him to Rome, at the close of 403, to defend himself before the pope (Paulinus, *Epist.* xxxvii. (36), Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 353). While there he received, in answer to his application for information, the famous letter of Innocent I. called the *Liber Regularum*, treating of various heads of ecclesiastical practice and discipline (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lvi. 519; see INNOCENTIUS (12), p. 244; Ceillier, vii. 507). The church at Rouen flourished under his care. The relics he obtained for it, the musical services which he instituted, and the devotion—under his guidance—of the virgins and widows, caused the city, hitherto unknown, to be spoken of with reverence in distant lands, and counted among cities famed for their sacred spots (Paulinus, *Ep.* xviii. § 5, *Patr. Lat.* col. 239). The date of his death is unknown; but from the fact that the letter written by Paulinus to St. Augustine in 409, omits the name of Victricius from its list of bishops, it has been argued that he was then dead (*Epist.* xlvi. col. 398). His day is Aug. 7. (For his life, see Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 437, 38; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 752-54; Le Brun in Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 192 sqq.; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 7.)

There is extant a treatise or sermon, it is not quite clear which, called the *Liber de Laude Sanctorum*, composed on the occasion of the receipt of some relics from St. Ambrose of Milan. It was formerly ascribed to St. Germanus of Auxerre (*Hist. Litt.* ii. 261, 750), but the discovery of a MS. at St. Gall, in the last century, made it clear that it belonged to Victricius (see the *Praefatio* of the abbé Lebeuf in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 437-442). It gives a few details of the condition of the church at Rouen, and makes mention of a church being built for the reception of the relics, possibly the one afterwards dedicated to St. Gervais (Migne, *ibid.* 443-458; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 750). Paulinus had perhaps read this document (*Epist.* xviii.). [S. A. B.]

VICTURINUS (1) (VICTOR), ST., bishop of Grenoble, a correspondent of St. Avitus, of Vienne. Whether churches and church furniture, which heretics had made use of, could again, by virtue of a fresh consecration, be made serviceable for the orthodox, to which Avitus replies in the negative (Avitus, *Epist.* vi.), and

as to the penalties to be inflicted in the case of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, which were very severe (*Epp.* xiv. xv. xvi.), are points on which he consulted and received replies from the archbishop. Victurinus is among the bishops present at the council of Agaunum, in 515, if it is to be accepted as genuine, and also at Epaon and Lyons in 517. [S. A. B.]

VICTURINUS (2), a bishop in Gaul, in the latter half of the 5th or beginning of the 6th century, who wrote to Ruricius, bishop of Limoges, begging aid for a man whose family, taken captive by barbarians, was held to ransom. We are ignorant of his see. The letter is published among those of Faustus of Riez. (*Faust. Epist.* xiii., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 863; *Ceillier*, x. 610.) [S. A. B.]

VICTURIUS (1) I. (VICTOR), ST., fifth bishop of Le Mans, was, if his *Acta* are to be believed, consecrated by St. Martin of Tours (circ. A.D. 397). He had a wife named Maura, who thenceforth relinquished the world, and a son who followed him at Le Mans as Victurius II. His episcopate is said to have lasted 24 years, 7 months, and 13 days. He is commemorated Aug. 25 (*Boll. Acta SS.* Aug. v. 140; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 341). [S. A. B.]

VICTURIUS (2) II. (VICTORIUS), ST., sixth bishop of Le Mans, is said to have been the son of his predecessor St. Victurius I. and Maura, and to have been baptized and educated by St. Martin of Tours (*Boll. Acta SS.* Aug. v. 146). In 451 he appears as subscribing the letter of the Gallic bishops to pope Leo on the subject of Eutychianism (*Leo, Epist.* xcix., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 966); and about two years later, in conjunction with his metropolitan, Eusebius of Tours, and another, he writes to the clergy of the third province of Lyons, denouncing the practice of appealing to kings and emperors to settle spiritual controversies (*ibid.* liv. 1239). The same year he was at the council of Angers, and in 461 at that of Tours. In 465 pope Hilary entrusted to him a commission, with other bishops, to settle a controversy as to jurisdiction between Ingenuus, archbishop of Embrun, and Auxanius, one of the bishops of his province, followed by another to compose disputes in the province of Arles (*Hilarius, Ep.* iv. xi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 20, 28). His memory is preserved in the *De Gloria Confessorum* of Gregory of Tours, who attributes to his sanctity miraculous powers (lvi.). According to his *Acta* he died on the 1st of September (on which day he is commemorated) 490, after an episcopate of 41 years, 6 months, and 10 days (*Boll. Acta SS.* Sept. i. 220; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 342). [S. A. B.]

VIGILANTIA, mother of the emperor Justinian I. [*JUSTINIANUS* (6).]

VIGILANTIUS (1), a presbyter of Comminges and Barcelona in the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, known by his protests against the superstitious practices then creeping into the church. He was born about 370 at Calagurris, near Comminges (Convenae), which was a station on the great Roman road from Aquitaine to Spain (*Himericium Antonin.* quoted in Gilly's *Vigilantius*, p. 128). His father

probably kept the statio or the place of refreshment there; and Vigilantius appears to have been brought up to the trade of innkeeper and wine seller. ("Iste Caupo Calagurritanus," *Jer. Cont. Vig.* 1). But he had from the first an inclination to learning; and Sulpicius Severus, who had estates in these parts, took him into his service. From him, probably, he received baptism; possibly he may have been the manager of his estates (Gilly, 133-4). What is certain is that in the year 395 he was sent with letters from Sulpicius to Paulinus, then recently settled at Nola, possibly he was the puer sent to Paulinus at Barcelona the year before (*Paul. Ep.* i. 11). By him he was treated as a friend. Paulinus speaks of him as Vigilantius noster (*Ep.* v. 11), and reports the care with which he had watched him during illness, and refused to let him depart till he was well. On his return to Severus, then living at Eluso in Gaul, he was ordained; and, having a desire for learning, and a wish to visit Jerusalem, he set forth by way of Nola. His father, it seems, had now died, since he was wealthy enough to have many notaries in his employ (*Jerome, Ep.* lxi. 4), and he was the proprietor of the inn at Convenae. (*Jerome, Ep.* lxi. 3, *Cont. Vig.* i.) Paulinus gave him a very honourable introduction to Jerome (*Jer. Ep.* lxi. 3), then living at Bethlehem; and he was received on his arrival there with great respect (*Jerome, Ep.* lviii. 11). He remained there a considerable time, staying partly with Jerome, but partly, it is supposed, with others, possibly with Rufinus (*Jer. Apol.* iii. 11), who, equally with Jerome, was known and honoured by Paulinus, but whose letters have not been preserved. At that time the schism between the monasteries of Bethlehem and the bishop of Jerusalem was at its height; and it is probable that it was in connexion with this that he had his first disagreement with Jerome (*Jerome, Ep.* lxi. 1; *Apol.* iii. 19). Origenism, which had caused the schism, and with which Vigilantius afterwards connected Jerome's name, was, no doubt, the subject of this disagreement. But Vigilantius was brought to confess that he had been in the wrong and to ask pardon for his fault (*Jerome, Ep.* lxi. end). He was an inmate of Jerome's monastery on the occasion of a tremendous storm with earthquake and eclipse, when all the monks thought the last day was coming, and Jerome records that he was in such terror that he sprang from his bed absolutely without clothing, and came out amongst the brethren in a condition which afterwards caused their derision (*Cont. Vig.* ii.). He was for a time favourably impressed by what he saw at Bethlehem, and on one occasion when Jerome was preaching upon the reality of the body at the resurrection, Vigilantius was so much struck by what he heard that he sprang up and with applause of hands and feet saluted Jerome as champion of orthodoxy (*Ep.* lxi. 3). But the extremes of asceticism, the corruption produced by indiscriminate almsgiving, and the violence, perhaps the insincerity, of Jerome's dealing with the question of Origen [*HIERONYMUS*, section *Origenism*] produced a reaction against Jerome. Vigilantius begged to be dismissed, and left in great haste (*Jer. Ep.* cix. 2), without giving any reason. He was the bearer of Jerome's reply to Paulinus at

Nola (Jerome, *Ep.* lxi. 11); but his journey home was first by Egypt (*Ib.* 1, *Cont. Ruf.* iii. 12), "by Hadria and the Cottian Alps" (*Jer. Ep.* cix. 12). He landed probably at Naples, and, after visiting Nola, went home by the land route. He stopped, however, on the way for a considerable time at various places, and the account he gave of what he had seen in the East, which was related to Jerome either by report or by some writing of Vigilantius to or about Jerome, provoked him to write a reply (*Jerome, Ep.* 61). In this he shows the same feeling which comes out more fully in his replies to Rufinus, that of a jealous sensitiveness for his own orthodox reputation; and it seems probable that Vigilantius had acted somewhat as Rufinus subsequently did, praising Jerome's learning, but thereby bringing him under the imputation of Origenism (*Cont. Ruf.* iii. 19). He had subscribed some document rather unwillingly (*Jer. Ep.* lxi. 1), perhaps a condemnation of Origenism, forming possibly part of the reconciliation between Jerome and Rufinus, which occurred soon afterwards; but continued, Jerome says, to preach in a sense contrary to the compact as Jerome understood it; and he quoted Jerome as agreeing to statements which Jerome himself regarded as heretical (*Jerome, Ep.* lxi. 1). He boasted, Jerome says, that he had overcome him in argument (*Ep.* lxi. 3), but this may imply no more than that he could not accept Jerome's judgment, and had held his own against him. Jerome treats him with contempt, declaring that he had never understood the points in dispute (*Ep.* lxi. 1), and that he should attain some elementary knowledge which would show him his own ignorance; but this was Jerome's manner in controversy. He quotes also (*Ib.* 4) a passage from a Commentary of Vigilantius upon Daniel, in which he makes the mountain from which the stone was cut out without hands to be the World and the Devil; an interpretation which Jerome speaks of as a blasphemy never to be pardoned until, as Origen holds, the Devil himself is pardoned; but such interpretations were common and can easily be matched in the Commentaries of Jerome himself. He speaks of him also as a man of uncouth speech (*Cont. Vig.* 3); yet he had evidently acquired the Greek language, for Jerome gives more Greek expressions in his letter to him than in any other letter; and Gennadius calls him "homo linguâ politus"; nor is it likely that a man who spent a large part of his fortune in the increase of literature (*Ib.* § 4) would be worthy of the contemptuous expression "Ὀφὸς λῦρα, which Jerome flings at him, or of having his name turned to Dormitantius.

The mention of the Cottian Alps as a place in which Vigilantius sojourned has led several writers, both Roman and Protestant, to connect the subsequent efforts for a religion freed from superstition made by Claude, bishop of Turin, and the Waldenses, with what may be called the Puritanism of Vigilantius (See Jonas Aurelianensis, quoted by Gilly, 484). The evidence is too slight to build upon; but Vigilantius must certainly be reckoned amongst those who raised an unavailing protest against a superstitious system destined to last till the Reformation. On his return to Gaul, he settled in his native country. Gennadius (*De Scr. Eccl.* c. 35) states that he at one time held a church in the

diocese of Barcelona; but this was probably at a later time, since his doctrines prevailed in the parishes of Riparius and Desiderius (Ripaïre and Didier), and the messenger who took back Jerome's work against Vigilantius took at the same time his Commentary on Zachariah which was dedicated and sent to Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, and his letter to Minervius and Alexander (119) who was presbyter of Toulouse, and the Commentary on Malachi dedicated to them.

The work of Vigilantius against superstitious practices was written about the year 403. We may presume that his intercourse with Severus, Paulinus and Jerome furnished the principal motives and materials for it. The fables told of St. Martin by Severus, the cult of St. Felix by Paulinus, the extreme asceticism recommended by the monk of Bethlehem, together with the crowds of persons maintained in idleness at Jerusalem by the mistaken almsgiving of the churches, are evidently present to his mind in making his protest. There were similar practices no doubt arising in a grosser form in his own neighbourhood among a population emerging from heathenism, which provoked his protest against the introduction of heathen ceremonial into Christian worship. The work is only known to us through the writings of Jerome, of whose unscrupulousness and violence in controversy we have many proofs. Nothing of the kind appears in the quotations from the book of Vigilantius, which, considering the extreme difficulty of his position in the rising flood of superstition, we must presume to have been a serious and faithful protest. It was not written hastily, under provocation, such as he may have felt in leaving Bethlehem, but after the lapse of six or seven years. His own bishop (*Jerome, Ep.* cix. 2) and several others in his neighbourhood (*Cont. Vig.* 2) approved his action, and he appears to have been appointed to a church in the diocese of Barcelona after the controversy had run its course (*Gennad. De Sc. Eccl.* 35).

The points against which he argues are four:—1. The superstitious reverence paid to the remains of holy men, which were carried round in the church assemblies in gold vessels or silken wrappings to be kissed, and the prayers in which their intercession was asked; 2. The late and frequent watchings at the basilicas of the martyrs, from which scandals constantly arose, the burning of numerous tapers, which was a heathen practice, the stress laid on the miracles performed at the shrines, which, Vigilantius maintained, were of use only to unbelievers; 3. The sending of alms to Jerusalem, which might much better be given to the poor in each separate diocese, and generally the monkish habit of divesting oneself of possessions which should be administered as a trust by the possessor; and, fourthly, the special virtue attributed to the unmarried state. Vigilantius held that for the clergy especially to be married was an advantage to the church; and he looked upon the solitary life as a cowardly forsaking of responsibility.

The bishop of the diocese, who may possibly have been Exuperius of Toulouse [EXUPERIUS], since he is known to have had communications with the pope, Innocentius, about this time on points of discipline, strongly favoured the

views of Vigilantius, and they began to spread widely in Southern Gaul. The clergy who were fostering the practices impugned by him found their people imbibing his views, and two of them, Desiderius and Riparius, wrote to Jerome, representing the opinions of Vigilantius and asking for his advice. Jerome answered at once in a letter to Riparius (*Ep.* 109, ed. Vall.), which is one expressive of chagrin and indignation rather than one of sober argument. He begins by declaring that no adoration was paid to the martyrs, but that their relics were honoured as a means of worshipping God. The bodies of Jacob and of Moses were not held to be unclean. He breaks off, however, very soon, confessing that in a case of plain sacrilege he cannot speak patiently. He expresses his wonder that the bishop of the diocese should acquiesce in Vigilantius's madness. It was a case for such dealing as that of Peter with Ananias and Sapphira. He offered, however, to answer more fully if the work of Vigilantius itself were sent to him.

This offer was accepted. Through their friend Sisinnius, who was going to the East with alms for the Egyptian monks and the poor of Jerusalem, Riparius and Desiderius sent the book in the latter part of the year 406. (*Pref. to Comm. on Zach.*) Jerome gave little attention to the book at first, but finding Sisinnius obliged to leave Bethlehem in haste, he sat down and in one night's work wrote his treatise *Contra Vigilantium*. This treatise has less of reason and more of mere abuse than any which he wrote. The method followed throughout is to impute to his adversary extreme views, which it may certainly be assumed that he did not hold. If you deny that the bones and shrines of martyrs are to be honoured, you assert that they ought never to have become martyrs. Or, if you say it is desirable that the clergy should marry, you assert that no one should be ordained unless the bishop first sees the wife pregnant or the child in her arms. Jerome admits that the lighting of candles by day is undesirable, but defends the simple devotion of those who adopt the practice. As to the support of the poor at Jerusalem, he is content to quote the practice of St. Paul as if it were binding in the 5th century, though his letters to Paulinus (58, § 4) shows his bad opinion of the population at Jerusalem. In reference to the monastic life, he admits that it is a flying from the battle; but it is safer to run away than to fight with a chance of being beaten. "There can be no doubt," says Zöckler (*Hieronymus*, p. 310) "that Jerome wrote no treatise which, both as to the matters which he defended and as to its tone of hatred and of passion, was more unworthy of him, than this immoderately vehement apology for a superstitious idolizing of the creature and a ceremonial sanctity against a man who at least in the main was striving to uphold the standpoint of pure evangelical truth."

What effect was produced by this philippic at the time we do not know. It is possible that Exuperius, if Vigilantius was in his diocese, by degrees changed his mind towards him, and that it was on this account that he passed into the diocese of Barcelona, where Gennadius places him. He does not appear to have been treated as a heretic in his own day. Indeed

Jerome in his *Apology* (iii. 19) expressly repels the imputation of having asserted that the character of Vigilantius had been stained by communion with heretics. But, as is seen by the sentence of Gelasius, quoted in the end of the article on Rufinus, the official leaders of the church came to reckon as enemies those whom Jerome had so treated, and Vigilantius came by degrees to be ranked among heretics. The sentence of Gennadius upon him is as follows (*De Sec. Eccl.* 35); "Vigilantius the presbyter, a Gaul by birth, held a church in the Spanish diocese of Barcelona. He wrote with a certain zeal for religion; but he was led astray by the praise of men, and presumed beyond his strength; and being a man of elegant speech but not trained in discerning the sense of the scriptures, he interpreted in a perverse manner the second vision of Daniel, and put forth other works of no value, which must be placed in the catalogue of heretical writings. He was answered by the blessed presbyter Jerome."

This judgment has lasted nearly down to our own time. In the year 1844, Dr. Gilly, Canon of Durham, published a work on "*Vigilantius and his Times*," (Seeleys), in which he brings together all the facts known about him, and shows the true significance of his protest by describing the life of Severus, Paulinus, and Jerome from their own writings. [W. H. F.]

VIGILANTIUS (2), one of the metropolitans of Illyricum addressed by pope Leo I. (*Ep.* 13) in 446 (*Pat. Lat.* liv. 663.) [C. H.]

VIGILIUS (1), a bishop to whom Celsus (otherwise unknown) dedicated his Latin translation of the Dialogue between Jason and Papius (*Pat. Lat.* vi. 49; Tillem. ii. 139). [C. H.]

VIGILIUS (2), bishop of Trent, martyr in A.D. 385, vid. for refs., *D. C. A.* [C. H.]

VIGILIUS (3), a deacon mentioned by Gennadius (*Scr. Eccl.* 51) as the author of a monastic rule, drawn from the Oriental monks "breviato et aperto sermone." Cave (i. 402) assigns his period as A.D. 420. What purports to be this rule is given by Holstein in his *Codex Regularum*, under the title *Regula Orientalis*, which may be seen likewise in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* li. 373; Ceillier (x. 472) has a notice of it. [C. H.]

VIGILIUS (4) THAPSENSIS, an African bishop, mentioned in the *Notitia* published at the end of the *Historia* of Victor Vitensis [VICTOR (44)], was present at the conference convened by the Vandal Hunneric in 484. He belonged to the Byzacene province, and was banished by the Vandal king. He seems then to have fled to Constantinople, where he wrote his works against Eutychianism and Arianism. He published one work alone under his own name, viz. his five books against Eutyches, in which he produces the usual arguments against the Eutychian system, and states them very clearly. An extremely good and copious analysis of this work will be found in Ceillier, x. 472-485. It is interesting as a specimen of fifth and sixth century controversy, and also as showing the evolution of thought among the Eutychians. The Eutychian party of his day had not quite completed or thought out their system. They had not fixed, for instance, on a date for the disappearance of Christ's human nature. A cen-

tury or so later they determined upon the Resurrection as the time when the human nature was swallowed up in the Divine. [ICONOCLASTAE, Vol. III. p. 203.] In the age of Vigilius this was a novel tenet, and found but few adherents, and he refers to it in his first book, as a view taught by some, not by all. In his fourth book he discusses the tome of St. Leo and the orthodoxy of the decrees of Chalcedon, in which he has some remarks important for liturgiology, on the form of the creed used at Rome. [See art. CREED, Vol. I. p. 708.] He defends St. Leo on the ground that he quoted the creed used in the Romish church from apostolic times. Vigilius wrote several works under various distinguished names. Thus Chifflet, who has published the best edition of his writings, attributes to Vigilius a dialogue in twelve books on the *Trinity*, printed among the works of St. Athanasius, a treatise against an Arian called Varimadus published under the name of Idacius Clarus, a book against Felicianus the Arian under that of St. Augustine; and two conferences, in which he represents Athanasius as disputing against Arius before a judge named Probus, who of course gives sentence against Arius. These conferences he published in two editions, one in two books, where Athanasius and Arius alone appear. Another in three books, in which Sabellius and Photinus are introduced in addition. His authorship of these conferences is absolutely certain, because in the fifth book of his work *Contra Eutyech.* p. 58, he speaks of his argument "in eis libris quos adversus Sabellium, Photinum et Arianum sub nomine Athanasii, conscripsimus," Chifflet also ascribes to him a treatise against Palladius, an Arian bishop, printed among the works of St. Ambrose and of Gregory Naz, and also the acts of the Council of Aquileia found among the *Epistles* of St. Ambrose (*Epist. S. Ambros. prima Classis*). The Athanasian creed has also been attributed to him, chiefly on the ground that in the creed and in his treatise against Eutyches the same use is made of an argument derived from the constitution of Man. In both the union of two natures in man is brought forward as an explanation of the union of two natures in the one person of Jesus Christ. The works of Vigilius were published, with an elaborate commentary by Chifflet at Dijon in 1664, together with those of Victor Vitensis. This edition has been reprinted by Migne, *P. L.* t. lxiii. [G. T. S.]

VIGILIUS (5), bishop of Rome, intruded into the see in the room of Silverius, A.D. 537, by Belisarius, acting under the orders of the empress Theodora. By birth a Roman of good position, being the son of one John, who had been consul, he had accompanied Agapetus as one of his deacons, when that pope went to Constantinople A.D. 536 and procured from Justinian the deposition and banishment of the Monophysite patriarch Anthimus, and the appointment of Mennas in his room. [See AGAPETUS.] The Monophysite party (called commonly at that time the *Acephali*), who continued to

* They began to be so called when Peter Mongus accepted the see of Alexandria on the doctrinal basis of the emperor Zeno's *Henoticon*. Some of his followers then deserted him, and were called *Acephali*, as being a party without a head.

reject the council of Chalcedon, had a resolute supporter in the notorious empress Theodora, through whose contrivance Anthimus had been originally translated to Constantinople, and who continued to manage her orthodox husband, though he prided himself on being a theological autocrat. "Theodora," says Procopius (*Hist. arcan.*), "took upon herself to manage all things in the state; for she herself appointed both to magistracies and ecclesiastical offices, aiming at and continually keeping before her this one thing, that no honourable or good man should obtain any dignity, but only such as would be subservient to her commands." Agapetus having died in April, A.D. 536, when on the point of departing for Rome, she seems to have lost no time in securing, if possible, a subservient pope as his successor. According to Liberatus (*Breviarium*, c. 22), she sent for Vigilius, and promised him an order to Belisarius to get him ordained pope, and also a reward of seven *centenaria* of gold,^b on condition of his secretly undertaking to disallow the council of Chalcedon, and to write to Anthimus, and also to Theodosius and Severus (former Monophysite patriarchs of Alexandria and Ephesus, who, like Anthimus, had been promoted by Theodora, but since deposed), confirming their faith. Vigilius (says the same authority) willingly complied, influenced "by the love of episcopacy and of gold," and thereupon proceeded to Rome, but found, on his arrival, Silverius already ordained. He then (it is further related) sought Belisarius, who was at Naples,^c delivered him the order of the empress, and promised him two *centenaria* of gold in case of Silverius being removed and himself ordained. For an account of the subsequent proceedings at Rome to attain this end, the deposition, banishment, and death of Silverius, and the ordination of Vigilius by order of Belisarius, see art. on SILVERIUS.

Vigilius having been thus ordained in the year 537 (on the 22nd of November, according to the conclusion of Pagi; on the 25th of March, according to that of Mansi),^d and the death of Silverius having been certainly not earlier than 20 June, A.D. 538, it is evident that for at least seven months his position was that of an unlawful antipope, his predecessor never having been canonically deposed. Nor is it easy to see how he ever became lawful pope at all, if it be true (as Bower contends, quoting many authorities) that ordination to a see canonically full was anciently accounted null and void. For the supposition of Baronius, that after the death of Silverius he resigned his usurped position, and was re-ordained, has not a shadow of historical evidence to rest on. However, as pope he was accepted, the deposition of bishops and the ordination of others in their room under imperial dictation being at that time, however irregular,

^b "Centenaria auri in Cod. Justin. lib. 12, tit. 51, leg. 12, sunt centenae librae auri signati, ut contra Dion. Gotofr. et Cujac. ostendit Salmas. ad Lamprid. in Alexand. Sev. c. 39."—Facciolati.

^c Liberatus says, at Ravenna. But see article on SILVERIUS.

^d For discussion of probable dates, see Pagi in Baron. ad an. 536, cxx.; ad an. 538, vi.; and ad an. 555, vii.; with Mansi's notes.

common enough elsewhere; and the ancients seem to have dated his episcopate from the time of his intrusion into the see. For Anastasius gives as the duration of that of Silverius 1 year, 5 months and 11 days, which could only be on the supposition that it terminated with his deposition, while as the duration of that of Vigilus (who died A.D. 555) he gives 17 years, and some months and days, thus implying that it began in the year 537, when he was first ordained.

Through Antonina, the wife of Belisarius and the real accomplice and agent of the empress in the whole transaction, Vigilus sent without delay letters to Anthimus, Theodosius, and Severus, in fulfilment of his secret promise. He expressed therein his entire agreement with them in matters of faith, but charged them to keep his avowal in the dark, so that he might more easily accomplish what he had undertaken to do. He added a confession of his own faith, condemning the *Tome* of pope Leo (in which the orthodox doctrine of two Natures in Christ had been enunciated), and anathematizing Paul of Samosata, Diodorus* (of Tarsus), Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret, with all who agreed with them. Binius and Baronius, in their jealousy for the credit of the Roman see, dispute the genuineness of this letter, supposing it to have been forged by the Monophysite party. But no valid ground has been adduced for suspecting it. It is given by Liberatus and Victor Tunonensis, who were both contemporaries; and Facundus (*c. Mociamum*), also a contemporary, seemingly alludes to it.† Pagi (*Not. in Baron. ad an. 538*) meets at length and successfully the arguments of Baronius, alleging at the same time that the Roman see was not compromised, since Vigilus was not the true pope at the time of writing.

* In the extant editions of the letter the name here is Dioscorus, which Pagi, with good reason, supposes to have been an error of transcription for Diodorus. For Dioscorus of Alexandria, the supporter of Eutyches and the president of the Robber Council (*Latrocinium*), could not have been anathematized by Vigilus in the interests of Eutychianism along with Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret. But Diodorus of Tarsus, who with them had been accused of Nestorianism, and to whose school of thought the latter of these had belonged, was likely to have been associated with them by the Eutychian, or Monophysite, party. Further, the order in which the names occur suggests Diodorus, rather than Dioscorus; for the former came in point of time between Paul of Samosata and the other two, Dioscorus being of later date.

† Baronius cites, in proof of the spuriousness of the epistle, *Act 15 sextae synodi*—"Anathema sit libro qui dicitur Mennae ad Vigilium, et qui eum scripserunt sive finxerunt: anathema libellis qui dicuntur facti fuisse a Vigilio ad Justinianum et Theodoram divae memoriae." He supposes the latter anathema to refer to the letter before us. But the reference cannot be to it, since it is not addressed to Justinian and Theodora. Its inscription in the present (apparently corrupt) text of Liberatus is, "Dominis et Christis (*al. Patribus*) Vigilus." But Victor Tunonensis gives it thus,—"Dominis et in Christi Dei Salvatoris nostri caritate conjunctis fratribus, Theodosio, Anthemio, et Severo episcopis Vigilus episcopus." Baronius notes also the condemnation of Dioscorus in the letter (with respect to which see last note), as suggesting suspicion of forgery. But a forger would have been unlikely as Vigilus himself to inroduce such an obvious inconsistency.

In whatever way the circumstances were represented to Justinian, he was evidently kept in the dark about all these secret proceedings, since, after the death of Silverius, he wrote to Vigilus, sending a confession of his own faith, and recognizing him as pope without any suspicion of his orthodoxy. The letter was sent to Rome by a patrician and ex-consul Dominicus, the reply to it, dated 540, together with a letter addressed at the same time to the patriarch Mennas, being extant. In these letters Vigilus declares himself altogether orthodox, accepts the *tome* of Leo and the council of Chalcedon, and condemns by name Theodosius, Anthimus, and Severus, together with all abettors of the Eutychian heresy. Baronius adduces these letters as evidence against the genuineness of his alleged previous letter to the deposed patriarchs, and also as striking proofs of divine watchfulness over the apostolic see, in that even such a man as Vigilus is acknowledged to have been originally was guarded from countenancing heresy from the time of his becoming lawful pope. It is true that he backed out of his promise to the empress, which he had all along been so desirous should be kept a secret: but, though thus preserved from openly committing the see of Rome to Monophysite heresy, he cut in other respects but a sorry figure as an authority in matters of faith, as will appear below.

In the year 541 began at Constantinople the new theological disputes which led to the 2nd council of Constantinople (called the 5th oecumenical), in the course of which Vigilus came in conflict with the emperor, presenting a painful picture of vacillation and inconsistency. It is not easy to disentangle the skein of events at this juncture, when various parties were pulling the strings, and when the great Justinian himself, while he posed as a despotic theologian, was, notwithstanding his undoubted abilities, made a tool of by intriguers. The course of things, briefly stated, appears to have been as follows.

The controversy on the writings of Origen, which had been rife in Palestine in the fourth century, when Jerome had been resident at Bethlehem, had lately broken out afresh in the monasteries there. Peter, the patriarch of Jerusalem, who was opposed to the Origenists, sent two abbots to Constantinople, with a letter to the emperor, and extracts from Origen's writings, complaining of the commotions excited by the Origenistic party, and praying for their condemnation (*Vit. S. Sabae*). Pelagius, apocriarius of the Roman see at Constantinople, who had been himself in Palestine, was joined by these monks on his return, and supported their petition, having (as Liberatus informs us) his own private reasons for doing so. For two Origenistic abbots from Palestine, Domitian and Theodore Ascidas, were at that time resident at the court of Justinian, and had acquired great influence with him. The former the emperor had made bishop of Ancyra, and the latter of Caesarea in Cappadocia; but they still remained at Constantinople. It was to jealousy of Theodore Ascidas that Liberatus attributes the readiness of Pelagius to support the petition of the monks. Mennas, the patriarch, also joined him, being perhaps similarly influenced. The emperor, glad of the opportunity of dictating on a question of theo-

logy, readily acceded, and issued a long edict, addressed to Mennas, setting forth and confuting the heresies attributed to Origen; commanding the patriarch to assemble the bishops and abbots then at Constantinople for the purpose of anathematizing him, his doctrine, and his followers, and to suffer no bishop or abbot to be thenceforth appointed except on condition of doing the same. The edict was to be sent also to all the other patriarchs, including Vigilius of Rome, who were all enjoined to receive it. There seems to have been no resistance to this imperial command; few probably out of Palestine cared enough about the matter to incur the risk of disobedience; but, if the purpose of Pelagius and Domitian had been to ruin Theodore Ascidas and Domitian, they were disappointed, for the latter signed the decrees of the synod which Mennas assembled, and retained their influence at court.

To them, Theodore and Domitian, the historians of the time attribute the moving of Justinian to take up the question of "the three Chapters,"—that further subject of controversy by which he long disturbed the church's peace. He was engaged, we are told, after his condemnation of Origen, in composing a treatise on the Incarnation in defence of the council of Chalcedon and in refutation of the Eutychians. Theodore and Domitian suggested to him at this juncture that he might better serve the cause of orthodoxy by procuring a condemnation of certain writers who had been accused of Nestorianism, but had been acquitted of the charge of heresy by the council of Chalcedon. These writers were Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas, the alleged author of a letter to one Maris, a Persian. It was represented to the emperor that, if these were now authoritatively condemned, and the council of Chalcedon freed from the imputation of having approved their errors, the Acephali would no longer refuse to accept that council. Theodore and Domitian were moved, it would seem, to offer this advice, partly in order to turn Justinian's thoughts into a new channel, and so diminish the risk of his discovering their own concealed Origenism; partly by way of reprisal on Pelagius and other Chalcedonists who had procured the condemnation of Origen; and partly because one at least of the writers in question, Theodore of Mopsuestia, was held to have written in opposition to the views of Origen. And they were abetted in their design, if not moved to it, by Theodora the empress, who welcomed the opportunity of covertly disparaging Chalcedon, and promoting measures against writers who had long been held in abhorrence by the Monophysite party which she favoured. It has been said above that Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret had been among those whom Vigilius had been by her required to condemn. The emperor, who had at heart the object so adroitly proposed to him, that of reconciling the Acephali to Chalcedon, and who was always only too glad of an opportunity of dogmatizing, readily fell into the snare. The writings thus prepared for condemnation are known as "the Three Chapters" (*tres capitula*). The imperial edict against them (*περὶ τριῶν κεφαλαίων*) was issued probably about A.D. 544, in which they, their deceased authors, and all defenders of them, were anathe-

matized,—with a saving clause to guard against any inculpation of the council of Chalcedon:—"Si quis dicit haec nos ad abolendos aut excludendos sanctos patres qui in Chalcedonensi fuere concilio dixisse, anathema sit" (Facund. l. iv. c. 4). The edict itself has not been preserved, its purport being known only from fragments given by Facundus.* It was given to Mennas, as that against Origen had been, to be accepted within his jurisdiction, and sent to all the patriarchs to receive universal ecclesiastical sanction. Justinian acknowledged in theory the authority of the spirituality in matters spiritual; but he took upon him to dictate to the spirituality what doctrines they should approve or condemn, and to enforce compliance with his own views. He aimed at being an autocrat in church as well as state. But it was not so easy in this case as in the former one to secure compliance, the edict being regarded as disparaging the authority of the council of Chalcedon. Mennas at first refused his assent to it, but at length gave his acquiescence in writing, though still with the proviso that, if the Roman bishop should declare against it, his approval should be withdrawn. The other three patriarchs of the East also refused at first, but yielded to threats of deposition. The rest of the Eastern bishops followed their example, the few who still refused being in the end deposed and banished. But in the West, less accustomed to imperial despotism, there was more difficulty. Especially in North Africa, and in Illyria and Dalmatia, the bishops and clergy were resolute in their opposition. It was of course of the first importance for the emperor's purpose to win over Vigilius, who, from his antecedents, might have been expected to obey. But it did not prove so. Being now in possession of his see, he shewed, though inconsistently in the sequel, considerable independence of spirit, being probably influenced by the prevailing feeling at Rome, and in the West generally. He being himself, it may be supposed, no great theologian, his deacons, Anatolius and Pelagius, suspecting a plot of the Monophysite party, wrote to the learned deacon, Fulgentius Ferrandus of Carthage, requesting him to deliver an opinion on the subject after consultation with his bishop, or other competent persons. He replied to the effect that what the council of Chalcedon had approved ought not to be called in question, since the conclusions of all councils might be unsettled if this were done, that persons deceased were removed from the jurisdiction of human tribunals, and that what individuals had written, whether right or wrong, did not matter much, having no binding authority (Facundus, l. iv. c. 3). Thus supported and advised, Vigilius refused his assent to the emperor's edict, and was thereupon summoned peremptorily to Constantinople, and unwillingly obeyed the summons. Anastasius (*in Vit. Vigil.*) ascribes his going to Constantinople to the action of Theodora, on the ground of her being incensed against him for not fulfilling his promise to her about the revocation of Anthimus, and on the plea of accusations of homicide and cruelty

* A lengthy edict, beginning, "Scientes quod nihil aliud," given by Baronius as the original one (*ad an. 546, xi.*), appears to have been a subsequent production. See Pagi in Baron. *ad an. 546.*

made to her against him by the Roman people. The story continues that she thereupon sent one Anthemius, a scribe, with a charge to seize the pope, wherever found (unless it were in the basilica of St. Peter), under pain (as the empress swore by the living God) of being skinned alive;—that Vigilius was found and apprehended in the church of St. Caecilia, and at once carried on board ship in the Tiber;—and that the Roman populace threw stones after him as he departed, crying, "Famine and death go with thee." But, as all the contemporary writers speak only of his having been sent for by Justinian in the matter of the Three Chapters, little credit is due to the whole story thus told.

Vigilius sailed first to Sicily, where he was joined by Datus, bishop of Milan, a resolute opponent of the condemnation of the Three Chapters, and by an emissary from the patriarch of Antioch, and was apparently by them informed that Mennas, with his colleagues at Constantinople, had already condemned the writings, without waiting, as they had been expected to do, for the pope's arrival, and that Stephen (who had succeeded Pelagius as the pope's apocrisiarius), with others, had consequently withdrawn from the patriarch's communion. Thereupon he wrote from Sicily to Mennas, referring to the injunctions that had been sent by the emperor to himself to the effect that he should consult the peace of the church by compliance, and setting forth in reply that the peace of this world was not the same thing as the peace of Christ. And he further threatened to assert his authority on his arrival at Constantinople, unless what had been done amiss were amended (Facundus, l. iv. c. 3; and c. Mocianum). Arrived at Constantinople, accompanied by Datus (A.D. 547), he persevered for a time in the same attitude, renouncing communion with Mennas and his followers,—for four months, according to Theophanes (*Chron.* l. iv.). But, having been received, says the same authority, with flattering distinction by both emperor and empress, he was before long won over to remove the excommunication, and to give a secret promise to condemn the chapters (*Occulta ejus ante judicium pollicitatio tenebatur, in qua se spopondit eadem capitula damnaturum. Facund. c. Moc.*). In fulfilment of this promise he first presided over a synod, with the hope of inducing it to do what the emperor required. But meeting opposition there,—and especially from bishop Facundus of Ermiana, who requested leave to argue the question (Facundus himself tells the story), he suspended the proceedings, requiring the bishops separately to send to him their opinions in writing. Imperial officers were employed to hasten the preparation of the required replies, which were given in to Vigilius, and by him handed to the emperor. Seventy bishops were thus induced to declare for the condemnation of the chapters, including many who had previously refused to comply. Vigilius appears, from the detailed account of the proceedings given by the said Facundus (who is our main authority, and apparently quite trustworthy), to have been adroit in cajoling objectors by misrepresenting his own intentions in the matter. He represented to them that in merely handing these answers of the bishops to the emperor he threw all responsibility in the matter on him, and saved the see

of Rome from complicity in disparagement of the council of Chalcedon. As if, says Facundus (*c. Mocianum*), he could not have burnt the answers or refused to take them, or condemned them by his own authority. But he did more than report to the emperor. He himself, in the next place, supported by these seventy signatories, issued the document known as his *Judicatum*, addressed to Mennas, and promulgated on Easter Eve, A.D. 548 (*Ep. Vigili, ad Rustianum et Sebastianum*). In it he condemned the Chapters, though disavowing any disparagement thereby of the council of Chalcedon. This *Judicatum* provoked serious opposition. At Constantinople Facundus continued resolute in his position, protesting against bishops who betrayed their trust to win favour with princes:—If (said he) God should now raise up an Ambrose, there would not fail to be a Theodosius. Vigilius' own deacons, Rusticus and Sebastianus, with others, declared against him, and renounced his communion; after which he wrote these two deacons a long vituperative letter, which is extant, deposing them from their office and excommunicating them. Elsewhere the bishops of Illyricum condemned the *Judicatum* in synod; those of North Africa did the same, and even formally excommunicated Vigilius, reserving him only the penance of the church (Vict. Tunon. *ad an.* 549, 550). Alarmed by the consequences of his act, Vigilius now recalled his *Judicatum*, and seems to have represented to the Westerns that he had issued it unwillingly, pleading also ignorance of the emperor's intentions; to which excuses Facundus replies that he could not plead unwillingness, since no severe persecution had been used to compel him; and that the plea of ignorance was inconsistent with that of unwillingness. He attributes his whole action to desire of court favour and position, as his earlier secret promise to Theodora had been due to ambition. He could not, however, undo what he had done, for the *Judicatum* was now known far and wide, Rusticus and Sebastianus having taken upon themselves to circulate copies of it, for doing which without his leave he severely reproves them in his letter to them that has been referred to. He seems to have wished so to manage matters as to be able to back out if necessary, throwing the onus of both the exaction and the promulgation of the *Judicatum* on the emperor. If any further proof were needed of his double dealing, we should have a signal one in the fact (if it be true) that, at the very time when he was thus trying to persuade the Westerns that he was on their side, he was induced by the emperor to take a secret oath before him to do all he could to bring about the condemnation of the Three Chapters. The oath said to have been thus taken, attested by Theodorus of Caesarea and the patrician Cethegus, present at the time of swearing, and dated the 23rd year of Justinian, is given among the Acts of the 7th session of the 5th council (Labbe, vol. vi. p. 194), and may have been produced then with other documents which were sent by the emperor to compromise Vigilius. There seems to be no sufficient reason to doubt its genuineness. In it he swore in the most solemn form to unite with the emperor to the utmost of his power to cause the chapters to be condemned and anathematized; to take no

measures or counsels with any one in their favour against the emperor's will; and to declare to him whatever he might hear prejudicial to the faith or the republic with reference to these chapters as well as to other matters:—but all this on the understanding that the oath thus taken should be kept secret from all, and that the emperor, in consideration of his position, would not betray his person, and would also secure to him his honour and dignity, and the privileges of his see. Conduct like this at this juncture renders highly probable his alleged secret compact with Theodora, and his private letters to the Eutychian bishops, at the beginning of his reign, though, as has been seen above, Baronius and others are anxious to regard these charges as unproven. All was in keeping with his character. Probably he cared little himself about the theological matters in dispute, but he denied two things which were really inconsistent:—to keep well with his own clergy and the Western bishops generally, and to retain court favour. The result of his crooked policy was, as it was likely to be, that neither party trusted him, and that he got wrong with both.

In the same year in which the *Judicatum* was issued (A.D. 548) Theodora died, so that she was no longer at hand to instigate or manage the emperor. But he continued resolute in carrying out his project for the condemnation of the Three Chapters by full ecclesiastical authority. Vigilius, hampered by the repudiation of his *Judicatum* in the West, and by his own secret understanding with the emperor, would gladly have left the scene of action. In a letter to Aurelianus of Arles, in which he expresses himself as on the side of the Westerns, he says, "When the lord, my son, the most clement emperor shall (with the help of God who holds his heart) order me to return, as he has promised, I will send to you one who shall inform you accurately of all that has been here done." But his presence being required at Constantinople for the emperor's purpose, he was not allowed to go. The plan he now adopted was to persuade the emperor to summon the bishops, both of the East and West (including especially those of Africa and Illyricum who had shewn themselves so strongly opposed to the *Judicatum*) to a council at Constantinople, and in the meantime to take no further steps. Justinian, ever open to management, acted on his advice; but, though the obsequious Easterns of course obeyed the summons,^h very few of the Westerns came at the time appointed;—a small number from Italy, two from Illyricum, but none from Africa. Justinian would have had Vigilius proceed at once with such bishops as were in Constantinople without waiting for the rest. Vigilius, who now shewed considerable spirit, refused to do so. Thereupon the emperor issued a new edict against the chapters, which he caused to be posted in the churches. Vigilius not only protested against this act as a violation of the agreement come to, but also called an

^h "The Greek bishops have rich churches, and cannot bear to be suspended for two months from domination over ecclesiastical affairs. Wherefore, according to circumstances, and according to the will of princes, they consent without altercation to whatever is required of them." (*Letter of the Roman clergy to the legates of the Franks* A.D. 551. See Labbé, vol. v. p. 1397.)

assembly of bishops in the palace of Placidia where he lodged, conjured them to use their efforts to procure a revocation of the edict till the episcopate of the West should have an opportunity of declaring its opinion, and in virtue of the authority of the apostolic see declared all excommunicated who should meanwhile sign or receive it. Datus of Milan, who was his firm supporter in these proceedings, also in a loud voice (*magna vociferatione*) declared all supporters of the edict to be separated from his own communion, and from that of the churches of Gaul, Burgundy, Spain, Liguria, Aemilia and Venetia (*Vigil. Ep. Encycl. and Ep. Cler. Ital. ad legat. Franc.*). The only Eastern bishop who supported the pope on the occasion seems to have been Zoilus of Alexandria, who was consequently deposed on the same day by the emperor. Vigilius and Datus, with good reason apprehending danger, took refuge in the basilica of St. Peter in Ormisda; and there the former drew up a letter of excommunication against bishop Theodore Ascidas of Caesarea, whom he accused of being the main contriver of all the mischief,ⁱ and also against Mennas the patriarch, and all who had acted with them. But he did not at once promulge the sentence, in the hope (as he says in his encyclic letter above referred to) that the emperor would be moved to recall his edict. He committed it meanwhile to a trustworthy person, to be published in case of need arising through violence being offered to himself, or his own death ensuing. Justinian sent the praetor whose office it was to apprehend common malefactors, with an armed band, to seize the pope in his place of refuge. He fled to the altar of St. Sergius in the church, and clung to its columns, whence he was dragged violently by his feet, so that the altar would have been pulled down had it not been held up by the clergy present. But a mob assembling at the door of the church, rescued him. After this, an honourable embassy was sent to him, including Belisarius and Justin the emperor's nephew, who induced him on the security of an oath to return to the palace of Placidia. He complied, he says in his encyclic letter, only because he was told that he would be removed violently if he refused, not as being satisfied with the terms of the promise made to him, which was not what he demanded, but all that the emperor would allow. After thus leaving the church he complains of having been subjected to incredible annoyances, being visited repeatedly and pressed to conform to the emperor's will, while he in vain, both by word and writing, appealed to the oath that had been sworn to him that he should be left in peace if he would return to his palace. At length, finding that every egress from the house was guarded, and hearing from his bedchamber voices that filled him with alarm, he escaped by night, though in bad health, over a wall that was in course of construction, and reaching the shore, took boat for Chalcedon, and there sought the sanctuary of the church of St. Euphemia. This was two days before Christmas, A.D. 551.

No attempt was made to violate this sanctuary:

ⁱ It was this Theodore, be it remembered, who was said to have been, with his colleague Domitian, the original instigator of the emperor in the matter of the Three Chapters.

its sanctity in public opinion, Justinian's own religious scruples, and a desire now to conciliate rather than to irritate, may have conspired to prevent any: and so the pope remained safe there, and in a position to dictate the terms on which he would take part in the forthcoming council. The same honourable embassy as before was sent to him to induce him to come out again under the security of a solemn oath. But he was resolute in remaining where he was till the edict against the chapters was revoked, and the whole question recognised as open till the council should have considered it. The emperor, in his anxiety to secure the pope's concurrence at the council, at length acceded to these conditions.

Theodore also (threatened with the excommunication, which was kept in readiness, though not yet formally promulgated), Mennas, and other bishops, proffered him a profession of their faith, including full acceptance of the council of Chalcedon, and of the decrees of all preceding popes, assenting fully to the revocation of whatever had been so far issued against the Three Chapters, expressing regret for any ill-treatment to which Vigilius had been subjected, and apologizing for having at any time received into their communion any whom he had excommunicated or condemned (*Constitutum Vigilii*). Thus apparently triumphant for the time, and invested with the temporary dignity of firmness, Vigilius returned to Constantinople towards the end of the year 552, having been nearly a year in the sanctuary of St. Euphemia. Mennas had meanwhile died, and Eutychius, who had succeeded him, addressed to the pope a confession of faith and of agreement with the four councils and with the decrees of popes, similar to what had been offered to him by Mennas previously, with a respectful request that he would take the presidency of the forthcoming council. This letter was signed also by Apollinaris, who had been intruded in the room of Zoilus into the see of Alexandria, Domnus of Ephesus, Elias of Thessalonica, and other bishops. Vigilius replied in an extant letter to Eutychius, giving his assent. But he represented at the same time to the emperor the overwhelming preponderance of Eastern bishops who would be present at the council, and requested leave to convene a synod of Westerns, including the Africans, in some part of Italy, or at any rate in Sicily, which should in the first place deliberate on the subject of the Three Chapters, and send their report to the emperor. Unsuccessful in this request, he proposed that the emperor should summon to Constantinople a number of Western bishops, whose names he and his colleagues would submit for approval, for the purpose of such deliberation. But neither was this allowed. To a third proposal, that the matter should be determined by an equal number on both sides of the Western and Eastern bishops then present at Constantinople, Justinian assented: but, finding it very unacceptable to the Eastern bishops, who pleaded the comparatively small number of Westerns that had taken part in former general councils, and the fact that the Western bishops had been summoned as well as the Easterns, and might have been present if they had chosen, he summoned the council, as he had originally intended, to meet on the fifth of May, A.D. 553.

On the appointed day the Easterns met, in number 165, under the presidency of Eutychius. Vigilius and the Westerns, though urged to come by a deputation from the emperor, kept aloof, assembling by themselves in the Placidian palace. A deputation, consisting of the three patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, with twenty Metropolitans, was sent to him from the council, at its first session, to request his attendance. He pleaded indisposition, but promised to send his answer the next day. The same deputation again waited on him at the time appointed, and received his promised answer, which was to the effect that he could not take part in proceedings where the Easterns, who were prejudiced on the matter in dispute, were in so large a majority. To their arguments and remonstrances he finally replied that in the space of twenty days he would send his judgment on the points at issue, alleging the weak state of his health as justifying so long a time for preparing it. This answer being reported to the council at its third session, it determined to wait no longer, and proceeded to an examination of the writings which it had been assembled to condemn, and, in obedience to the emperor's orders, in a spirit adverse to them from the first. Vigilius, meanwhile, in concert with the Westerns that were with him, prepared a document, known as his *Constitutum ad Imperatorem*. It was a very lengthy composition, addressed to the emperor. It begins with a recapitulation of the negotiations before the opening of the council between himself and the emperor: it then quotes at great length, and refutes, extracts that had been made from the works of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and condemns the views expressed as heretical: but it proceeds to protest against the condemnation of Theodorus himself as a heretic after his death, since he had not been so condemned when alive and had died in communion with the church; and also against any such condemnation of Theodoret or of the letter of Ibas, both having been acquitted of heresy by the council of Chalcedon. Finally, the following judgment is authoritatively pronounced: "These things, therefore, having been settled by us with all caution and diligence . . . we ordain and decree that it is lawful for no one pertaining to orders and dignities ecclesiastical to write, or promulge, or compose, or teach anything contrary to what we have in this present constitution asserted and ordained concerning the said Three Chapters, or to move any further question after this present definition. But if anything has been or shall be found to have been done said or written in the name of any one pertaining to orders and dignities ecclesiastical, or by any one whatever, in the matter of the same Three Chapters contrary to what we have here asserted and ordained, we in every way refute it by the authority of the apostolic see over which, by the grace of God, we preside." This *Constitutum*, dated 14 May, A.D. 553, was signed also by sixteen Western bishops, and by Theophanius, the archdeacon, and Pelagius and Peter, two deacons of Rome. It does not appear that the emperor transmitted it to the council: but he handed in, at the 7th session, on the 26th of May, a statement of what had previously passed between himself and Vigilius;—how the latter had once himself condemned the chapters, and

had pledged himself to do so by word, by writing, and by solemn oath; and how he had been invited to the council and had refused to come. He sent also copies of sundry letters and other documents thus implicating the pope, and a direction to the council signed by himself that it should proceed with its work, without regard to Vigilius, and even remove his name from the diptychs of the church. The fathers obsequiously lauded the emperor's pious solicitude in defence of the faith, and in their two subsequent sessions proceeded to a definite sentence. Anathemas were pronounced against Theodorus of Mopsuestia, his person as well as his writings, and against all defenders of them; against the inculcated writings, but not the persons, of Theodoret and Ibas; and all who should contravene the decisions of the council, or continue to defend the condemned writings, were, if ecclesiastics, to be deprived, if monks or laymen, to be excommunicated.

The banishment of Vigilius, asserted by Anastasius, to the island of Proconnesus is doubtful. There is indeed no doubt that many bishops were both deposed and banished by the emperor. Liberatus makes the general statement, "quomodo consentientes episcopi in trium damnationem capitulorum muneribus ditabantur; vel non consentientes depositi in exilium missi sunt; vel aliqui fuga latitantes in angustiis felicem exitum susceperunt, quoniam nota sunt omnibus, puto nunc a me silenda." (*Breviar. c. xxiv.*) But neither he nor any contemporary author speak definitely of any banishment of Vigilius, which is therefore on the whole improbable. Banished or not, he did not long retain his firmness: for there is no doubt that he soon changed sides once more, assenting to and confirming the decrees of the council, and thus giving them at length the sanction of the Roman see. That he did this is indisputable, and, according to Evagrius (*lib. iv. c. 34.*), in writing, ἐγγράφως; nor does there seem to be valid reason for doubting the genuineness of the two written documents in which his recantation is declared. The first of these is a letter to the patriarch Eutychius, first published by Peter de Marca from a MS. in the *Reg. Biblioth.* (1642) in Greek and Latin (*in diss. de decreto Papæ Vigilii pro confirm. V. Syn.—in ejusd. diss. III. a Baluzio editis*, Paris, 1669.—given in Labbe, *Concil.* vol. vi. p. 239). The reasons that have been adduced for doubting it (as to which see J. Garner in *edit. Liberati, Dissert. de V. Syn. c. 7.*), mainly resting on its contents;—"dicunt primo, in hacce decretali contineri plura, non contraria magis sedis apostolicæ dignitati quam falsa et inepta;"—are no proofs that Vigilius did not write it.^j In it he attributes his own former dissent from the views of his brethren, though he had really held the same faith with them, to the machinations of

^j Peter de Marca (*Dissert. de Vigilii decreto*. See Labbe, vol. vi. p. 246) thus describes the MS. found by him in the Royal Library: "Volumen illud manuscriptum Graecum extat in bibliotheca regia, accurate descriptum a Leone Cinnomo, et ab eo repositum Constantinopoli in bibliotheca imperatoria, temporibus Michaelis Palaeologi, anno mundi 6734, seu anno Christi 1276. Amanuensis vero testatur a se transcriptum ex autographo quod in veteri bibliotheca ecclesiae Romanae asservabatur, calamo exaratum anno Christi 753. Quod ideo annotavi, ut de manuscripti codicis antiquitate et fide nullus esset dubitandi locus."

the enemy of mankind, who had deceived him; but at length, he says, God had enlightened his mind to perceive the truth. His desire all along having been to ascertain the truth, he need not be ashamed, he continues, to acknowledge former error, since even so distinguished a theologian and master of the Latin language as Augustine had corrected his own writings, and retracted his own words. He concludes thus:—"Wherefore we anathematize and condemn the aforesaid three impious chapters, i.e. the so-called epistle of Ibas to Maris the Persian, in which the above described wicked blasphemies are contained, and the impious Theodorus of Mopsuestia with his wicked writings, and what Theodoret impiously wrote. And whosoever at any time shall hold them to be received or deferred to, or shall ever endeavour to set aside this present condemnation, we condemn with the like anathema. But those who, preserving the true faith declared by the four synods aforesaid, have condemned or do condemn the said Three Chapters we hold as brethren and fellow priests. And whatever may have been promulgated, or anywhere found, whether in my name or that of any persons whatever in defence of the said Three Chapters, by the authority of this present full constitution we declare null and void."

This letter is dated Dec. 8, A.D. 553, i.e. six months after the conclusion of the council. The other document above spoken of (dated Feb. 23, A.D. 554), was first published by Baluzius, in *Nov. Collect. Concil.* p. 1551, from an old MS. in the *Biblioth. Colbertin.* It is entitled "Constitutum Vigilii pro damnatione trium Capitulorum" (given in Labbe, vol. vi. p. 239), being a lengthy production like the previous *Constitutum*, and much in the same style. It expresses entire agreement with the decisions of the council, and ends with the same declaration, word for word, as has been quoted above from the letter to Eutychius.

Justinian having thus attained his end, Vigilius was allowed to leave the imperial city for Rome, after a compelled absence of 7 years, having before his departure obtained from the emperor certain grants, privileges, and exemptions for the people of Rome and Italy (*Baron. ad an. 554, ix, x, xi, xii.*) But he died on his way, at Syracuse according to Anastasius, from an attack of the stone. His successor, the deacon Pelagius, fell under suspicion of having hastened his end, with respect to which charge see art. on PELAGIUS I. The exact date of his death is not known: it was either towards the end of the year 554, or in the earlier part of 555.^k His body was conveyed to Rome, and buried in the church of St. Marcellus on the Salarian Way.

Vigilius was evidently a man with no firmness of character or principle;—an exception in this respect to the majority of ancient popes, who usually maintained well the dignity and authority of the great Roman see against imperial despotism. The attempts of Baronius to vindicate his conduct after he had become lawful pope, though allowing him to have been a poor creature before, are pitifully unavailing. The man's character was of a piece throughout. He seems to have been ever ready to enter into

^k For conjectures as to the date, see Pagi in *Baron. ad an. 555, vii*, and Mansi's note.

secret compacts with a view to position and court favour, to keep them dark, and break them if it proved convenient: and he trimmed and prevaricated through his whole career. His temporary firmness at Constantinople, when he was backed by his Western friends and hoped for a time to carry the day against the emperor, does him little credit in view of his speedy repudiation of all his solemn declarations. It is true that, in those evil times of intrigue and controversy, and under a theological despot like Justinian, the position of honest ecclesiastics was peculiarly difficult; but there were some who, unlike Vigilius, had views and principles of their own, which they maintained consistently, and were prepared to suffer for. As an authority on matters of faith in virtue of his occupancy of St. Peter's chair he proved an utter failure; for what he authoritatively in that capacity pronounced on one day he as authoritatively revoked on another; and he changed backwards and forwards as circumstances changed. But to his final submission to Justinian's will was due this important result; that the fifth council, the origin, the purpose, and the conduct of which have been seen to have had so little to commend them, came at last to be universally accepted, in the West as well as the East, as oecumenical and authoritative. For, though its anathemas against the dead and their writings were passed under imperial dictation in defiance of the pope and of the Western Church, Vigilius's eventual approval of them was endorsed by his successors, and thus led to the general acceptance of the Council in the end, though not without prolonged resistance in some parts of the West.

There is no lack of contemporary authority for the history that has been given above;—viz. the *Breviarium* of Liberatus, archdeacon of Carthage; the *Ecclesiastical History* of Evagrius; the *Chronicon* of Victor, bishop of Tununum; the *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum*, and the *Liber contra Mocianum* of Facundus, bishop of Ermiiana; and the *Hist. bell. Goth.*, and the *Anecdota*, or *Historia arcana*, of Procopius. The writings of Facundus are peculiarly valuable in giving us an insight into the state of parties, and the course of events, in which he was himself implicated, having been, with Victor Tunonensis, a prominent opponent at Constantinople of the condemnation of the Three Chapters. We have also the letters written by Vigilius, which are of great historical value, and the Acts of the Fifth Council, with contemporary documents preserved among them. The letters of Vigilius which elucidate the foregoing history are—(1) Those written from Rome, before the controversy about the Three Chapters; viz. *Ep.* iv, ad Justinianum, and *Ep.* v. ad Mennam:—(2) Those written from Constantinople during the controversy; viz. *Ep.* xii. ad Valentinianum episcopum Tomitanum, *Ep.* xiii. Ad Aurelianum Arelatensem (both of which—the second with details—refer to his experience at Constantinople after his breach with the emperor), *Ep.* xiv. ad Rusticum et Sebastianum (his two deacons whom he excommunicated after the issue of his *Judicatum*), *Ep.* xv. (an encyclic, written during his conflict with the emperor, giving an account of his troubles), and *Ep.* xvi. Ad Eutygium (written in answer to the patriarch's letter of invitation to the council, which is also extant). We have also *Fragmentum*

damnationis Theodori episcopi Cesareae Cappadociae (the excommunication of Theodore Ascidas, which, as has been related, was prepared, but not promulged), the *Constitutum de tribus capitulis* (sent to Justinian during the sitting of the council), and the second *Constitutum*, together with the letter to Eutygium (with respect to which see above), in which he finally condemned the chapters. Preserved also is *Epistola legatis Francorum ab Italiae Clericis directa*, a letter addressed by the Roman clergy to the legates of Theodebald, the king of the Franks, who were about to proceed to Constantinople (A.D. 551), in which letter the legates are informed of the state of things in the imperial city, and are requested to support the pope against the emperor. Extant also is a letter from the African bishop Pontianus to Justinian, written on receipt of the emperor's edict against the Three Chapters, in which the writer protests against the condemnation of dead men, and disturbance thereby of the church's peace, and expresses fear of a covert design in favour of Eutygian heresy. This bold but temperate and respectful letter is valuable, not only for its own merits, but also as expressing well and concisely the view taken from the first by the North African bishops on the matter in dispute.

The following letters of Vigilius himself, not so far alluded to, also remain:—*Epp.* ii, iii, written apparently during the life of Silverius. The first of these is to Prefecturus, bishop of Bracara Augusta in Spain,—condemning the abstinence from meat of the Priscillianists, and the omission of *and* in the Doxology between "the Son" and "the Holy Ghost,"—allowing the reception into the church of returning penitents who had been re-baptized by Arians,—declaring unnecessary a second consecration of a re-built church, unless the altar had been removed,—forbidding any variation on any festivals in the canon itself of the mass,—and directing the excommunication of any who departed from the usual form of baptism in the name of the Holy Trinity. Appended in the received editions is a strong assertion of the supreme universal authority of the Roman see, in virtue of the special commission to St. Peter, whose name *Cephas* is interpreted as meaning *Head*. But this section of the letter, being absent from several MSS. (including that of the *Biblioth. Colbert.*) may be concluded to have been a later addition. *Ep.* iii. is to Caesarius of Arles, called forth by an inquiry of king Theodebert as to how one who had married his brother's wife was to be dealt with. The answer is that Caesarius may use his discretion in condoning the offence in consideration of the offender's penitence; but that the guilty parties must henceforth live in separate houses, and the king must forbid all such unions in future. *Epp.* vi, vii, viii, are to Auxanius of Arles on the occasion of the pall being sent to him after his accession, and the usual vicariate jurisdiction in Gaul assigned him; and *Ep.* ix. is to the bishops of Gaul on the same occasion with respect to him and his authority. *Epp.* x, xi, are to Aurelianus of Arles and the bishops of Gaul respectively, written when the former succeeded Auxanius in the see, and are of similar purport to those last mentioned. [J. B—y.]

VIGILIUS (6), twenty-first bishop of Auxerre, succeeded Palladius, A.D. 658, and con-

tinued bishop till 684. He is said, on account of his sanctity, to have incurred the dislike of Warachus, or Varatus, high steward of the Frank king, and been murdered in a wood at Scotia or Cotia (Boll. *A. SS. Mart.* ii. 71-2, from Ferrarius and Saussay; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 269; Vincent Belvac. *Spec. Hist.* xxiii. c. 126, ed. 1624). His feast is March 11, but some (e.g. Usuard and Saussay) give June 26. [J. G.]

VIGOR, seventh bishop of Bayeux, succeeded Contextus c. A.D. 514. He was born of noble and wealthy parents among the Atrebates, and flourished in the time of Childebert I, king of the Franks. He was educated in the monastery of St. Vedast at Arras, but leaving home and country he travelled westward with one companion to Bayeux, and settled first at an idolatrous village called Redeversus (Ravière). He died c. A.D. 537, and was buried at Bayeux, but his body was translated to Centoul. His feast is Nov. 1. His life is said to have been written by Paternus, bishop of Avranches (Surius, *Vit. SS.* xi. 23-5; Vincent Belvac. *Spec. Hist.* xxi. c. 39; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 348). Folcard. Sith. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxlvii. 1179) wrote a short *Carmen de S. Vigore*. [J. G.]

VILLICUS, bishop of Metz, 543-568 (*Gall. Chr.* xiii. 688), addressed by Mappinius with much praise (*Pat. Lat.* lxxviii. 43), and by Dynamius Patricius (lxxx. 25), who asks him to arrange his recall from exile. He is also eulogised in a poem of Venantius Fortunatus (lib. iii. *carm.* iv. in *P. L.* lxxxviii. 138). The Bollandists (17 Apr. ii. 476) place him among their *praetermissi*. [G. W. D.]

VIMINUS (VIMIUS), bishop in Scotland, placed by Camerarius (*De Scot. Fort.* 88, Jan. 18) in Fifeshire, and dated by King (*Kal. Jan.* 21) at A.D. 715 (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 142, 234). To him Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 637) ascribes *Lectura in Threnos* and *Meditationes in Psalterium*. He is possibly St. Finnian of Moville. [FINNIAN (2)]. [J. G.]

VINCENTIUS (1), martyr A.D. 192. [EUSEBIUS (108)].

VINCENTIUS (2), African bishop in Syn. iv. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Basilide*, A.D. 254, Cyp. *Ep.* 67; bishop of Thibaris, Prov. Byz., thirty-seventh suffrage in Syn. vii. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Bap.* ii. A.D. 256. Probably, therefore, he was the bishop whose absence under the persecution is felt by the Thibaritans (*Ep.* 57). "Episcopus tractantes non audiat." The name of the city is found only in these two passages, and in the *Collatio Carthag.* A.D. 411. [E. W. B.]

VINCENTIUS (3), deacon of Saragossa, one of the most famous martyrs in the persecution of Diocletian. Prudentius (*Peristeph.* v.) and certain Acta are the chief sources of information about him. A native of Saragossa, he was made archdeacon by bishop VALERIUS I. Arrested with his bishop, and brought to Valencia by DACIANUS, the praeses, probably in A.D. 304, after a long and rigorous imprisonment he unflinchingly endured the most horrible tortures. He is commemorated on Jan. 22. (*AA. SS. Jan.* ii. 393; Tillemont, *M. E.* v. 215;

Esp. Sag. viii. 179; xxx. 248; Gams, *Kirchenj. von Sp.* i. 376.) [F. D.]

VINCENTIUS (4), martyr of Gerona. [ORONTIUS (1)].

VINCENTIUS (5), bishop of Capua, for many years a prominent figure in the controversies of the 4th century, was probably the same as the priest Vincentius who was one of the two legates of pope Silvester to the council of Nice. He probably attended the council of Rome held by pope Julius in A.D. 341, and two years later was sent by him to Milan to induce the emperor Constans to convene the council of Sardica. He subscribes the Acts of this council, and was sent by it with Euphratas, bishop of Cologne, to persuade the Eastern emperor Constantius to recall the exiled bishops to their sees, a mission which proved successful (*Ath. Ap. c. Ar.* § 50, *Hist. Arian.* § 20 in *Patr. Gr.* xxv. 337, 716). After the Arian Constantius had by his victory over Magnentius become the master of the Roman world, Vincentius, with Marcellus another Campanian bishop, was sent to him at Arles by Liberius in A.D. 353, to obtain the assembling of a council at Aquileia. He was treated with such harshness that he was compelled to renounce communion with Athanasius [LIBERIUS (4) Vol. III. 718] (*Ath. ad Const.* 247, in *Patr. Gr.* xxv. 629). This was probably the extent of his error, though Liberius (*Hil. Frag.* vi. 677, in *Patr. Lat.* x. 688) speaks of it in graver terms. When the constancy of Liberius himself had given way, he wrote to Vincentius, asking him to convene the bishops of Campania and to write in their name to Constantius to procure his recall from exile (*Hil. supra* 682). Vincentius appears to have returned to the orthodox faith if he had ever left it, for at Ariminum he was one of the few who remained firm throughout (Damasi *Ep.* quoted by Theod. *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 17, in *Patr. Graec.* lxxxii. 1053). [F. D.]

VINCENTIUS (6), papal legate to the council of Nicea; *vid.* preceding.

VINCENTIUS (7), second bishop of Digne and martyr, accompanied Marcellinus, bishop of Embrun from Africa [MARCELLINUS (2)], and was sent by him with Dominus [DOMINUS (3)] into Gaul. When Dominus became bishop, Vincentius was only a deacon, but afterwards succeeded him, c. A.D. 374. Tillemont thinks he may have died about 407. His feast is 22 Jan. (Usuardus, *Mart.* 22 Jan.; Tillemont, *H. E.* vii. 561, 563, 780, viii. 557; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1110). The *Gall. Christ.* (iii. 1110) says he was present at the Council of Valence, A.D. 374, but though a Vincentius is there named, and the name appears in the synodical letter (Labbe, *Conc.* ii. 904, 906), yet it may not have been that of the bishop of Digne (Tillemont, *H. E.* ii. 369). [J. G.]

VINCENTIUS (8), presbyter of Constantinople, but intimately attached to Jerome, through whose writings we hear of him throughout the last twenty years of the 4th century. Jerome became acquainted with him when he came to Constantinople in 380 to be under Gregory Nazianzen, and Vincentius from that time shared the interests and pursuits of

his friend. To him, with Gallienus, Jerome dedicated his translation of Eusebius's chronicle in the year 382. In the preface to the second part of that work Vincentius is not called presbyter, whereas afterwards he constantly bears that title, and it seems certain that he was a presbyter of the church of Constantinople (Jerome, *cont. Joan. Hieros.* c. 41). We may therefore suppose that he was ordained early in 382. But whether, like Jerome, he was ordained against his own will, or for some other reason, he never fulfilled the office of presbyter. Even when the ministry of a presbyter was specially needed in the monasteries at Bethlehem (394) the place, unoccupied by Jerome and Vincentius, had to be supplied by the irregular ordination of Paulinianus. That he knew both Greek and Latin is shown by the preface to the chronicle of Eusebius, where Jerome, writing to him in Latin, excuses his possible faults of translation by appealing to Vincentius's appreciation of the necessary difference between a translation and an original writing, as shown in the contrast between the LXX and the Greek Testament. The same dedication shows that he was interested in general history. He shared Jerome's admiration of Origen, then at its height, and asked him to translate all his works into Latin. This was an impossible task, but the preface to the translation of Origen's Commentary on Jeremiah and Ezekiel (date not fixed) shows Jerome's wish to translate as much as possible, not only of the commentaries, but even of the doctrinal works. In the year 382 Vincentius accompanied Jerome to Rome, but without intending to stay there. Jerome says (*Cont. Joan. Hieros.* c. 41) that Vincent had quitted Constantinople, as he had quitted Antioch, the place of his ordination, so that they might in solitude lament the sins of youth and invoke the mercy of Christ. We do not hear of him during Jerome's stay at Rome, but they left Rome together in 385, and settled with him at Bethlehem (*Cont. Ruf.* iii. 22). He shared not only Jerome's studies, but his asceticism and his controversial antipathies. He was severe in his judgment upon Vigilantius (Jerome, *Ep.* lxi. 3, A.D. 396), and he co-operated eagerly in the subsequent condemnation of Origenism. In the year 396 or 397 he went to Rome, for what cause is unknown (*Cont. Ruf.* iii. 24). Rufinus, who came there some time after, looked on his presence there as in some way hostile to himself. This Jerome points out was unreasonable, since Rufinus had not reached Rome till two years after Vincentius; but no doubt, he took part in the proceedings against Origenism, in which Eusebius of Cremona and Jerome's Roman friends were actively engaged. On his return to Bethlehem in 400, he was full of the subject. All Rome and Italy he reported had been delivered; and his praise of Theophilus of Alexandria as having by his letter to the pope Anastasius procured this deliverance, is communicated to that prelate in Jerome's letter (*Ep.* 88, ed. Vall.) to him, the last mention of Vincentius which has come down to us.

[W. H. F.]

VINCENTIUS (9), a friend to whose letter, with some doubt as to its genuineness, St. Augustine replied at great length. He was the

successor at Cartenna of Rogatus, during whose lifetime Augustine as a young man had known him at Carthage. In his reply Augustine defends repression, by legal means, of Donatists whose conduct is violent and vexatious; but he rejoices that some of the Circumcellions have returned to the church. Some remain in the Donatist persuasion from hereditary attachment only, but some are only to be restrained by fear of punishment. Friendship does not consist only in leniency, for it is better to show severity than to deceive by lenient treatment. His friend thinks that no compulsion should be used; but against this idea he brings forward instances both from Old Testament and New Testament. As to the Rogatists, they seem to be of a milder disposition than the Donatists, but they are like the animal deprived of claws and teeth, for their founder, Rogatus, was bitter in controversy. When they complain of the use of secular force, they are answered by the fact that Donatists who showed severity against the Maximianists and Rogatists, who had not yet separated from them, appealed to Julian for protection, as their forefathers had appealed to Constantine against Coecilianus. He then repeats some arguments on the question of the complicity of the church in individual and special acts, in order to shew that the question of compulsion turns, not on the act towards which it is exercised, but its quality, whether good or bad; and its good effects are seen in the return of many to the church. He entreats his friend to abandon his false opinions, and not with his obscure and scanty band of followers at Cartenna and a few other places, to oppose the Catholic Church. If the Donatists are not to be listened to, nor the Maximianists, how much less the Rogatists, a mere crumb cut off from the general body, and who can have no claim to be called the Church of Christ. But his friend fears lest imperial compulsion may give occasion to Jews and pagans to blaspheme; whereas they will rather scoff at their small numbers who can have no right to separate from the church. The sayings of Hilary about the prevalence of Arian opinions ought not to be perverted as if the church had adopted them; nor those of Cyprian about the disagreement between Peter and Paul as if they were canonical, and as if the latter did not maintain firmly the unity of the church, when, in his letter to Jubaianus he taught that in some cases those who had been baptized outside of the church should be received into it without re-baptism. Some have thought this opinion to have been ascribed falsely to Cyprian, an opinion in which Augustine does not agree; but thinks that he either afterwards corrected his opinion, or that his great charity covers this blot. He also quotes Tichonius, a Donatist, who condemned the false views of his own party. If he says who is Tichonius? he replies, the man whom Parmenian put down. Or suppose that his statement as to communing with the church was untrue, let him return to Cyprian. If the church is polluted by the guilt of individuals, it must have died out before Cyprian's time. The church does not re-baptize persons returning from Donatism, any more than Paul baptized disciples of John; but everyone who returns to the truth must do so through penitence (*Aug. Ep.* 93).

[H. W. P.]

TICHONIUS.

VINCENTIUS (10), bishop of Culcitanum, Cullicitanum, or Culusitanum, a place in the proconsular province of Africa; but by Antoninus placed between Rusiccada and Hippo (*Ras Tchekidich*) called in *Peut. Tab.* Culsitani (*Ant. Itin.* 19, 4; see *Notit. Episc.* 33, and *Annot. ad Notitiam Africae*, in App. to Victor Vitensis, p. 285, ed. Migne). He is mentioned by Paullinus in his life of St. Ambrose as having been met by him at the house of Fortunatus a deacon, brother to Aurelius (Paull. *Vit. Ambr.* c. 54). He was one of the managers of the Carth. conference A.D. 411, on the Catholic side (*Carth. Coll.* i. 138). Previous to this he appears to have been joined with Fortunatianus of Sicca, in a mission to Honorius from the African church A.D. 407, to request that advocates may be appointed to support the causes of the church before the imperial tribunals; and that they may be allowed to have access to the private rooms of the judges (*Bruno, Conc.* i. 184; *Conc. Afr. Can.* 97). With Clarus and Tribunitianus he was chosen from the province of Carthage as a member of the judicial committee, consisting of three bishops from each province, to act on behalf of the African episcopate, A.D. 418 (*Bruno, i.* 194; *Afr. Conc. Can.* 127). He was also present at the council at which Faustinus appeared on behalf of pope Boniface, and at a council held at Carthage A.D. 419 (*Morcelli, Afr. Chr.* i. 148; iii. 34, 88).

VINCENTIUS (11) LIRINENSIS (SEU LERINSIS, VINCENT OF LERINS), ST., a distinguished presbyter of Gaul in the 5th century. Date of birth uncertain. Must have died in or before A.D. 450.

Name.—The name is one of a considerable class of names (common after the Christian epoch, but less usual in earlier Latinity), which are simply formed by the lengthening of an adjective, generally a participial adjective. Thus we have Crescens, Crescentius; Fulgens, Fulgentius; Vincens, Vincentius, and many more. Both the short and the lengthened forms were occasionally employed as proper names; e.g. Constans, Constantius. It is almost needless to notice the existence of a form still more prolonged in respect of quantity; e.g. Florentinus, Constantinus.

Authorities.—Gennadius, *Virorum Illustrum Catalogus* (cap. 64). [GENNADIUS.] References to himself and to his times in his chief (most probably his sole) work, the *Commonitorium*. Of the copious literature which has grown up around this treatise some notice will be found below.

Life.—Concerning the events of Vincent's life we are all but absolutely ignorant. He was a native of Gaul, possibly brother of St. Loup; bishop of Troyes [LUPUS (2)], and he himself informs us that he had for a considerable time been involved in the turmoils of worldly life, perhaps of warlike life, before his retirement into that harbour of religion, a monastery near a small town, itself remote from the stir of cities.^a This was the monastery of Lerins (*Lerinum*), situated in the island of that name

^a Dom Ceillier does not hesitate to speak of Vincent as having experienced the sad and varied trials *du siècle et de la guerre*. He may be right, but the Apostolic use of metaphors derived from the profession of a soldier is so frequent (*Eph.* vi. 13-17; *1 Tim.* vi.

near Antibes, now known as *L'île de St. Honorat*, from the founder of this celebrated institution. [HONORATUS (10).] Here he wrote his *Adversus profanas omnium novitates Haereticorum Commonitorium*, almost three years (as he tells us in cap. 42 of the work itself) after the council of Ephesus, consequently in A.D. 434. The date of his decease is approximately fixed by Gennadius as falling within the joint reign of the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian; i.e. as has been already said, in or about A.D. 450. His name occurs in the Roman Martyrology, where May 24th is given as the day of his death. It is not too much to assert that his name must be reckoned among those which have shed lustre on the retreat of Lerins, in company with those of Honoratus, Cassian, Eucherius and others. [HONORATUS (10 and 14). CASSIAN (11). EUCHERIUS (1).]

Writings.—It will be convenient to treat, in the first place, of works often ascribed to Vincent of Lerins, but of which the authorship is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. These are two. One is a tract, which was not generally known before its publication by Sirmond (Paris, 1643), entitled *Prædestinatus sive Prædestinatorum Haeresis et libri S. Augustino temerè adscripti Refutatio*. The other must evidently have discussed the same subject, but it is only known to us by the reply of Prosper [PROSPER AQUITANUS], which will be found in the third part of the appendix to tom. x. of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine, headed *Pro Augustini Doctrinâ Responsiones ad Capitula Objectionum Vincentianarum*.

The opinion that these two treatises are not only from the pen of one and the same author (which is highly probable), but that this author is Vincent of Lerins is supported, though with varying degrees of confidence, by names of considerable authority. Among foreign Protestants may be mentioned Vossius, Rivet, Dailé, Scherzer, and H. Schmidt (in Herzog's Cyclopaedia); among Roman Catholics, Jansen, Henri de Noris, Noel Alexandre, Pagi. The Louvain editors of St. Augustine (herein followed by the Benedictine editors) mention the identity, at any rate as regards the *Objectiones*, as an opinion held by some, without committing themselves to any decision. Canon Robertson, citing Pagi, seems to incline to the identification. On the other side stand Baronius, Labbe, Papebroch, Ceillier, Schönemann, Fabricius, the Bollandists, Migne, and Ramsay, and probably, by implication, Cassander and Casaubon; Tillemont is doubtful. Under such circumstances it is natural to shrink from dogmatizing. But it is right, though with diffidence, to state the impression made on the writer's mind by the consideration of both the arguments and the authorities.

The arguments are (a) that the author of these tractates was named Vincent; (b) that their semi-Pelagian tone is not at variance with that of the *Commonitorium*; and (c) that the

12; 2 Tim. iv. 7) that Vincent is probably taking a liberty with the word *militia*, which is authorised by Ovid and by Cicero, and which would even more obviously suggest itself to a Christian writer. The context favours this interpretation, "*quippe cum aliquamdiu variis ac tristibus secularis militiae turbinibus volveremur.*"

monastery of Lerins was a stronghold of semi-Pelagian teaching. To the present writer these reasonings do not appear to carry conviction.

As regards the name (a) it is enough to remark, that the name of Vincent was exceedingly common, especially in Gaul, during the 5th century; and that it is consequently impossible to lay much stress upon that circumstance. The presumed identity of tone between the *Objectiones* and the *Commonitorium* (b) will be noticed in our epitome of the latter work. Despite the ingenuity of many advocates for the identity of authorship, especially Natalis Alexander, and Schmidt, the writer is compelled to say *non liquet*. Thirdly (c), a monk of Lerins of this period was by no means necessarily a semi-Pelagian. St. Loup, bishop of Troyes [LUPUS (2)], was a monk of Lerins and probably own brother to Vincentius. Now this prelate, who accompanied St. Germain [GERMANUS (8)] to Britain on an anti-Pelagian mission, was never so much as suspected of the slightest semi-Pelagian tinge, and the Bollandists appeal with some force to the eulogies of Lerins by Eucherius, Sidonius, Caesarius, and other eminent divines, as evidence of the general orthodoxy of the monastery. It may be said that some of those who take the negative side, such as Baronius, are prejudiced. But it is no less true that some of the Jansenist writers, such as Noris, display a decided tendency to press everything against an author who cannot be reckoned among the thorough and unhesitating disciples of St. Augustine, and that they too approach the subject with a certain bias.

We now pass on to what is *universally* admitted to be the genuine and authentic production of Vincent. Although, for brevity's sake, it is usually known as the *Commonitorium*; its full title is that given above, namely, *Vincentii Lirinensis adversus Profanas omnium novitates Haeticorum Commonitorium*.

The importance and celebrity of this work seem to justify the insertion of a brief epitome of its contents, as indeed has been done by Dom Ceillier and others. In the form in which it has come down to us it extends, even in a duodecimo edition, to only 150 pages, and consists of 42 short chapters. *Peregrinus* (as Vincent called himself) begins by stating that he thought it might be useful and in accordance with Scriptural precepts (Deut. xxxii. 7; Prov. xxii. 17, iii. 1) to write down certain principles, which he had received from holy Fathers. It is needful for himself that he may repair the feebleness of memory. Time and place (Ephes. ii. 19; 1 St. Pet. ii. 21; Psalm xlv. [A.V. xlvi.] 11) are in his favour, the quiet of the monastery and his experience of life. He will try, *Domino praesente*, to recollect faithfully, and to write simply (*Praefat.*). His tests to discern the truth of the Catholic faith from heresy will be sought first in the *authority of the Divine law*, and next in the *tradition of the Catholic Church*. The second source of information would not be needed, had not all the leading heretics claimed the support of Holy Scripture (capp. i. ii.) We must hold that, which has been believed everywhere, always, by all (*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*); in other words we must follow *Universitatem, Antiquitatem, Consensum omnium*; understanding by the last the

agreement of all, or almost all bishops and doctors (cap. ii.). A small portion of the church dissenting from the rest must be cut off like an unsound limb; nay, even a large portion if it does not abide by antiquity. Illustrations are afforded negatively by the history of Donatism and of Arianism; positively by the teaching of St. Ambrose and of other eminent confessors (capp. iv.-viii.). Antiquity was on the side of pope Stephen, bishop of the Apostolic see, and against the excellent Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, who desired to re-baptize heretics. True, the re-baptizers claim the sanction of the holy Cyprian; but to do so is behaving like Ham towards Noah, for on this point that pious martyr erred (capp. ix.-xi.). Apostolic warrant for what has been advanced may be found in St. Paul's writings, as in the epistles to Timothy and Titus (*p. ssim*), to the Romans (xv. 17), and to the Galatians (i. 7-10). Those who would make accretions to the faith stand thereby condemned for all time. The Pelagians are such (capp. xii.-xiv.). Valentinus, Photinus, Apollinaris, and others, are similarly condemned by the warnings of Moses (Deut. xiii. 1-11). Even good gifts, such as those of Nestorius, or useful labours such as those of Apollinaris against Porphyry, cannot be pleaded against their novelties (capp. xv.-xvi.). It is desirable to explain with some comparative minuteness wherein consisted the respective heresies of Photinus, Apollinaris, and Nestorius, and the true doctrine of the church as opposed to theirs (capp. xvii.-xxii.).^b

^b The language of the *Commonitorium* in these chapters bears at times a marked resemblance to that of the Symbolum "*Quicumque*," commonly called the creed of St. Athanasius. A few specimens only can be here set down, but the list might easily be enlarged.

*Commonitorium
Vincentii.*

Ecclesia verò Catholica
... unam divinitatem in
Trinitatis plenitudine et
Trinitatis aequalitatem in
unâ atque eâdem majestate
veneratur. (Cap. xviii.)

In Deo una substantia,
sed tres personae: ...
quia scilicet alia est persona
Patris, alia Filii, alia
Spiritus sancti. (Cap. xix.)

Cum veritas dicat ex
duabus substantiis unum
esse Christum, ... In
Christo esse duas substantias,
unam divinam, alteram
humanam; unam ex patre,
alteram ex matre. (Cap. xvii.)

Altera substantia divinitatis,
altera humanitatis: sed tamen
Deitas et humanitas non alter
alter, sed unus idemque
Christus, unus idemque
Filius Dei, et unius ejusdemque
Christi et filii Dei una
eademque persona. Sicut in
homine aliud caro, et aliud
anima; sed unus idemque
homo, anima et caro. (Cap. xix.)

*Symbolum quod vulgi vocant
Scti. Athanasii.*

Fides autem Catholica
haec est: Ut unum Deum
in Trinitate, et Trinitatem
in Unitate, veneremur.

Neque confundentes
Personas: neque Substantiam
separantes. Alia est enim
Persona Patris, alia Filii,
alia Spiritus Sancti.

Est ergò Fides recta, ut
credamus et confiteamur:
quia Dominus noster Jesus
Christus, Dei Filius, Deus
et Homo est; Deus est ex
substantiâ Patris, ante
saecula genitus: et Homo
est ex substantiâ Matris, in
saeculo natus: ... Qui licet
Deus sit et Homo: non duo
tamen, sed unus est Christus.
... Unus omnino, non
confusione substantiae:
sed unitate Personae.
Nam sicut anima rationalis
et caro unus est homo, ita
Deus et homo unus est
Christus.

The danger of ignoring the principles here laid down, more especially the test of antiquity, is painfully exhibited by the case of Origen, whose acute, profound and brilliant genius (fully recognised by imperial disciples and by the church at large) has not saved his writings from becoming a source of temptation; though it is just possible, as some think, that they may have been tampered with (cap. xxii.). Very similar must be the judgment passed upon Tertullian, of whom Hilary [of Poitiers] too truly said that "by his errors he had diminished the authority due to his approved writings" (cap. xxiv.). The true and genuine Catholic is he who loves Christ's body, the Church; who puts God's truth before all things, before the authority of any individual, before affection, genius, eloquence, or philosophy. Many who fall short of

Unus autem, non corruptibili nescio quâ divinitatis et humanitatis confusione, sed integrâ et singulari quâdam unitate personae. (Ib.) Non ergo alter Christus Deus, alter homo . . . non alter aequalis Patri, alter minor Patre . . . sed unus idemque Christus Deus et homo (ib.)

Aequalis Patri secundum divinitatem: minor Patre secundum humanitatem.

These identities of expression are too close to be accidental. Three ways of accounting for them are conceivable. (1) That the Athanasian Creed was extant before the composition of the *Commonitorium*, and that Vincent simply interwove into his treatise expressions taken from the creed. (2) That Vincent was himself the author of the Athanasian Creed. (3) That the author or authors of the creed were well acquainted with Vincent's book and made free use of its language. Hypothesis (1) can scarcely be said to have any supporters, inasmuch as few, if any, of those who assign to this creed an early date would be prepared to maintain that by A.D. 453 it could have become so well known as that its language was likely to have been embodied in this manner into a controversial treatise. Of supposition (2) it can only be said that it is not absolutely impossible. Those portions of Waterland's essay which tend to show that the Athanasian Creed was a production of Southern Gaul in the fifth century are as applicable to St. Vincent of Lerins as to St. Hilary of Arles. But definite proof is wanting in either case. The last-named view (3) seems to the present writer the most probable. It accords well with the communication made by Dr. Caspari in 1876 to Dr. Schaff (*Hist. of Creeds of Christendom*: London, 1877, vol. i. p. 37, note). Caspari is inclined to trace this creed to the fifth century, and has found some symbols resembling it. It is also compatible with the ably-reasoned writings of Mr. Ommaney on this subject.

[Since the above was written, my friend Dr. Dowden (who first suggested to me the importance of instituting this inquiry) has called my attention to the latest remarks of Mr. Ommaney (*Early History of the Athanasian Creed*: London, 1880). In addition to the list of similarities independently collected above, Mr. O. points out the curious fact that the words '*perfectus Deus, perfectus homo*,' which occur in both the *Commonitorium* and the creed, "are not to be found in St. Augustine, though the sense which they express is abundantly taught by him; inasmuch as he uses the similar phrases '*totus Deus et totus homo*' and '*verus Deus et verus homo*'" (pp. 287-9). Mr. Ommaney evidently considers that the case on behalf of St. Vincent's authorship is stronger than that which can be made out on behalf of any single Father, but that the point is still *sub-judice*.]

this standard, when not slain, are yet sadly stunted in their spiritual growth (cap. xxv.). Additions to the faith, or detractions from it are alike condemned by Holy Scripture, especially by St. Paul (1 Tim. vi.). The deposit is the talent of the Catholic faith, which the man of God must, like a spiritual Bezaleel, adorn, arrange and display to others, but not injure by novelties (capp. xxvi. xxvii.). Is there then to be no progress of religion (*perfectus religionis*) in the Church of Christ? Certainly there is to be progress, but it must resemble the growth of the infant into manhood and maturity; a growth which, through all changes, preserves identity. The dogmas of the heavenly philosophy may by the operation of time be smoothed and polished. They may gain in the way of greater fullness of evidence, light and elucidation (*distinctioem*), but they must of necessity retain integrity, and all essential characteristics (capp. xxviii.-xxx.). Such has been the Church's task in the decrees of councils, which have simply aimed at adding clearness, vigour and zeal to what was believed, taught, and practised already (capp. xxx.-xxxii.). St. John, in his second epistle, is as emphatic as St. Paul against the teacher of false doctrine. Such an one cannot be encouraged without a virtual rejection of saints, confessors and martyrs; a rejection in short of the holy Church throughout the world. Pelagius (with his disciple Coelestius), Arius, Sabellius, Novatian, Simon Magus, agree in being introducers of novelties (capp. xxxiii. xxxiv.). The heretics use the Scriptures, but only in the way in which bitter potions are disguised for children by a previous taste of honey, or poisons labelled as healing medicines. The Saviour warned us against such perils in His words concerning the wolves in sheep's clothing. We must attend to his subsequent advice, *by their fruits ye shall know them*. His apostle too bids us beware of false apostles (2 Cor. xi. 13-15), the imitators of Satan, who transform themselves into angels of light. Their employment of Scripture resembles that of Satan in the Temptation of our Lord. They presume, in the teeth of the teaching of the Church, to claim a special illumination for their own small conventicle (capp. xxxv.-xxxvii.). Catholics must, as has been stated at the beginning of this treatise, apply to the interpretation of Scripture the texts of universality, antiquity, and consent. Where they can, let them adduce the decrees of general councils; where that cannot be done, the consistent rulings of great doctors. This is not meant to apply to small questions, but only to whatsoever affects the rule of faith. Inveterate heresies can generally be met by Holy Scripture alone, or by clear decisions of Oecumenical councils. New ones often present at first greater difficulty, and we must be careful to cite those Fathers only who lived and died in the faith, or who even suffered martyrdom for it. What all, or the majority clearly and perseveringly received, held and taught, let that be held as undoubted, certain and ratified. But any merely private opinion, even of a saint or martyr, must be put upon one side. This again agrees with the teaching addressed by St. Paul to the Corinthians and the Ephesians (1 Cor. xii. 27, 28, i. 10, xiv. 33, 36; Ephes. iv. 11). That Pelagian writer, Julian, neglected these cautions, and broke away from the sentiments of his col-

leagues. But it is time to give an illustration of the contrary course being happily pursued and the rule of the Church's faith being settled by the authority of a council. This topic, however, demands a fresh commencement (capp. xxxviii.-xl.).^c

Here ends the first book of the *Commonitorium*. The second book, as Gennadius informs us, was for the most part lost, having been stolen from its author. Vincent has, however, provided us with a recapitulation of its substance, which occupies three additional chapters. We proceed to epitomise them in the same manner as the preceding ones.

The first of these (cap. xli.) simply re-states the main proposition of the earlier book. The author then, in order to show that his view is no offspring of private presumption, adduces the example of the council of Ephesus, which was held nearly three years before the time in which he is writing, in the consulship of Bassus and Antiochus. Great pains were taken to avoid an unfortunate issue, such as that of the council of Rimini (*Council Ariminense*); and the testimonies of martyrs, confessors and orthodox doctors, were considered by an assemblage of nearly two hundred bishops to prove Nestorius an irreligious impugner of Catholic truth, and Cyril to be in accordance with it. Amongst the saintly doctors who were present in person, or whose works were cited as authoritative, may be named Peter of Alexandria, Athanasius, Theophilus, Cyril, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, and his excellent brother, Gregory of Nyssa. The West was represented by letters of Felix and of Julius, bishops of Rome; the South by the evidence of Cyprian of Carthage; the North by that of Ambrose of Milan. The whole of the bishops, for the most part metropolitans, acted upon the principles maintained in this treatise and censured Nestorius for his unhallowed presumption,—that he was the first and only man who rightly understood the Scriptures. (xli.)

One element must be added, lest to all this weight anything seem lacking, namely, the authority of the apostolic see, which was illustrated by the twofold testimony of the reigning pope Xystus [Sixtus III.] and of his predecessor Coelestine. It was on the principles herein set forth that pope Sixtus condemned Nestorius; and Coelestine wrote in the same spirit to certain priests in Gaul who were fostering novelties. It is in fact an acceptance of the warning of St. Paul to Timothy to keep *the deposit* (1 Tim. vi. 20, R. V. margin) and to the Galatians, that he would be *anathema* who should preach to them any other gospel (Gal. i. 8). Justly upon these grounds are Pelagius and Coelestius as well as Nestorius condemned.^d (Cap. xlii.)

^c "Both inclusive" must be understood at each of our numberings of chapters.

^d It must be owned that there is a certain amount of difficulty, one may almost say mystery, connected with these last two chapters. In the first place they introduce a new element into the discussion, namely, the authority claimed for the Roman see. The author appears to assume that this authority will always be manifested on the side of his great maxim of the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, and makes no provision for the possibility of a divergence between the teaching of Rome and that of antiquity. Secondly, while the language concerning Nestorius and his opponent at Cyril is clear and

It is time to give, from details, some general estimate of the work of Vincent; and it may safely be asserted that few theological books of such modest bulk, published within the period embraced in this Dictionary, have attracted so large a share of attention. Not only has it been included within all the best known collections of the works of the Fathers (as e. g. in the *Maxima Bibliotheca Patrum*, Lugduni, A.D. 1677; and in our own age, in that of Migne), but it has been repeatedly published separately in many lands, and not unfrequently translated. The following, though not an exhaustive list, will be found sufficient for ordinary purposes.

The earliest printed edition of the *Commonitorium* is to be found in the *Antidotum contra diversas omnium ferè sæculorum Hæreses*, by J. Sichardus, fol. Basil, 1528. It has appeared separately, *cum commentario Costeri*, Antverpiæ, 1560; Lugduni Batavorum, 1572; Coloniae Agrippinae, 1600; by Steph. Baluzius, Parisiis, 1663, 1669, 1684; and Augustae Vindelicorum, 1757. (This edition was reproduced also by Galland, *Bibliotheca Patrum* (tom. x.), fol. Venet. 1774.) Other single editions are those issued by Joann. Salinas, *Romæ*, 1731; by Engelbert Klüppel, *Vindobonæ*, 1809. Among these the editions by Baluzius and by Klüppel stand pre-eminent. Still more recent issues are those at Ingoldstadt, 1834; at Breslau, by Herzog, 1839; Lyons, by Grégoire and Collombet; at Oxford, by Dr. Pusey, 1838.

Evidence even more marked of its popularity may perhaps be found in the translations. These have been very numerous. Among them may be specified an Italian version published at Monreale in 1665; a French version (one of many such) dedicated to M. de Harlay, archbishop of Paris, 1686; German ones by Féder; Bamberg, 1795; and by Geiger, Lucerne, 1822. A Scottish translation, dedicated to Mary Queen of Scots, was issued by Knox's opponent, Ninian Winzeit, at Antwerp, in 1563;^e and a com-

emphatic, there does seem to be a certain degree of reticence about some of the opponents of Augustine, as, for instance, Julian. The name of Augustine himself is not even mentioned, and though it is true that equal silence is observed respecting Augustine's great contemporaries, Jerome and Chrysostom, still there was no especial reason for the introduction of their names, while the repeated mention of Pelagius would have rendered the introduction of the name of his chief opponent only natural.

It cannot be matter of surprise to find that this reticence is urged in favour of the view that Vincent was a semi-Pelagian, and that consequently he may have been the author of the *Objectiones*. But if Vincent's silence was only intended to express a doubt whether Augustine had not pressed his views concerning Original Sin and the cognate doctrines beyond what was warranted by the threefold text of universality of time, place, and numbers, it seems hardly fair to stigmatize as semi-Pelagian, sentiments held by so many divines of orthodox repute, from the 5th down to the 19th century. Erasmus in the famous preface to his edition of the works of St. Hilary, expressly asserts that in his time Augustine was thought in the ardour of his zeal against Pelagius to have left less scope for free agency than was now (i.e. circ. A.D. 1520) generally granted. For our own day, to say nothing of Arminian divines in the past, it may suffice to refer to the commentary of Mr. Beet on the Epistle to the Romans. (London, 1883, Fourth Edit.)

^e "A richt goldin buke writtin in Latin about xi c jeris [years] passit and newlie translated in Scottis be Niniane Winzet a catholik Preist." (Original title.)

paratively recent English one by the Rev. W. B. Flower, London, 1866.

Further, the *Commonitorium* has gathered around itself a literature of its own. How far its leading principles have been accepted, either explicitly or implicitly, in the past; how far they made a line of demarcation between those who accepted and those who rejected the Reformation; to what extent they are available in the controversies between the various Christian communions, or in the contest between Christianity and unbelief;—these are questions which have all been keenly and ably discussed. To review these controversies would far exceed the limits of this work, but it seems right to call attention to one or two features of the debate, which have not received elsewhere the notice which they deserve.

It has been asserted that the *Commonitorium* lays down a broad line of demarcation between the Protestant and the Roman churches. This appears to be an over-statement. It is true that any Protestants, who regard the Bible as its own sole and all-sufficient witness and interpreter, must be inclined to set aside the work of Vincent as needless and superfluous, and hence perhaps its rejection by Rivet, Daillé, and other foreign Protestants. But this verdict has not, even on the continent of Europe, been a universal one. The Magdeburg Centuriators distinctly pronounce in its favour as a work of learning and acuteness; as a book which reveals and forcibly assails the frauds of heretics; which supplies a remedy and antidote against their poisons; which sets forth a weighty doctrine and displays knowledge of antiquity with skill and clearness in its treatment of Holy Scripture.^f As regards England, the praise given by Casaubon to the principles of its Reformation, the challenge of Jewell, and a large *consensus* of 17th century divines, all rest, more or less explicitly, upon the famous *dictum* of Vincent,—which, indeed, derives considerable support from certain portions of the Prayer-Book, Articles, and Canons.^g

It is, of course, equally true that Roman Catholic divines, especially at the epoch of the Reformation and long after, also professed to take their stand upon the principles asserted in the *Commonitorium*. The fact that Knox's opponent, Winzet, published a translation of Vincent's treatise, as an aid to the Roman side of the controversy, is but one instance out of many that might be adduced.

There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of the Roman Catholic controversialists who thus acted. They were not in a position to judge the evidence on behalf of this and that portion of medieval doctrine and practice, and they appealed with confidence to such stores of learning

^f We have translated freely from the original, as cited by Natalis Alexander (*Hist. Eccles. saeculum v. cap. v. art. xvii.*). It may be well to subjoin a part of the passage:—"Scriptum esse eruditum et acutum; quodque Haereticorum fraudes clarè in apertum producat, detegat, atque egregiè impugnet... praesens valdè remedium, et antidotum, quasi contra eorum venena ministret... elucet doctrinae ipsius magnitudo... in Scripturarum tractatione argutum, facilem et perspicuum."

^g *E.g.* The positions of the creeds, the language of Article xx., and the canon urging preachers to interpret Holy Scripture in accordance with the general teaching of the Fathers.

as lay open to them. A day came when this confidence was rudely shaken. The Benedictine editions of the works of the Fathers appeared, with honest and discriminating criticism applied to their writings. Not only was it seen how considerable a portion of their works, which had been long accepted as genuine and authentic, was in reality spurious, but it also became evident that while distinctively Roman tenets and practices received much support from the sermons and treatises relegated into the appendix of each volume, the case was widely different when reference had to be made to the genuine Patristic remains. In time a new school of Roman Catholic divines arose, of whom Father Petau (Petavius) may perhaps be considered the earliest, as he is certainly among the greatest. In our own age the process of development in the church of Rome has widened the breach between her teaching and the principles of Vincent of Lerins. The church which has set forth the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mother, not merely as a lawful opinion, but as a dogma, has, to all appearance, for ever broken with the maxim: *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. And, indeed, the process of self-refutation, which Cardinal Newman has endeavoured to achieve in the notes to his re-issue of his Anglican work on the *Via Media*,^h seems to give up the Vincentian rule, and only to argue that Anglicanism, no less than Romanism, has failed to carry it out.

But even if it can be shown that there are some few cases of controversy between Christian bodies, to which it is difficult to apply the test of Vincent's maxim, its general value must still be pronounced to be very great. Most especially in the contest of belief with unbelief, its efficacy is deeply felt, inasmuch as both in faith and morals there still exists, despite of differences, a code which may fairly be called the Creed of Christendom: and that code is mainly based, even if sometimes unconsciously, upon the principles asserted in the *Commonitorium* of St. Vincent of Lerins. [J. G. C.]

VINCENTIUS (12), a monk of Lerins in the first half of the 5th century, a brother of St. Lupus of Troyes (Eucherius, *De Laude Eremi.* 42, *Patr. Lat.* l. 711), must be distinguished from his more famous namesake, the author, who was also a monk of Lerins (Ceillier, viii. 468), though some have identified them (see *Boll. Acta SS.* Jul. vii. 59). [S. A. B.]

VINCENTIUS (13), a priest, a Gaul by birth; thought to be identical with Vincentius, a presbyter, who signed the decrees of the council of Riez in 439 on behalf of bishop Constantinus (Labbe, v. 1196.) Gennadius (*Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1104) speaks of him as well-versed in Scripture, learned, and eloquent, and author of a *Commentary on the Psalms*, part of which he had himself heard him read. This work is lost. It has been thought by some that he is the author of *The Objections*, defending the teaching of St. August-

^h The original work was published in 1837, its author being then Fellow of Oriel College and Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford. The third edition, published in 1877, contains the notes from a Roman Catholic stand-point, which "1," says the author, "consider a reiteration."

tine against which St. Prosper. wrote; cf. Baron. *Ann.* 434, xv. . . . xx.; *Hist. Litt. Franc.* vol. ii. p. 413; also Articles PROSPER (6), VINCENTIUS (11) LIRINENSIS in this Dictionary.

[G. W. D.]

VINCENTIUS (14), addressed by Sidonius (*Ep.* 7), in a letter giving an account of Arvandus, a prefect of Gaul. While Sidonius was at Rome, A.D. 469, this Arvandus, his friend, was accused of peculation and treason. By the intercession of Sidonius his punishment was lessened.

[R. J. K.]

VINCENTIUS (15), bishop of Saragossa, became an Arian in the reign of Leovigild, and submitted to re-baptism. It was against him that the treatise of SEVERUS of Malaga was written. (Isidorus, *Hist. Goth., de Vir. Ill.* 43, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1071, 1105; *Esp. Sap.* xxx. 129.)

[F. D.]

VINCENTIUS (16) of Iviça. [LICINIANUS.]

VINCENTIUS (17) and Felicissimus, deacons of the church of Lamigia or Lamiggiga in Africa, brought before Gregory the Great various grave charges against their bishop. (*Epp.* i. 74.)

[F. D.]

VINCENTIUS (18), addressed with five other bishops of Sardinia by Gregory the Great (*Epist.* lib. ix. ind. ii. 8, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 947). He directs them according to the ancient customs of Sardinia to ascertain from their metropolitan the date of Easter and not to leave the island without his permission.

[F. D.]

VINCENTIUS (19), ST., July 14, Sep. 20 (MADELGARIUS, MAUGER), abbat of Haumont and Soignies. He was originally a count at the court of Dagobert, but on the persuasion of his wife Waldetrudis embraced the monastic life. Founding a monastery at Haumont on the Sambre, near Maubeuge, he became its first abbat; and when this grew famous and too public for him he founded another in a more retired spot at Soignies in Hainault and there passed the remainder of his life, dying c. 677 (*Boll. Acta SS.* 14 Jul. iii. 668; Guérin, *Les Pet. Boll.* viii. 290). A full view of all the authorities may be seen in Chevalier, *Sources*, p. 2308.

[C. H.]

VINCOMALUS (1), a deacon, married to his deceased wife's sister, and on that account the subject of a correspondence between his diocesan Victorius, bishop of Grenoble, and the metropolitan Avitus, bishop of Vienne, who directs the immediate separation of the offenders (*Pat. Lat.* lix. 252).

[G. W. D.]

VINCOMALUS (2), was appointed defensor of the Roman church by Gregory the Great in March A.D. 595. He is therefore probably not the same as the Vincomalus whose widow is commended the next year by Gregory to the subdeacon Anthemius. (*Epp.* v. 29, vi. 38.)

[F. D.]

VINCOMALUS (3), magister officiorum at Constantinople, who, though he had no special intimacy with Theodoret, on Marcianus becoming emperor in A.D. 450, lost no time in representing to him the injustice with which he

had been treated by Theodosius, and procuring the remission of his sentence of exile. Theodoret testified his gratitude in a letter (*Theod. Ep.* 140). He took part in the council of Chalcedon (*Labbe*, iv. 555). Marcian's second edict, requiring the general acceptance of the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, March 13, A.D. 452, was addressed, among other chief officers of state, to Vincomalus, who was then consul-designate (*Labbe*, iv. 843).

[E. V.]

VINDEMIALIS (1), an African bishop, bearer of a letter to Augustine from Valerius, count of Africa (*Aug. Ep.* 200).

[H. W. P.]

VINDEMIALIS (2), bishop of Capsa, martyred under Thrasamund king of the Vandals (Victor Vit. *Persec. Vandal.* in *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 263 A, 272 C, 325 C, 400 C, 401 C).

[C. H.]

VINDICIANUS, an eminent physician, mentioned by St. Augustine (*Aug. Ep.* 138, 3).

[H. W. P.]

VINDICIANUS, eighth bishop of Cambrai and Arras, succeeded Autbertus c. 668. His *Vita* is given in *Boll. AA. SS. Mart.* ii. 75. He was born at Bullecourtium in Artesia c. A.D. 620, and educated under St. Eligius at Noyon and St. Autbertus at Cambrai. He was called by Amandus, bishop of Maestricht, to attest, with Amandus and Autbertus, Richtrudis's disposition of her goods before she entered her monastery, and was associated with Autbertus in administering the see of Cambrai; at that time he was present at the translation of the remains of SS. Vedastus and Furseus. On Autbertus's death Vindicianus was consecrated, finished the monastery of St. Vedast, sought to promote its interests, and subscribed the will of St. Amandus. When Theodoric III. succeeded Childeric II. in Neustria, and Ebroinus the mayor of the palace, and Leodegarius bishop of Autun, were carrying on their intrigues [LEODEGARIUS (2)], Vindicianus held a synod at Arras, and induced the king to make grants to the see. And after the violent deaths of these ambitious ministers he was able to bring the king to a form of penitence which issued in further grants to ecclesiastical purposes; by a personal visit to Rome, he induced pope Sergius I. to exempt the monastery of St. Vedast from the papal jurisdiction. He built many churches and monasteries during his episcopate of more than forty years at a time of constant trouble in the kingdom, and dying A.D. 712 of a fever at Brussels, he was buried in the church of St. Eligius near Arras. In the 10th century the relics were raised, and enshrined with great pomp in the presence of a vast assemblage by Fulbertus the bishop. His feast is 11th March (*Gall. Christ.* iii. 7).

[J. G.]

VINNIANUS, bishop of Clonard while St. Columba was a deacon. (Reeves, *St. Adamnan.* 104; Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 649.) [FINNIAN (1)].

[J. G.]

VINNOCUS, bishop of Rath-Easpuic-Innic, where he and St. Patrick were contemporaries and friends (*Colgan, Tr. Th.* 27, c. 71, *et al.*). His place was in the north of co. Down, and Colgan identifies him with Uindic of Tuighneatha (Reeves, *Eocl. Ant.* 339, 379; Cotton, *Fast. Eocl. Hib.* iii. 252).

[J. G.]

VIRGILIUS (1), ST., twenty-fourth archbishop of Arles. There is some confusion as to his earlier life. According to Gregory of Tours, his contemporary, on the death of Licerius, the twenty-third archbishop, Virgilius, who was abbat of Autun, was put in his place by the influence of Syagrius, bishop of that see, A.D. 588 (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 23), and this high authority has usually been followed (see *Gall. Christ.* i. 540; Gams, 493). The old catalogue of Arles, however, inserts a Paschasius between the two. It may be, as has been suggested, that the latter's tenure of office being very short escaped Gregory's notice (see *Greg. Magn. Epist.* i. 47, n., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 509). Again, the life extracted from an ancient MS. of the diocese, by Barralis Salerna, makes him a monk and abbat of Lérins, and has no mention of any abbacy at Autun (*Chronologi: Lerinensis*, i. 87). As archbishop he was the recipient of several letters from Gregory the Great between the years 590 and 601. The occupant of the see of Arles was in some sense primate of France at this time, and, as such, Virgilius received from the pope the pallium and the papal vicerentship in the kingdom of Childebert. "If any bishop desire to make a long journey, he must obtain your consent. If there shall arise any question of faith or other matter of difficulty, you are to assemble twelve bishops to discuss and decide it," are the pope's words (*Epist.* v. 53; see too 54 and 55). The other letters are mainly occupied with the suppression of simony and matters of discipline, and the mission of St. Augustine and his monks to England (*ibid.* i. 47, vi. 53, ix. 106, 111, 114, xi. 55, 68; cf. Ceillier, xi. 484 sqq.). St. Augustine himself was consecrated by Virgilius, and not, as incorrectly stated by Bede (*H. E.* i. 27), by Aetherius, who was bishop of Lyons, not Arles. Virgilius is said to have built the cathedral church of St. Stephen in the city, and that of St. Saviour and St. Honoratus outside the walls. According to the above-mentioned biography he died in the 127th year of his age, which would bring him down to 640, but we have no record of him after 601, and it is improbable that he lived later than 610. According to the same authority he was buried in the church of St. Saviour and St. Honoratus, which he had built himself. He was commemorated at Lérins March 5, and at Arles Oct. 7 or 10. His successor was Florianus. As to his cult see *Boll. Acta SS. Mart.* i. 399 sqq. For his life see *Gall. Christ.* i. 540, and Trichaud, *Hist. de l'Église d'Arles*, ii. 125-151; and i. 100 for an inscription in the cathedral attributed to him. [S. A. B.]

VIRGILIUS (2) (FEIRGHIL, FERGHIL, FERGAL), of Aghavee and Salzburg, the Geometer. In the stream of missionaries that passed from Britain and Ireland to the continent in the fifth and following centuries, an honourable place must be assigned to St. Fergil as a divine, a philosopher, and a man of general learning. His Irish name was Ferghil or Fergal, which, as latinized, became Virgilius, the usual form of his name in connexion with Bavaria. Beyond the affirmation that he was of noble Irish descent, the Lives tell us nothing of his parentage, and the earliest traces of his history we find in the notices of his death in the *Annals of the Four Masters*:—

"A.D. 784. Ferghil, *i.e.* the Geometer, abbat of Achadh-bo, died in Germany in the thirtieth year of his episcopate;" and in the *Ann. Ult.*:—"A.D. 788. Feirgil Ab. Acaid boo mor," but Lanigan, with others, doubts the identity of the saint of Aghavee and the bishop of Salzburg.

From Aghaboe, in Queen's County, Fergil is said to have gone to France before 746, and to have been kindly received by Pepin, then mayor of the palace under Childeric III. king of Austrasia. After being with Pepin for two years at Carisiacum, near Compiègne on the Oise, he proceeded to Bavaria, and was again kindly treated by duke Otilo, upon the recommendation of Pepin. There he became abbat of St. Peter's monastery in Salzburg. At that time, from motives probably of humility, he concealed the fact of his ordination for the space of about two years, and had a bishop "proprium episcopum" attached to his monastery for the performance of holy functions. (Messingham, *Flor. Insul. Sanct.* 331, col. 1; and see Todd, *St. Patrick*, 64-7, discussing the meaning and purpose of this concealment.) [DOBDA.] During his abbacy in Salzburg, the controversies seem to have arisen between him and St. Boniface, at first upon a theological question, and afterwards upon certain conclusions of science. St. Fergil had acknowledged as valid the baptisms of a priest who through ignorance had mutilated the words of administration; he refused also to re-baptize at the command of St. Boniface, in whose province Salzburg then lay. When the case was referred to the decision of pope Zachary (A.D. 741-752), the pontiff decided in favour of Fergil, and cautioned St. Boniface about his conduct in the matter. The feeling thus aroused between the two ecclesiastics does not appear to have been allowed to remain inactive, and St. Boniface soon found or took occasion again to denounce Fergil to the pope, on grounds apparently more or less personal. But that which gave St. Boniface the readiest and most fatal weapon against his opponent was the publication, by the latter, of a philosophical treatise regarding the rotundity of the earth, and thus the fact of there being antipodes. What gave plausibility to the accusation against the teaching of Fergil was the thought that two sides of the earth involved two different races of men, one of which, being not descended from Adam, would be free from the stain of original sin. And his ultimate acquittal was probably brought about by his being able to show that his speculations (based, possibly, on those of Martianus Capella of Madaura in Africa, who wrote in the 5th century) did not encroach in the least on the doctrine of original sin, or the unity of the human race. But at first it was like to go hard with the philosopher and mathematician, when Zachary issued the decretal, that if it was proved by his own confession that Fergil taught that there was another world, and people on the other side of the earth, a council should be summoned, and Fergil degraded from the priesthood, and expelled the church. Milder counsels, however, prevailed, after St. Boniface's martyrdom in A.D. 755, and when John, bishop of Salzburg, died, Fergil was appointed to take his place, and consecrated on the 13th of June, A.D. 766 or 767 (Todd, *St. Patrick*, 66, adopting the date given by Mabillon, *Acta SS. tom.* iv. 280; but Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* iii. 184, places it in

A.D. 756, and is very hard on those who follow the later date). At Salzburg he built a magnificent cathedral, which he dedicated to the memory of one of his predecessors, the famous St. Rupert or Rudbert, and thither transferred his relics. In the duties of his episcopal office he was specially careful, sending missionaries into the neighbouring heathen countries; one of his last official acts was to visit all his large diocese, and pay his long deferred visit to Carinthia. On his return he was seized with what at first appeared to be a mild sickness, and (though hardly in the thirtieth year of his episcopate, as said in the *Four Mast.*) calmly breathed his last on November 27, A.D. 789. Though he was acquitted at the time by the pope, the suspicion of heterodoxy clung to his memory, till it was finally purged by canonization by pope Gregory IX. in the year 1233. He was called Geometer and Solivagus, but for what special reason he received the latter appellation we do not hear. His life, written by St. Eberhard, his pupil and successor at Salzburg, is published by Canisius (*Lect. Ant.* tom. iii. pars ii. Basnage ed.), by Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ben.* sec. iii. pars. ii.) and by Messingham (*Florileg. Insul. Sanct.* 331-41). See further, on his life, Mabillon, *Ann. Bened.* t. m. ii. lib. ii. A.D. 756, 785; Bonifacius, *Opera*, tom. ii. Ep. lxxi. p. 171 sq.; Ussher, *Sylog. Ep.* xvi. xvii. 462 sq.; Raynaldus, *Ann. Eccles.* tom. ii. 93, ed. Mansi, Lucae, 1747; Ware, *Ir. Writers*, by Harris, 49, giving his consecration in A.D. 767, and his death in A.D. 785 or 784; Reeves, *Adamnan*, 340, n. 6; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* 314, 315, 327; *Journ. Ktlen. Archaeol. Soc.* i. 222 n. 1; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* viii. 300, giving an account of a very interesting silver crown-piece of Salzburg, now belonging to the Royal Irish Academy, and representing on the obverse the two patron saints of Salzburg, SS. Rupert and Ferghil. [J. G.]

VIRGNOUS, abbat of Iona. [FERGNA (1).]

VIRIGANTIUS, monk. Gregory the Great with difficulty compelled the palatinus Catellus to give him part of his mother's property. (*Epp.* iv. 47.) [F. D.]

VIRO, bishop of Dublin or Glasgow (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 459; Camerarius, *De Scot. Fort.* 138, May 8). [WIRO.] [J. G.]

VIRTIUS (al. BRITIUS), presbyter at Carthage, one of Cyprian's chief supporters in his absence (*Cyp. Ep.* 43), v. l. Britius. Fell would conclude that the three mentioned here were the only presbyters who remained faithful. But as one of them, Numidicus, was not a presbyter of Carthage at the time of Cyprian's retreat, and there are five persons mentioned whom Fell assigns to the party of Felicissimus, it would follow if Fell were right that there were but seven presbyters in Carthage at this time. This is not likely, since at Rome at the same time there were no less than forty-four presbyters (Euseb. vi. 43). [E. W. B.]

VITALIANI. [VITALIUS.]

VITALIANUS (1), a man of rank in Capadocia and of a high religious profession, to whom Gregory Nazianzen addressed a poem in behalf of his two sons, Peter and Phocas, for

whom he had conceived an unnatural aversion, and after their mother's death had driven them from his house and forced them to subsist on charity. The appeal is put by Gregory in the mouth of the elder son Peter. (*Greg. Naz. Carm.* 52, p. 121-126.) Baronius in defiance of all probability identifies Vitalianus with the husband of Gregory's sister Gorgonia (*Annal.* 389, § 51). [E. V.]

VITALIANUS (2), a senator addressed by Avitus, bishop of Vienne (*Ep.* 42 in *Pat. Lat.* lix. 259.) [C. H.]

VITALIANUS (3), magister militum, associated with IRENAEUS (21) in the emperor Justin's measures against Severus, the heretical patriarch of Antioch (Evag. iv. 4). Evagrius relates his treasonable designs and his violent end (iii. 43, iv. 3). [C. H.]

VITALIANUS (4) deposed priest of the diocese of Miian, was sent by Gregory the Great to Sicily to be kept in strict custody. (*Epp.* v. 4.) [F. D.]

VITALIANUS (5), bishop of Sipontum is early in A.D. 598 rebuked sharply by Gregory the Great for allowing the daughter of Tullianus to abandon her nun's dress, and is ordered with SERGIUS the defensor to place her under strict custody in a nunnery. In A.D. 600 he is directed with JOANNES (585) to investigate whether the bearer of the letter was free or not. He may be meant by the Vitulinus, bishop of Sipontum, whose signature appears to the probably spurious grant mentioned under PETRUS of Anagnia. (*Epp.* viii. 8, xi. 24, *App. ad S. Greg. Epp.* 4.) [F. D.]

VITALIANUS (6), bishop of Rome after Eugenius, ordained (probably) 30th July, A.D. 657, the see having been vacant one month and twenty-nine days (Anastasius). He was a native of Campania, the son of one Anastasius. The burning question of his day was the Monothelitic controversy. All the popes since its origin, except the first, Honorius, had stood out for the doctrine of two wills in Christ against the patriarchs of Constantinople, who were supported by the emperors; pope Martin especially, in the famous first Lateran Council, having condemned Monothelism and the patriarchs who had maintained it, and having died in consequence with a martyr's halo round him [MARTINUS (1)]. The emperor Constans II. had indeed, under the advice of the patriarch Paul, evinced a desire to close the controversy by issuing the document called *The Type*, which prohibited all future discussion of the subject at issue on either side. But this attempt at compromise had proved as little acceptable at Rome as distinct assertion of heretical doctrine; and the *Type*, no less than the previous *Ecthesis* of Heraclius, had been condemned by the aforesaid Lateran Council. When Vitalianus became pope, Constans was still in power as emperor, having associated with himself his young son Constantine (called Pogonatus) A.D. 654. Peter had succeeded Pyrrhus (whom Rome had excommunicated) as patriarch. The relations between Rome and Constantinople, however strained, were still not such as to prevent the new pope from sending the customary announce-

ment of his accession, with a confession of his faith, to the emperors and the patriarch; which confession appears to have been so worded as to give no offence: for the emperors sent him in return a book of the Gospels adorned with gold and jewels, while Peter replied to him in a letter which began, "The letter of your unanimous and holy fraternity has given birth in us to spiritual joy." However, neither the pope's letter nor the whole reply of the patriarch being extant, we do not know how the former had expressed himself with regard to doctrine. What further passed between them is known of only through reference to it in the sixth general council (*Actio* xiii.); from which it certainly appears that Peter had understood the pope, or affected to understand him, as assenting to the Monothelite position. That he had not really done so, but that, at the same time, he had not declared himself distinctly against it, may be concluded from a subsequent letter of Constantine Pogonatus to pope Donus, in which the emperor says that he had been urged by the then patriarch Theodore, and by Macarius of Theopolis, to cause the name of Vitalian to be erased from the diptychs at Constantinople, in which, along with that of pope Honorius, it still remained; but that he had refused to allow this to be done till he should be satisfied, through emissaries then expected from Rome, that the difference between the pope and the patriarchs had been of real importance. It thus seems to have been still a question at Constantinople what his doctrine really was. That, however, his name was afterwards erased, and thus that his views had not eventually satisfied the Monothelites, appears from the Acts of the sixth council (*Actio* viii.), at which petition was made to the emperor to restore the name. Still, orthodox as he may have always been, his reception of Constans, when the latter visited Rome A.D. 668, affords further evidence of his inclination to conciliation, rather than resolute dogmatism. His attitude in this respect might be due partly to deficiency of such courage and zeal as had been so notably evinced by pope Martin; or perhaps also to his entertaining a hope (which was justified by the final result under Pogonatus) of at length winning over the emperors, who were already disposed to compromise.

The visit of Constans to Rome was before his retirement to Syracuse, where he spent the latter part of his days. His reasons for leaving Constantinople, as gathered from the historians Theophanes, Cedrenus, Constantinus Manasses, and Zonaras, were the odium against him there because of his murder of his brother Theodosius and of the violence he had done to pope Martin and St. Maximus, and his own consequent mental misery. He used continually (says Cedrenus) to see visions of his brother (who is said to have been forcibly ordained deacon, and afterwards poisoned in the Eucharist) in a deacon's habit, offering him a cup full of blood, and saying, "Drink, brother." The same authority informs us that, on sailing from Constantinople, he turned round and spat against the city, and that he had a design of transferring the seat of the empire to Syracuse. But he had an intermediate design, not mentioned by the above annalists, viz., that of breaking the power of the Lombards in Italy. For,

according to Anastasius and Paulus Diaconus (*de gest. Lonjob.* l. v. c. 6-12), he first proceeded thither with an army, landed at Tarentum, besieged Beneventum, and after unsuccessful warfare against the Lombards, retired at last to Sicily, having first (as said above) visited Rome. Vitalian met him with his clergy, at a distance of six miles from the city, and seems to have received him with the utmost honour. Having arrived on Wednesday, 5th July, and on the same day paid his devotions and made an offering at St. Peter's, and having on Saturday done the same at the church of St. Mary ad Praesepe, the emperor made his grand entry, attended by his army, into St. Peter's on Sunday, being met by all the clergy carrying waxlights; mass was celebrated, and he offered at the altar a mantle of cloth of gold. On the following Saturday he bathed and dined at the Lateran palace, and again on Sunday attended mass at St. Peter's, where he took leave of the pope. His stay in Rome lasted twelve days, during which he had not been wholly occupied by devotional exercises; for he is said by Anastasius, with whom Paulus Diaconus agrees, to have removed all the brazen ornaments that were in the city, and even the brazen tiles from the roof of the Pantheon (then the Church of St. Mary ad Martyres), and to have sent the spoils to Constantinople. Baronius (*ad an.* 663, iii. *et seq.*) expresses surprise that a pope, now numbered among the saints, should have so cordially received and honoured the sacrilegious fratricide, and the ruthless persecutor of Martinus and Maximus, instead of closing the doors of the church against him, as canonical discipline required. He attributes such conduct to a wise and justifiable economy, exercised with the view of winning the heretical East to orthodoxy through the emperor; and he supposes the latter to have himself pretended to be orthodox, accounting further by this supposition for Vitalian having accepted a present from him at the commencement of his pontificate. But such a supposition has not the least historical ground: it is only resorted to by Baronius to save the credit of a pope.

To Vitalian England was indebted for the able and influential archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore, consecrated at Rome A.D. 668. [THEODORUS (7).]

Vitalian died in January (probably the 27th), A.D. 672, having held the see for about fourteen years and a half, and was buried in St. Peter's.

The only extant letters of Vitalian, except that to king Oswy, above referred to, and the alleged one given by William of Malmesbury, have reference to the case of John, bishop of Lappa in Crete, who had been deposed by Paul his metropolitan in synod, and appealed to Rome. Vitalian, in a synod assembled for the purpose, absolved the appellant, and commanded his restitution, on the ground—so far as appears from his letters—not so much of the merits of the charge against him (whatever it may have been) as of uncanonical procedure, in that the accused had been put in prison, had been required to find bail, and had been treated as guilty after his appeal to Rome. He wrote two letters to Paul the metropolitan on the subject, ordering John's restoration, and one also to Vaanus, the emperor's chamberlain and chartularius at Syracuse, and another to the bishop of

Syracuse, desiring them to enforce the appellant's restitution to the see. It would thus appear that the metropolitan and bishops of Crete were not ready of their own accord to submit to the pope's authority.

A more distinct case of insubordination was that of Maurus, archbishop of Ravenna. The bishops of this city, as being the seat of the exarchate, at this time claimed to be autocephalous, and were supported by the exarchs and emperors while Rome stood out against imperial authority with regard to Monothelism. The aforesaid Maurus had, it seems, disregarded a summons to come to Rome and give an account of himself, and was thereupon excommunicated by Vitalian; he, in return, excommunicated the pope, and forbade the churches under his jurisdiction to pay allegiance to the see of Rome; and his degradation from the priesthood was consequently pronounced in a synod of bishops at Rome (Hieron. Rubeus, *Hist. Ravenn.* lib. iv. ann. 648, p. 172, ed. 1572). This position of independence was continued by Reparatus, the successor of Maurus, during the pontificate of pope Adeodatus, but was apparently given up by the following bishop Theodore under pope Donus (676-678). For Anastasius tells (*in Vit. Doni*) "Hujus temporibus ecclesia Ravennatum, quae se ab ecclesia Romana segregaverat causa autocephaliae, denuo se pristinae sedi Apostolicae subjugavit:"—and we find the name of Theodore of Ravenna among the signatories of a Roman council under the next pope Agatho. Under Leo II., who succeeded Agatho (683-684), an imperial rescript is further said to have been obtained for confirming the submission of Ravenna to Rome:—"Hujus temporibus percurrente divali jussione clementissimi Principis. restituta est Ecclesia Ravennatis sub ordinatione sedis apostolicae, defuncto archiepiscopo, qui electus fuit juxta antiquam consuetudinem in civitatem Romanam veniat ordinandus:—sed et ne Mauri quondam episcopi anniversitas celebretur: sed et typum autocephaliae, quem sibi elicierant ad amputanda scandala sedis apostolicae, restituerunt" (Anastas. *in Vit. Leonis II.*) [J. B—y.]

VITALINUS, praised along with his brother Marianus by St. Ambrose (*Serm.* lxiii. 6).

[C. H.]

VITALIS (1), ST., Apr. 28th, a reputed martyr of Ravenna, chiefly interesting us as the patron saint of the famous church of that city. [ECCLESIAST (1).] The fullest early notice of him (but quite legendary) occurs in Ado's *Martyrology*, while he is mentioned also by Usuard, the *Mart. Vet. Rom.*, the *Mart. Rom.*, Notker, and Wandelbert. Rubeus in his *Historia Ravennatum* (ed. 1572, p. 34) gives his story; Papebroch (Boll. *Acta SS.* 28 Apr. iii. 568) and Tillemont (ii. 75, 496) discuss the period, which Baronius (*Mart. Rom.*) considers as A.D. 171. The current legend however assigns him to the reign of Nero, makes him the father of GERVASIUS (1) and PROTASIIUS, and attributes his martyrdom to his having paid honour to the remains of the martyr URSICINUS (1). His wife, Valeria, commemorated on the same day, is said to have suffered at Milan. Papebroch mentions other churches dedicated to Vitalis, viz. at Rome, Faenza, Rimini, Como, Ferrara,

Venice, Verona, in Italy, and at Jadera in Dalmatia. [C. H.]

VITALIS (2), reader, martyred with FELIX (174) in 303. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* 355.) [C. H.]

VITALIS (3), martyr at Bologna with his master. [AGRICOLA.] (Tillem. v. 314.) [C. H.]

VITALIS (4), bishop of Antioch, 21st in succession, followed Tyrannus after the cessation of the persecution of Diocletian, c. A.D. 312 or 313. Entering on his episcopate amid the universal joy at the relaxation of the fiery trial which had been devastating the church, he signalized his entrance on office by commencing the rebuilding of the most ancient church in Antioch, which was specially dear to the Christians, as in Chrysostom's words "the mother of all the churches in the city," having been according to tradition founded by the apostles themselves (Theod. *H. E.* i. 3; Chrysost. *Homil. in Inscript. Act. Apostol.*), which on his death in A.D. 318 or 319, he left to be finished by his successor Philogonus. He was present at the councils of Ancyra, A.D. 314 (Labbe, i. 1475), and Neocaesarea, the date of which is uncertain (*ibid.* i. 1488), and signed the canons. Euty chius calls him Vitellius, and assigns him 6 years (p. 412) (Tillemont, *Mem. Eccles.* tom. vi. p. 194.) [E. V.]

VITALIS, Apollinarist. [VITALIUS.]

VITALIS (5), a presbyter, perhaps of Aquitania, who wrote to Jerome in the year 398 to ask the solution of difficulties as to the early age at which some of the Jewish kings are said to have had children. Jerome admits that there are discrepancies as to these matters, but deprecates the wasting of time on such trivial questions. (*Ep.* 72, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

VITALIS (6), an archdeacon, bearer of a letter from the bishops of Macedonia to pope Innocent I. (*Innoc. Ep.* 17 al. 22 in *Pat. Lat.* xx. 526.) [C. H.]

VITALIS (7), a friend to whom Augustine wrote to reclaim him from Pelagianism. Vitalis had said that belief was not God's gift, but entirely in a man's own power. Having quoted Phil. ii. 15, Augustine asks him whether he thought it needful to pray for those to whom the gospel is preached or only to preach to them. The priest at the altar prays for those who are not converted, and for catechumens, and for the faithful that they may continue in the faith. How can Vitalis contradict the church, or despise the authority of a man so eminent in the African branch of it, as Cyprian in his treatise on the Lord's Prayer, or, to go higher still, that of the Apostle Paul (2 Cor. xiii. 7), or such passages as Ps. xxxvi. (xxxvii.) 23. If he says that a man is guided by God so long as by his own free will he walks in God's way, this is the same opinion which was condemned by Pelagius himself before the Eastern bishops. Grace is given, not according to man's desert, but previously to his will; if otherwise, there would be no need to pray for the conversion of unbelievers. Let him read the Lord's Prayer and Cyprian's treatise on it (c. 17). To pray in any other spirit is to pretend to pray,

for we must suppose that what we pray for is done, not by Him, but by ourselves. In maintaining free will let us not deny God's grace; for if we do so to thank God for bringing us out of darkness (Col. i. 12) is a mockery. Men become Christians by free will, but, at the same time, by His grace. Children are redeemed, regenerated, not by their own free will; but this must be called into action afterwards by agreement with saving doctrine. The works of unbelievers, *e.g.* of illustrious Romans, being done without faith, cannot please God however much they may please men. It is the Mediator who enters into the strong man's house and binds him. Teaching is not grace, but grace makes teaching effectual (John vi. 68). We pray for the conversion of sinners; we pray, not that doctrine may be preached to them, but that their will may be changed. The faithful pray that they may persevere, carrying out the warning of 1 Cor. x. 12. The question as to the removal of Christians in early life, in order to prevent them from falling into sin, must be put aside for the present; our duty is to walk in true faith now.

Then follow twelve rules or principles opposed to the doctrine of Pelagius, of which the substance may be said to be that grace is given by God at His pleasure, not on account of man's desert whether in the case of children or adults. All, even children, will be judged for their works. Those who believe in God do so of their own free will. We pray for unbelievers, that they may be brought to believe; we thank God for those who have been so brought. In summing up what has been said, Augustine touches the argument drawn from 1 Tim. ii. 4, by showing that some infants die without baptism, and, on the other hand, the one drawn from 1 Cor. xv. 22, by showing that those who are saved are so in accordance with God's will, but that against his will none can be saved. As those who die in the Lord are blessed, the opinion that men will be judged according to their hypothetical conduct is absurd. To say that men believe with their own free will is not to deny free will, whereas those who oppose God's grace really do so. How can we thank God for what He has not done? or will Vitalis refuse to allow the church to pray for the conversion of infidels, as the priest does at the altar, or will he blame St. Paul for praying for the Jews? If he allows that prayer to God and thanksgiving are lawful, how can he deny that God's grace precedes man's will? (Aug. *Ep.* 217.) [H. W. P.]

VITALIS (8), a notary on the Catholic side at the conference A.D. 411 (Carth. Coll. i. 1. 132; ii. 1. iii. 1). [H. W. P.]

VITALIS (9), addressed along with TONANTIUS (1) by Capreolus. [C. H.]

VITALIS (10), bishop of Truentum or Tronto in Picenum, and, with Misenus, legate of Felix III. in A.D. 483, sent to Constantinople to procure the deposition of Peter Mongus. Overcome by imprisonment and threats, they were induced to go over to the side of Acacius, to join him in processions, to communicate with him and the heretical partisans of Peter Mongus, and to recite the name of the latter in the diptychs. They brought back a letter from Acacius to the pope

in which he praised Peter Mongus. On their return the pope assembled a council at Rome in July, A.D. 484, at which they were deposed from the episcopate and excluded from communion till the church of Alexandria should receive a Catholic bishop. Vitalis died excommunicated between A.D. 492 and 495, but at a synod under pope Gelasius in the latter year Misenus was admitted to communion and restored to the episcopate on abjuring Eutychianism and anathematizing its chief supporters. [FELIX (3) III. and GELASIVS (1)] (Felicis III. *Epist.* 2, 6, 10; Liberatus 18, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 899, 921, 936, lxxviii. 1028; *Evag. H. E.* iii. 20). [F. D.]

VITALIS (11), third abbat of M. Cassino after St. Benedict. (Paulus Diac. *Hist. Lang.* iv. 18.) [F. D.]

VITALIS (12), addressed as bishop of Ravenna, by Venantius Fortunatus, in two poems describing the church of St. Andrew and its consecration which Vitalis had built (*Miscell.* i. 1, 2, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 63). As no bishop of Ravenna of this name is otherwise known, the editor of Fortunatus conjectures he is the same as Maximianus, who was bishop from A.D. 546 to A.D. 553, and who restored the church of St. Andrew (Agnellus, *V. S. Maximiani* 4, in *Patr. Lat.* cvi. 608). [F. D.]

VITALIS (13), defensor of the Roman church at Cagliari in Sardinia. Four letters of Gregory the Great are addressed to him (lib. ix. ind. ii. 2, 64, lib. xi. ind. iv. 23, lib. xiv. ind. vii. 2, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 940, 1000, 1135, 1303). In the first the case of Januarius, bishop of Cagliari, is referred to, who was accused of ploughing up the crops of a neighbour on a Sunday and removing his landmarks, and Vitalis is forbidden to take any commission on the money remitted by the pope for wheat purchased; in the second, he is forbidden to interfere with the bishop's jurisdiction over his clergy; in the third, he is told to assist in the purchase of Barbaricine slaves. The Barbaricines were the heathen descendants of a tribe transported to Sardinia by the Vandals, who lived by brigandage in the mountains near Cagliari. [F. D.]

VITALIUS (VITALIS), the most distinguished and influential of the disciples of Apollinaris, ordained by him bishop of his schismatical congregation at Antioch. Vitalius was a man of the highest character, much revered at Antioch for the sanctity of his life and his many virtues. He had been brought up in the orthodox faith, and after having spent some years as a layman was ordained presbyter by Meletius (Theod. *H. E.* v. 4; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 25). An unhappy jealousy of his fellow presbyter Flavian, whom he thought to be higher in Meletius's favour than himself, caused a breach between him and his bishop. Deprived of the wholesome guidance of Meletius, Vitalius fell under the influence of Apollinaris, whose intimate friend he became, and embraced his theological system. Tidings of his unsoundness in the faith having reached Rome, Vitalius made a journey thither (which may be placed in 375) to clear himself of the charges before pope Damasus, and to be received by him into communion. By the use of equivocal terms, and the production of a de-

elation of faith in which all crucial expressions were skillfully omitted he convinced Damasus of his orthodoxy. Damasus did not, however, receive him into communion, but as if he suspected that he was being imposed on he sent Vitalius back to Antioch with a letter to Paulinus, whom, during the Meletian schism, Rome and the Western Church recognised as the orthodox and canonical bishop of that see, remitting the whole matter to his decision, as one likely to be better informed on its true bearing than himself. He praised his caution, but recommended that it should not lead him to postpone too long the re-admission of those of whose orthodoxy he had sufficient proof, on their signing the Nicene creed, and also making a declaration that the Son of God took on Him "entire Adam" with body, soul and sense. Those whom Paulinus admitted to communion would be received into communion with Rome (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. 864). Both of these requirements were satisfied by Vitalius, but with a secret reserve as to the interpretation of the words. Shortly after Vitalius had left Rome, Damasus, not quite easy in his mind as to his orthodoxy, despatched a second letter to Paulinus, containing a profession of faith, and a long string of anathematisms, which, without naming Apollinaris, condemned him and his doctrines, desiring Paulinus to require signature to them as the terms of being admitted into communion (Labbe, ii. 900, sq.; *Theod. H. E.* v. 11). These terms Vitalius refused to satisfy, and the breach between him and Paulinus became complete. Apollinaris ordained him bishop of his schismatical church, his holiness of life and pastoral zeal gathering a large number of followers, the successors of whom were still existing at Antioch under the name of Vitalians when Sozomen wrote (*Soz. H. E.* vi. 25). The unsoundness of Vitalius on the point on which Apollinaris diverged from the orthodox faith, did not prevent his being regarded with much esteem and affection by leaders on the orthodox side, with whom, this one point excepted, he completely agreed. On his return from Rome to Antioch, A.D. 375, he visited Gregory Nazianzen, by whom he was acknowledged as a beloved brother, whose soundness in the faith he entirely accepted, though subsequently when convinced of the real meaning of his ambiguous language he was forced to recall his approval (*Greg. Naz. Ep. ad Cledon.* ii. *Orat.* 52, tom. i. p. 746). It must have been very shortly after Vitalius's return to Antioch that Epiphanius, urged thereto by Basil (*Bas. Ep.* 258 [325]) visited Antioch for the purpose of healing the differences which were rending that unhappy church. Among those he met there he specially mentions "Vitalius the bishop," whom he speaks of in the highest terms as εὐλαβεστάτος τῶν βίῳ, καὶ τῆ καταστάσει καὶ τῆ πολιτεία, and earnestly besought him to reunite himself to the Catholic Church. Finding that the misunderstanding was chiefly a personal one, between him and Paulinus, each charging the other with unsoundness in the faith, Epiphanius invited them both to a conference. At first Vitalius's language appeared perfectly orthodox. He acknowledged as fully as Paulinus that Christ was perfect man with a human body and soul (ψυχῆ); but when pressed as to whether He also

had a human mind (νοῦς) he denied it, stating that His divinity was to Him in its place. Neither party could persuade the other, and Epiphanius had to give up the hopeless attempt (*Épiphan. lxxvii. c.* 20-23). The schism of Vitalius added a third, or counting the Arians, a fourth church at Antioch, each denouncing the others. Meletius, Paulinus and Vitalius each claimed to be the orthodox bishop. The perplexity they created is graphically described by Jerome in his letters to pope Damasus (*Hieron. Ep.* 57, 58): "Whoever is united to the chair of Peter he regards as his own. But Meletius, Vitalius and Paulinus, each asserted that they clave to Damasus. He could believe it if every one said so. But now two must be liars, if not all three. He is equally ignorant of them all, 'non novi Vitalem; Meletium respuo, ignoro Paulinum,' and he begs the pope for his soul's sake to signify to him whom he is to communicate with" (*Tillemont, Mem. Ecclés.* vii. 617-622; *Dorner, Person of Christ, Div.* 1, vol. ii. p. 386 ff, *Clark's transl.*). [E. V.]

VITELLIUS, an African Donatist writer mentioned by Gennadius (*Scr. Eccl.* 4). He flourished in the time of the emperor Constans, and so cir. A.D. 344. His works *De eo quod odio sint mundo servi Dei* (written against the Catholic party as persecutors). *Adversus Gentes, adversus Catholicos* (accusing them of being traitors) are not extant. (*Cave, i.* 209; *Ceill. v.* 105.) [C. H.]

VITONUS (VITONIUS), Nov. 9, bishop of Verdun, succeeded Firmus A.D. 502. His life is given by SURIUS (*Vit. SS.* xi. 236) and MABILLON (*AA. SS. Ben.* vi. i. 496). The modern interest in St. Vitonus centres in the connection of his abbey with the Benedictines. He died A.D. 525 (*Ceillier, xii.* 833, *xiii.* 119). [J. G.]

VITUS (1) (GUY), ST., June 15th, a youthful martyr in the persecution of Diocletian. He was the son of a pagan gentleman in Sicily, but had been secretly trained in Christianity by his nurse Crescentia and her husband Modestus. After the boy had encountered much cruel suffering they succeeded in carrying him over to Italy, where however they all three fell victims, either in Lucania or at Rome. (*Boll. Acta SS.* 15 Jun. iii. 491, ed. 1867.) For references to the Martyrologies, see *D. C. A. VITUS (2)*. His *Passio*, composed in the sixth or the seventh century, was discovered at Rome in the ninth, and is of no authority. His relics are reputed to be at Corbey and at Prague. He is invoked against sudden death and hydrophobia (*Acta SS.* 15 Jun. iii. App. p. 21*), as well as against prolonged sleep and the complaint known as the Chorea or Dance of St. Vitus (Guérin, *Les Pet. Boll.* vii. 30). He is also, says Guérin, the patron of comedians and dancers. Two German medical writers, Gregory Horst and John Juncker, of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries respectively, relate how the malady came to take the name of St. Vitus, and the substance of their remarks, with references, may be read in Rees's *Encyclopædia, s.v.* Chorea. There sprang up, they say, in Germany in the seventeenth century, a superstitious belief that by presenting gifts to the image of St. Vitus,

and dancing before it day and night on his festival, people ensured themselves good health through the following year. The saints' two enapels at Ulm and Ravensberg became more especially noted for the annual resort of these dancing fanatics. The Dance of St. Vitus or St. Guy, thus gaining currency in speech, became a popular name for the well-known nervous disorder. [C. H.]

VITUS (2), bishop of Charrae (Haran). He was one of the signers of the letter of the Oriental prelates to the bishops of Italy and Gaul in 372 (Basil. *Ep.* 92 [69]). On the return of Sancti-simus from the west, Basil sent a letter by him to Vitus, expressing his respectful regard, and his desire to enjoy his society (*ibid.* *Ep.* 255 [314]). He was present at Constantinople in 381 (Labbe, ii. 955). Sozomen speaks of him as famous for his sanctity, and records that on his first interview with Constantine, the emperor stated that he had seen him frequently in visions, and that he had been bidden to obey all his counsels. (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 33; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 975.) [E. V.]

VIULANDUS. Gregory the Great requests the bishop of Ravenna to hear and determine without delay a suit between him and one of his deacons. (*Epp.* ii. 40.) [F. D.]

VIVENTIOLUS (1), a rhetorician who found fault with St. Avitus for pronouncing the second syllable of the word "potitur" long in a discourse pronounced at the dedication of a church at Lyons. Avitus replied, justifying himself, and stating that the shortening of the syllable by Virgil (*Æn.* iii. 56) was a case of poetic licence (Avitus, *Ep.* li. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 268; Ceillier, x. 562). [S. A. B.]

VIVENTIOLUS (2), ST. (VIVENTIUS), 24th bishop of Lyons. He spent the first part of his life at Condol in the monastery under Eugendus. In 510 he went to Lyons, and had a correspondence with Avitus, who thanks him for telling him of the illness of his brother Apollinarius, bishop of Lyons, and exhorts him to interest himself in settling the discords in the monastery at Condat, consequent on the death of Eugendus. Avitus also wishes him a higher post than that of head of a monastery—a 'Cathedra' instead of the 'sella,' which he had brought as a present to Avitus. (*Pat. Lat.* lix. 272.) In 516 Viventius assisted at the consecration of the monastery at Agaunum as bishop of Lyons, and a fragment of his oration on this occasion is preserved. (*Pat. Lat.* lxvii. 994; Labbe, iv. 1559.) In 517 he subscribed at Epaon, and wrote a 'tractoria epistola,' summoning the bishops to it (Labbe, iv. 1581; *Pat. Lat.* lxvii. 993). He also presided at the Council of Lyons 517. (Labbe, iv. 1585.) There are extant five letters of Avitus to him, some passages of which speak highly of his zeal and affection (*Pat. Lat.* lix.), and one of his to Avitus, inviting his presence at the Feast of St. Just (*Pat. Lat.* lix. 272).

His extant works cited above are in *Pat. Lat.* (lxvii. 994-6). Agobardus, in his work *De Jud. Sup.*, mentions works of his, but it is not known what these are. He makes the following

remark concerning him, "Viventiolus Ecclesiae Lugdunensis episcopus cujus doctrinae fuerit non solum ipsius, sed et aliorum de eo scripta testantur." (*Pat. Lat.* civ. 82; *Hist. Litt. de la Fr.* iii. 94-95.) [G. W. D.]

VIVENTIUS of Lyons. [VIVENTIOLUS.]

VIVENTIUS, a bishop in France, and one of the three authors of the first book of the life of St. Caesarius of Arles. His coadjutors were St. Cyprian, bishop of Toulon, and Firminus, bishop of Uzez. It was written immediately after Caesarius's death in 542, at the request of the abess Caesaria, the younger, and her nuns (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvii. 1001; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 238; Ceillier, xi. 128) From a letter of a priest, Messianus, to Viventius, first published by Mabillon, we learn that he was a bishop (see *Boll. Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 60), but his see is unknown. [S. A. B.]

VIVIANDUS (BIBIANDUS, BIBIANUS, VIBIANUS), second bishop of Saintes, succeeded Eutropius, and has a meagre tradition. The *Vita, auctore anonymo*, given by the *Boll. (AA. SS.* Aug. vi. 461-2) is late, and makes him pupil and successor, instead of predecessor, of Amrosius. According to the Life he was a native of Saintes; his mother was Maurela, a Christian: at the age of eleven he was placed under Ambrosius the bishop, passed through the ecclesiastical grades, and became his successor. He flourished c. A.D. 450, and his tomb at Saintes is mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Conf.* c. 58). He is usually known as Bibianus, and his feast is 28 Aug. (Surius, *Vit. SS.* viii. 318; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 228; x. p. lvii.; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 1055). In *Append. ad Opera S. Germai i Parisiensis*, there is given by Migne (*Pat. Lat.* lxxii. 430 sq.) *Epistula S. Augustini ad Sanctum Dei Bibianum Santonicae civitatis antestitem* (ex MS. Codice S. Petri Carnotensis). It purports to be in reply to a letter from Bibianus to St. Augustine of Hippo; the letter was sent through Trojanus, a deacon of Saintes, and the reply through Eugepius, a presbyter of Hippo; the subject relates to the observance of Advent, but the whole is probably fictitious. [J. G.]

VOCIUS, bishop of Lyons, present at the council of Arles A.D. 314 (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 95). [H. W. P.]

VOCONIUS, bishop of Castellanum in Mauretania, c. 460, author of a work *Against Jews, Arians, and other Heretics*, and another *On the Sacraments* (Gennad. *Scr. Eccl.* 78) now lost. (Cave, i. 448; Ceill. x. 469.) [C. H.]

VODALIS (VODVAL, ST. VOUEL), Pictish priest, inclusus at St. Hildegard's monastery of Soissons, died A.D. 720 (Innes, *Civ. and Eccl. Hist. Scot.* 318, Sp. Cl. Ed.). [J. G.]

VODINUS, 15th in the mythical list of British archbishops of London, as to which, see OBINUS and Stubbs's *Reg. Sac.* 152. He is said to have been slain in 436 (453 Stubbs), for forbidding Vortigern, king of Britain, to marry Hengist's daughter Rowenna (Godwin, *De Praesul.* 170, ed. 1743). [C. H.]

VOLAGESUS, bishop of Nisibis, succeeded James in 361. He is mentioned in the *Chronicle* of Dionysius in 363, and according to the *Chronicle* of Edessa he died in 396. He was the author of a graphic narrative of the siege and relief of Nisibis in Julian's Persian campaign. (*Chron. Puschal.* p. 291; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* 18; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.*) [E. V.]

VOLCATIUS GALLICANUS, one of the writers of the Augustan History. He wrote the account of the usurper Avidius Cassius, A.D. 175, and dedicated it to Diocletian. It is remarkable for an extensive use of original correspondence. [SPARTIANUS.] Teuffel's *Hist. of Rom. Literat.* t. ii. p. 323, Eng. trans. [G. T. S.]

VOLOCUS, bishop. [FAELCHU (2).]

VOLUSIANUS (1), C. VIBIUS AFINIUS GALLUS VELDUMNIANUS, joint emperor with his father Gallus. At the end of A.D. 251 Gallus was proclaimed emperor after the defeat and death of Decius, which he is said to have caused by his treachery. He associated Volusian with himself in the empire, and, after making peace with the Goths on the shameful terms of allowing them to keep their prisoners and paying them tribute, the emperors proceeded to Rome. Their short reign was marked by the dreadful pestilence which began in Aethiopia and spread over the whole Roman world, and in which Hostilianus, the son of Decius, who had been associated with the Galli in the empire, died. By the care they bestowed on the funerals of the poorer classes in Rome they won, it is said, great popularity (Victor, *de Caes.*). Their numerous medals, bearing representations of Apollo and Juno, the deities of the sun and the air (Eckhel, vii. 357), support the statement of St. Cyprian (*Ep.* 55 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* iii. 805), that they issued an edict, ordering sacrifices to be offered everywhere to appease the wrath of the gods. By their refusal to obey the edict the Christians aroused the hatred of the populace. In Africa the cry of *Cyprianum ad leonem* was again raised, and the outbreak of a persecution worse than that of Decius was daily apprehended (*Ep.* 54 in *Patr. Lat.* iii. 855, 861). Fortunately these apprehensions were not realised. The only overt acts of persecution we certainly know of were confined to Rome. The outbreak was sudden (*Ep.* 58 in *Patr. Lat.* iii. 274), and Cornelius, the bishop of Rome, seems to have been specially singled out for attack. His flock rallied bravely round him, and some, who had fallen away in the Decian persecution, distinguished themselves by their firmness (*Ep.* 57 in *Patr. Lat.* iii. 832). Cornelius and some of his followers were banished to Centum Cellae, where he died, probably by a natural death, in June, A.D. 253. (See Lipsius, *Chron. der Röm. Bisch.* 207.) His successor Lucius was apparently elected in exile, but was soon allowed to return, the cessation of the persecution being probably due to the outbreak of the civil war. There is no clear proof that any severer punishment than exile was inflicted in this persecution. At least, this is the worst that is mentioned by the contemporary writers St. Cyprian and St. Dionysius of Alexandria (in Eus. *H. E.* vii. 1). In the summer of A.D. 253 Aemilianus, after gaining some suc-

cesses over the Goths in Moesia, was proclaimed emperor by his soldiers, and towards the end of the year marched on Rome. Gallus and Volusian advanced to meet him, but their own troops mutinied, murdered them at Torni, and went over to their rival about the month of February, A.D. 254. [See VALERIANUS.] (Zos. i. 23-28; Zon. xii. 21; Tillemont, *Emp.* iii. 287, *M. E.* iii. 465, iv. 115; Gibbon, c. 10.) [F. D.]

VOLUSIANUS (2). A law of Constantius, dated April 30, A.D. 355, is addressed to him forbidding marriage with a brother's wife or a wife's sister, and bastardizing the issue of such marriages (*Cod. Theod.* iii. tit. xii. 2). In this law Volusianus is styled vicarius urbis, but this is probably a wrong reading, as in three laws of the same year he is styled Praefectus Praetorio (*Cod. Theod.* xi. tit. xxx. 26, tit. xxxiv. 2, tit. xxxvi. 12). [F. D.]

VOLUSIANUS (3), son of Albinus, and brother to Albina, and thus maternal uncle to her daughter Melania the younger (Photius, *Bibl.* 53, 19; and not ed. Bekker; Tillemont, xiv. 233, 747). His mother was a devout Christian, but her name is not known. He may have been the same as Caius Coeonius Rufus Volusianus, *praefectus urbi* in the time of Valentinian, who died A.D. 375. (Baronius, ann. 412, xvi. xvii.) At the time when Marcellinus went to Africa, the mother of Volusianus wrote to St. Augustine, entreating him to use his influence with him to become a Christian, and in reply to her appeal he wrote to him, exhorting him to study the Scriptures, not on account of their style, but their subject matter, and if he has questions to ask he offered to write to him, a method which he preferred to that of conversing with him (*Aug. Ep.* 132). Volusianus accepted this invitation, and related what had taken place at a meeting of his friends. After discussing various matters relating to poetry, metaphysics, and the like, one of the party asked where a Christian was to be found who could explain the mystery of the Saviour's birth in all its details, his life, and his actions. The party agreed to lay the matter before Augustine, as the man best qualified to explain it (*Ep.* 135). In the meantime Marcellinus, who visited Volusianus frequently at Carthage, and discussed with him the subject of Christianity, and to whom at the earnest request of his mother, Volusianus had shown the letter of Augustine, wrote to him about A.D. 412 to request him to reply to the question of Volusianus, and also to the objection raised by unbelievers that our Lord had performed no work greater than had been done by Apollonius of Tyana or by Apuleius. Volusianus had put the question that even if the Incarnation could be explained, how could the difference be explained between the sacrifices of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament, and how could both of them be consistent with God's unity of purpose. He asked also how some results of Christian doctrine could be reconciled with the principles of government and national economy, e. g. non-resistance to evil and to enemies, and submission to injustice, arbitrary aggression and the like. He trusts that an answer will be given to these questions which will do credit to the reputation of Augustine, especially in the

eyes of the possessor of Hippo, whose name may have been, unless the word be only an epithet, Eximius, who under the guise of flattery could hesitate to declare himself satisfied (*Ep.* 136; Tillemont, xiii. 594). To the letter of Volusianus Augustine replies, 1. That the depth of Scripture is great, that men's minds are unwilling at first to conceive of bodies in any other light than as full grown and occupying definite space, but that God fills the universe without limitation of space. The senses are bound up in life, yet those of hearing and seeing, and even smell, have often a range beyond the body, and thus life may be said to exist at a distance from it. What then is the soul but a sense of the body, *i.e.* in the mind by which it looks at these things, for it does not judge of the senses by a sensation of the body, and yet we cannot believe that God took a body from his virgin mother while he did not depart from the bosom of the Father. The omnipresence of the Word resembles in some degree the human voice before a multitude; and thus the impregnation of the virgin mother is not incredible, for God is great, not in bulk but in energy. He who caused her womb to produce fruit passed through the closed door after the resurrection. Of this, not the first example of power, the reason is to be sought in the power of the agent. The Word took human form not, as He might have done in the form of an adult, but as an infant, in order to prove the reality of his human nature, which otherwise might have been doubted. In doing this He added the human to the divine nature; but this union of natures is not more wonderful than that of soul and body in man. Augustine then enlarges on the moral benefit arising from the truth, in leading men to the divine nature through the assistance of divine grace. As to the immortality of the soul, who is there that refuses to believe in it?

"But," says Volusianus, "the divinity of Christ was not apparent by any sufficient signs, for his miracles were after all only small works as regards God." Augustine grants that similar works have been performed by prophets and others, for how could His works be unlike those of His servants? But His incarnation, resurrection, and ascension, belong to Him alone. He then appeals to the preparation for His coming in Abraham and in the history of Israel, the law with its sacrifices and rites, and in prophecy, and to the subsequent fulfilment of all this in the progress of the church. He asks what precepts of philosophers are equal to the two great commandments, including as they do all public and private duty. Scripture contains plain precepts both for learned and unlearned people, but also deep mysteries which prevent man from despising the plain precepts. He invites Volusianus to ask questions, which he need not scruple to express at length. As to the Gospel being unsuited to state government, this notion must come from those who think that a state stands, not by strength of virtues, but by impunity of vices. God's mercy and grace do not desert men living by faith, whatever their sufferings in the world may be. He assures him of his prayers and trusts that they may be heard (*Ep.* 137). In a letter to Marcellinus Augustine mentions his having sent this letter (*Ep.* 139). In a letter to Evodius Augustine

asked him to explain a passage in the same letter in which he had said, (a) That if a reason were required for the birth of Christ of the Virgin, there need be no wonder at it. (b) That if a similar instance, it would be found to be not singular (*Ep.* 137, 2, 8). This argument, Evodius says, proves too much, for we can give no account of any birth at all, and therefore to say that the birth from the Virgin is not wonderful is to say no more than may be said of every birth, and to say that it is not without parallel, is only to repeat what we know about many instances of spontaneous generation in animals. In his reply to this letter, in which other questions besides these are treated, Augustine says, (a) That the birth was not without reason, but that the reason is not apparent to some to whom it seems wonderful, somewhat in the same way as our Lord marvelled at the centurion's faith because it was uncommon. As to (b) the instances adduced by Evodius are irrelevant, while the birth of Christ is unique in its circumstances, but not without parallel as an act of power (*Ep.* 161-162). It is plain that Augustine took great pains with his letter to Volusianus, and he refers to it in his Enchiridion addressed to Laurentius c. 34. In A.D. 420 or 421 an edict was issued by Constantine or Constantius, created Augustus by Honorius, to expel Coelestius from Rome, which was addressed to Volusianus, *praefectus urbi* (Photius, *Bibl.* 53, 14; Baronius, ann. 420, ii. iii). Notwithstanding the duty which he had to perform in this matter, it appears to have made no difference in his religious profession, but in A.D. 434, the year in which Proclus became archbishop of Constantinople, he appears, being then very ill, to have sent for his niece Melania to come to him to that city from Jerusalem, and there to have been persuaded by her to receive baptism from the archbishop. This is stated shortly by Photius in a passage expressing the common reading of the text, but which is not accepted by the editor, Bekker. It is related in greater fulness in one of the letters of Melania published by Symeon Metaphrastes, but which is extant only in the Latin version by Surlus, given by Baronius, ann. 434, viii.-xi. The statement may be true, but there seems to be in the narrative some confusion of time and place, for Volusianus is represented as having been made *praefectus urbi* at Constantinople at that time, an office which he held at Rome thirteen or fourteen years before. Tillemont speaks doubtfully of the identity of the two persons, vol. xiii. 595. He is mentioned as a *praefectus praetorio* in an edict of Theodosius and Valentinian III. A.D. 429 (*Ad Theod.* xii. 6, 32), also as holding the same office in one from the same emperors dated Ravenna, June 10, 429 (*Just. Cod.* i. 14, 4; Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vi. p. 202).

[H. W. P.]

VOLUSIANUS (4) addressed by Firmus bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. (*Ep.* 25 in *Patr. Gr.* lxxvii. 1499.) [C. H.]

VOLUSIANUS (5), ST., seventh bishop of Tours, who succeeded his relative St. Perpetuus, A.D. 491, was of senatorial family, very rich, and holy in life. In the seventh year of his episcopate, he was driven into exile at Toulouse by the Goths, who suspected him of favouring the

arms of the orthodox Clovis and his Franks. In his time were built the bourg of Manthelan and the church of Saint-Jean-à-Marmoutiers. He died in exile after an episcopate of seven years and two months, and was succeeded by Verus (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 26, x. 31). A story not known to Gregory makes him die a martyr's death at a place called Patrosa, near Pamiers, in the year 500. His day is Jan. 18. (See Boll. Jan. ii. 194-5; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 14-15.)

[S. A. B.]

VOLVENTIUS, proconsul of Spain. [PRISCILLIANUS.]

VOUEL. [VODALIS (1).]

VULGANIUS (WULGAN), bishop and confessor, patron of Lens, dep. Pas-de-Calais, has a very uncertain tradition, but he appears to have been of Irish birth, and missionary in ancient Picardy or Belgic Gaul in the first half of the 7th century. His death was soon after the middle of that century. His relics were translated from Arras to Lens about the 11th century and his feast is Nov. 2. (Malbrancq, *De Mor.* ii. cc. 50 sq.; Molanus, *SS. Belg.* v. 253; O'Connor, *Ep. Nunc.* 149; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 162, 377, 797; Baring Gould, *Saints*, Nov. p. 59.) His connection with Canterbury is mythical, and so also with Scotland. [J. G.]

VUSCFREA, a son of Edwin, king of Northumbria, who was baptized by Paulinus, with Edwin and others, on Easter day, A.D. 627 (Beda, *H. E.* ii. 14). After his father's death, in A.D. 633, he was conveyed to Kent for safety, and was afterwards sent into France to be brought up at the friendly court of king Dagobert, where he died in his childhood. (*Id.* ii. 20.) [J. R.]

W

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

WAERMUND, bishop. (Kemble, *C. D.* 155.) [WEREMUND (2).]

WAIMERUS (VAIMERUS, WAGEMARUS, WEGEMARUS), twenty-first bishop of Troyes, comes before us first as duke of Champagne, when he was sent to take Autun; on the surrender of Leodegarius bishop of Autun, that prelate was handed over by Ebroin mayor of the palace, to Waimerus for torture and death [LEODEGARIUS (2)] (*Vita S. Leodegarii*, c. 12 sq.; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxiv. 1138 sq.), but according to one of the anonymous Lives of Leodegarius (*Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 359), Waimerus and his wife were converted by Leodegarius, who received a sum of money from his converts, and devoted it to charitable purposes. Through the influence of Ebroin Waimerus became bishop of Troyes, yet only to incur the suspicion and hatred of Ebroin, who had him strangled, or at least driven from his see, A.D. 678 (*Id.* xcvi. 363-4). He could not have been bishop more than two or

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

three years. (See *Vitae duae S. Leodegarii*, in Migne, xevi. 329 sq.; *Gall. Christ.* xii. 488.)

[J. G.]

WALARICUS (VALERY), ST., founder and first abbat of the monastery of Leuconaus, at the mouth of the Somme, which, with the adjacent town, took his name (Saint-Valery) in the 9th century. He died about 622, and his life was written about 660 by Raimbertus, or Ragimbertus, the second abbat after him. This life, as so often happened, being composed, as was thought, "nimis prolixo et simplici sermone," was rewritten to suit the taste of a later age, the 8th century (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 602) or the 11th century (Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. i. 14). The original has been lost, but the new version is preserved, the most correct edition being that of the *Acta SS.* (*ibid.* pp. 16-23).

Walaricus was born in Auvergne, where he fed his father's flocks and taught himself to read in the field. He became a monk in a neighbouring monastery, and a member of the clergy. He next migrated to a monastery at Auxerre, and thence repaired to St. Columban at Luxeuil. When the latter was banished in 610, he remained for a time with his successor St. Eustasius, but before long departed with one companion to the diocese of Amiens, where he begged from Clotaire a spot called Leuconaus, at the mouth of the Somme. Here a small community collected round him, though he lived apart in a solitary cell. His death is variously given as Dec. 12 and April 1, but he is commemorated the latter day. His grave becoming famous for its miracles, his successor St. Blitmundus built the monastery, afterwards known as St. Valery. For its history see *Gall. Christ.* x. 1231; and for the subsequent removals of Walaricus' body and attendant miracles, Boll. *ibid.* pp. 23-30; cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii. 558. [S. A. B.]

WALBURGIS, ST., Feb. 25 (WALBURGA, WILBURGA, WALPURGA, WALTPURDE, WALPOUR, WARPURG, VAUBOURG, FALBOURG, GAUBURGE, PERCHE), abbess of Heidenheim, in the diocese of Eichstädt in Bavaria, the sister of Willibald and Wunobald. She was educated in the monastery of Wimburn under the abbess Tetta, with whom she was sent with Lioba and others into Germany at the request of Boniface, about A.D. 748. At first she remained under Lioba at Bischofsheim, but in or about 750 she was appointed abbess of the monastery founded by her brothers at Heidenheim, and there she died c. 780 (Boll. *Acta SS.* 25 Feb. iii. 516; *Pat. Lat.* cxxix. 866; Capgrave *N. L.* 293; Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 907; Butler, Feb. 25). For numerous other Lives see Potthast, *Biblioth. Hist.* ii. 929; Chevalier, *Sources Histor.* p. 2325. [C. H.]

WALDEBERTUS (WALBERT, VALBERT), ST., third abbat of Luxeuil, where he succeeded St. Eustasius, whose disciple he was, about 625. We have a 10th-century life of him, written by an abbat Adso, who either belonged to Luxeuil (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. i. 277) or, as seems more probable, to Moutier-en-Der (Ceillier, xii. 887, 88). Though supposed to be based on an older account (cf. Boll. *ibid.* p. 275), it is of little value. First published by Mabillon, it is repeated by the Bol-