

obscure; we are not told on what grounds Kenulf regarded the Kentish monasteries as his patrimonial property, or enabled to determine the exact steps of the litigation. The documents will be found in the Collections of Councils (Wilkins, i. 172; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 587-604). They prove a good deal of synodal activity at the time, and suggest an undercurrent of jealousy between the king and the primate, possibly due to the increasing power of Egbert of Wessex, although there is, really, very little evidence of any intercourse between Egbert and Wulfred, except in Rochester and Canterbury charters of 828 and 830 (Kemble, *C. D.* 223, 224). In the synods, held to treat on the great dispute, other business was transacted, as appears from the charters of the time.

We hear hardly anything of Wulfred after the termination of the dispute. The Christ Church Cartulary, however, contains a charter (K., *C. D.* 225) which shows his affection for his cathedral church and family, and which may very probably have been one of his last acts. In this, he gives, for the good of his soul, to the devout family of Christ Church, a part of his patrimonial property at Sheldsford, near Eastry, after his own death, to be held as hereditary or allodial estate: they are to commemorate him with alms and masses; and the condition is attached that they are to confirm and keep unchanged all his acts and words, doing their best to improve on all that he had done for good. He gives, further, an estate, which Cynehard, the deacon [archdeacon, K., *C. D.* 224], had given him, and which Cynehard had received from Egbert and Ethelwulf after the conquest of Kent in 824, on the condition that every morning and evening, when the brethren go to the church of St. Peter to sing the usual service, they shall say pater noster for Cynehard's soul; another property, a court which the monk Dodda had held in the monastery, he also bestowed, for the souls of himself, Dodda and Cynehard, to be used at the pleasure of the family, either for internal improvement or for the refectory of the citizens, or for the rest (requiescere) of sick priests or deacons. The act is attested by the archbishop, and confirmed by Ceolnoth, his successor, and a large number of priests, whose signatures seem to have been added on the occasion that would answer to the modern probate of the will. Among other points that are suggested by this charter, we may notice that it confirms the impression, arrived at from external history, that Wulfred acquiesced without difficulty in the transfer of Kent from Mercian to West Saxon domination. His own position was secure; a strong West Saxon ruler was better than a weak Mercian viceroy, or a divided body of Kentish lords.

A charter of Werhard, a kinsman of Wulfred (*C. D.* 230), is extant, in which, before his death, he returns to the cathedral monastery the lands which he had held by the archbishop's gift. He adds that Wulfred ordered masses to be said daily for all the benefactors of the convent, and left a dole of bread and cheese, or bacon, and a penny to 1200 poor people on his anniversary.

Wulfred's life was prolonged, as seems most probable, to the year 832. His death is placed in the Chronicle in 830 but this may be cor-

rected, first by allowing for the two years error, and next by the existence of a charter (K., *C. D.* 227), in which he attests a grant of Wiglaf of Mercia dated August 28, 831. As his obit was kept on the 24th of March, and his successor consecrated in June, his death must be thrown on to another year 832. (See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 557, 558.)

Among the professions of obedience made by the bishops, at their consecration, to the primate and see of Canterbury, the following are extant, made to Wulfred, by Ethelnoth of London, Wigthegn of Winchester, Herewin of Lichfield, Hrethun of Leicester, Heabert of Worcester, Hunferth of Elmham, Ceolbert of London, Hereferth of Winchester, Humbert of Lichfield, and Eadulf of Hereford. (See *Councils*, &c. Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 568-608.)

The principal council held by Wulfred was that of Chelsea in 816, already described; but there are sufficient traces of synodal action to warrant us in dating ecclesiastical assemblies, or councils, at Acle (Ockley), in 805 and 810, and at Clovesho in 824 and 825; besides important witenagemots at which the temporal matters concerning the clergy and church property might be settled, and of which we have traces in the many charters of the period. [S.]

WUNEBALDUS, Dec. 18 (WUNIBALDUS, WINEBALDUS), abbat of Heidenheim, was brother of Willibaldus and Walburgis. He accompanied Willibald to Rome A.D. 720 [WILLIBALD], where he stayed seven years: during that time or after it he paid a visit to Britain (*Vita S. Wunibaldi*, c. 5). Trithemius (*de Vir. Illust.* iii.) says that he became a monk at Monte Casino. On the invitation of his kinsman St. Boniface he proceeded to Germany, and was ordained a priest to labour in Thuringia. There he established seven churches or monasteries, and was treated with great honour by duke Otilo, who gave him a residence at Nordisule. He paid a visit to St. Boniface, and then received from his brother Willibald the charge of the double monastery at Heidenheim, to which his sister Walburgis had also been invited from Britain (Canisius, *Lect. Antiq.* ii. pt. iii. 168 Antv. 1725). He died A.D. 761 at the age of 60 and in the 10th year of his abbacy (*Vita S. Wunibaldi*, written evidently by the same hand as the *Vita S. Willibaldi*, is in Surius *Vit. SS.* xii. 293; Mabillon, *AA. SS. O. S. B.* III. ii. 160, 173; Canisius, *Lect. Antiq.* ii. pt. i. 123. See also *Vita S. Willibaldi*, and notes in Boll. *AA. SS.* Jul. ii. 485 sq.; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 186-7; *Vita S. Walpurgis* in Canisius, *Lect. Antiq.* ii. pt. iii. 267 sq.). [J. G.]

X

XANTHIPPIUS, bishop of Tagora, addressed by St. Augustine (Ep. 65, cf. Ant. *Itin.* 41, 6; Bruns. *Conc.* i. 180, 186). [H. W. P.]

XENAIAS, bishop. [PHILOXENUS.]

XYSTUS (SIXTUS), bishop of Rome after Stephanus for about one year, martyred under

Valerian on August 6, A.D. 258. This date is well ascertained, since a contemporary letter of St. Cyprian (*Ep.* 80) confirms the assertion of the Liberian Catalogue. But with respect to the duration of his episcopate, the old catalogues are erroneous and conflicting, as in cases of other bishops of the same period. The Liberian gives him two years, eleven months, and six days; a duration inconsistent with the course of events, as known from the Cyprianic correspondence. But by rejecting the years as an interpolation, and retaining the months and days, we arrive at a probable conclusion, according to which his accession would be on August 31, 257. (See Lipsius, *Chronol. der Röm. Bischöfe.*)

His predecessor Stephanus had been at issue with Cyprian of Carthage on the question of the rebaptism of heretics, and had apparently broken off communion with the African as well as Asiatic churches for their resolute refusal to adopt the Roman usage of receiving those who had been baptized in heresy by imposition of hands only. [CYPRIANUS; STEPHANUS.] Under Xystus, who was of a more conciliatory disposition, though he upheld and continued the Roman usage, peace was restored. This appears from Pontius, the biographer of Cyprian, speaking of Xystus (intending doubtless a hit at Stephanus) as "bonus et pacificus sacerdos"; and from the letters of Dionysius of Alexandria, of which fragments are preserved by Eusebius. The latter writes to Xystus that he had sent to Stephanus, on his refusal to communicate with the Asiatics and Africans, "entreating him," and addresses his new correspondent in a way that shows that, though he knew him to hold the same views with his predecessor, he could reckon on his tolerance and sympathy (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 5-7).

Nothing remains to be told of this pacific pope except the circumstances of his martyrdom, which appear to have been as follows. The emperor Valerian, though at first tolerant towards the Christians, had already, before the accession of Xystus, forbidden their resort to the cemeteries, and visited them with banishment. Under the edict to this effect, Dionysius of Alexandria had been banished to Cephro, and Cyprian to Curubis. But in the middle of the year 258, when Valerian was arming for his Persian war, he sent a rescript to the Senate of much severer import; ordering bishops, priests, and deacons to be summarily executed; senators and other persons of rank to be visited with loss of dignity and goods, and, on their refusal to renounce Christianity, with death; matrons to be despoiled and exiled; and imperial officials (*Caesariani*) to be sent in chains to labour on the imperial domains (Cyprian, *Ep.* 80). Xystus fell an early victim to this rescript. He was found by the soldiers sent to seek him seated on his episcopal chair, in the cemetery of Praetextatus on the Appian Way, surrounded by members of his flock. As these endeavoured to protect him, he thrust himself forward lest they should suffer in his stead, and was thus beheaded. Several of his companions were also slain. His body was afterwards removed by the Christians to the usual place of burial of the bishops of that period, the neighbouring cemetery of Callistus, and there interred. His two deacons, Agapetus and Felicissimus, with others, were buried in the cemetery where they fell. This

account of the occurrence is gathered from Cyprian's contemporary letter to Successus (*Ep.* 80): "Xistum autem in coemeterio animadversum sciatis, et cum eodem Quartum," *al.* "cum eo diacones quatuor;" and from the Damascine inscription in the papal crypt of the cemetery of Callistus, of which a few fragments have been found there by De Rossi, and which was originally as follows:

"Tempore quo gladius secuit pia viscera matris
Hic positus rector coelestia dona docebam.
Adveniunt subito rapiant qui forte sedentem.
Militibus missis populi nunc colla dedere:
Mox sibi cognovit senior quis tollere vellet
Palmam, seque suumque caput prior obtulit ipse,
Impatiens feritas posset ne laedere quemquam,
Ostendit Christus, reddit qui praemia vitae,
Pastoris meritum, numerum gregis ipse tuetur."
—(Gruter, 1173, 13.)

That these verses refer to Xystus, and not, as assumed in the Acts of St. Stephen, to his predecessor, is satisfactorily shown by Lipsius (*Chronol. der Röm. Bischöfe*). That he was buried there is expressly stated in the Liberian Catalogue of Martyrs, as well as all later authorities; and the statement is confirmed by numerous *graffiti* on the walls of the crypt in question, in which the name of Xystus is prominent. The line, "Hic positus," &c., may be taken to refer to the *cathedra* on which he had sat when found by the soldiers, which had been removed with his body to the papal crypt. For that the cemetery of Praetextatus was the real scene of his martyrdom is concluded from the ancient tradition to that effect, in accordance with which an oratory was afterwards built on the spot, "coemeterium ubi decollatus est Xystus"; and confirmed by representations of him and his chair in this cemetery, under one of which is the legend SVSTVS. One of these pictures represents him seated in his chair, a book in his hand, and a deacon standing by him. The tradition that his two deacons, Agapetus and Felicissimus, were buried there after martyrdom is supported by an inscription round the edge of one of the graves, "... mi refrigeri Januarius Agapetus Felicissimus" (Northcote, *Roma Sotteranea*, p. 79). The Roman Martyrology (Aug. 6) mentions four sub-deacons, Januarius, Magnus, Innocentius, and Stephanus, as also beheaded with their bishop and buried in this cemetery, while it rightly assigns that of Callistus as the resting-place of the bishop himself.

The circumstances of the martyrdom of Xystus are differently given in later accounts. St. Ambrose (*De Offic. Ministr.* i. 41) speaks of his having been led to his place of execution after a formal judgment, and gives a dialogue between him and his deacon Laurentius, in which the latter desires to die with his bishop, who consoles him by promising that he will follow him in three days with greater glory than his own. De Rossi reconciles this account with the conclusion, otherwise arrived at, as shown above, that he was beheaded in the cemetery itself, by supposing him to have been led thence to judgment, and brought back for execution. Lipsius rejects St. Ambrose's story as inconsistent with the inference from the Damascine inscription that he was beheaded at once on the spot without trial, and puts it down to the rhetorical colour-

ing evident in the whole style of the passage. Possibly, if the exact facts were more fully known, the accounts would not be irreconcilable. It is to be observed that the inscription does not state absolutely that he was executed immediately, though it conveys the impression of its having been so. Other accounts, later than that of Ambrose, say that he was thrown into prison, heard before "Decius and Valerian," and then beheaded on the hill on which the temple of Mars stood (Boll. *Acta Sanct.* Aug. ii. 140 sq.). Prudentius, in his hymn on St. Laurentius, refers to him as crucified:

"Jam Xystus adfixus cruci
Laurentium flentem videns
Crucis sub ipso stipte."

Lipsius traces conjecturally this evident error to a misunderstanding of the lines in one of the Damascine inscriptions:

"Hic crucis invictae comites pariterque ministri
Pastoris sancti meritumque fidemque secuti."

Two spurious decretals are attributed to this pope; one to a bishop Gratus, the other to the Spanish churches, the main subject being the mode of procedure against accused clergy. There are two others given by Gratian.

[J. B.—Y.]

XYSTUS (SIXTUS or SEXTUS), GNOMES or SENTENCES OF, a collection of proverbs and precepts, moral and religious, extant in Latin and Syriac versions, of which the Greek original survives only in fragments.

I. The LATIN VERSION is the work of Rufinus, who, as he tells us in the Prologue prefixed to it, made it for the use of his "religiosa filia Aproniana," sister of the person (no doubt his friend Apronianus) to whom the Prologue is addressed, entitling it *Annulus* (the Ring), as being intended for an *Ancheiridion*, never to leave the hand of its possessor. He introduces it as the work of one Sextus [*al.* Sixtus], who, he says, was identified by tradition with Xystus [*al.* Sixtus] of Rome, bishop and martyr. Against this ascription of the authorship, Jerome protested with even more than his usual virulence; and though he twice (*Adv. Jovinian.* i. 49; *Comm. in Ezech.* vi. 18) quotes with approval a saying (231) from the *Sententiae* of Xystus [*al.* Sextus], in the latter place he affirms that the author was not the Roman martyr-bishop, but a Gentile philosopher, of the Pythagorean school. In two other passages (*Ep.* 233, *Ad Ctesiph.*; and *Comm. in Hierem.* iv. 22—his last work) he makes the same assertion, accompanying it with scurrilous abuse of Rufinus; and in both passages—especially the former, which was written against Pelagianism—he censures the teaching of the work concerning man's relation to God, and his perfectibility, as heresy borrowed from a heathen and foisted on Christian readers under the venerated name of a Christian martyr. Augustine, who in the treatise *De Nat. et Grat.* (64) had quoted three of the *Sentences* (36, 46, 60), on the authority of Pelagius, as sayings of "Sixtus [*al.* Xystus], bishop of Rome and martyr," and upheld their orthodoxy, subsequently altered his opinion because (*Retract.* ii. 42) he had afterwards read

that the book was composed by "Sextus, a philosopher, not by the Christian Xystus,"—Jerome, no doubt, being his authority. So likewise the condemnation pronounced against it in the *Decree* which bears the name of Gelasius (vii. 24)—"The Book of Proverbs composed by heretics and entitled (*praenotatus*) by the name of Saint Xystus is apocryphal." This is but an echo of the passage just referred to in Jerome's *Ep. ad Ctesiph.*: "Librum Sexti Pythagorei . . . nomine Xysti martyris praenotavit . . . unde et vos plurima contra ecclesiam usurpatis testimonia"—a statement which, it is to be observed, the author of the *Decree* perverts when he stigmatizes it as the composition of heretics.^a The work, however, though discredited by censures so weighty and authoritative, has had sufficient vitality to survive in the form in which Rufinus made it known to Latin readers. An examination of its contents will satisfy the reader that it deserved to live, and that it is neither heathen nor heretical, but a body of ethical and theological truths, effectively conveyed in terse sentences, bearing traces unquestionable though not conspicuous of a Christian hand. And accordingly we are not surprised to find that its intrinsic merits enabled it to retain its hold on the mind of the Church, notwithstanding the Gelasian condemnation. Thus in the very numerous MSS. in which it is preserved, ranging in date from the sixth to the fifteenth century, it is almost invariably described as the work "Sixti episcopi" or "Sixti papae."^b And it is cited in the sixth and seventh centuries as almost on a level with the Scriptures, in the Rule of St. Benedict (cvii. p. 199) and the anonymous *Rule* known as *Regula Magistri* (c. ix.). Later on, the use made of it likewise by the Pseudo-Isidore in the ninth century, who adopts many of its sentences in his forged *Decretal Epistles*, is a farther proof of the regard in which it was held. Indeed, Jerome himself, as above shown, admits its merit in two passages (the first of which, it is to be noted, was written before Rufinus had published his version)—denying only that it is the production of a Christian divine. But the argument by which he supports his judgment of its non-Christian character,—the absence of all mention of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and of the Apostles and Prophets,—is neither candid nor conclusive; and his failure to observe the Christian ideas and expressions which pervade it, if not wilful, convicts him of carelessness in examining the book, or of defect in critical judgment. In its very terminology there occur words not a few,—"the elect," "the faithful," "the word of God," "the world" (meaning not *the universe*, but the things of this present life),

^a Isidore of Seville (*De Viris Ill.* l.) maintains that the work is not of heretical origin, but written by Xystus of Rome, and interpolated by heretics. But his opinion is of no weight, as he professedly rests it on the authority of the statement, afterwards retracted, of Augustine, *De Nat. et Gr.*

^b A MS. in the British Museum of the thirteenth century seems to be the only one which describes the author as "Sextus Pythagoricus." Even in MSS. which (as that of St. John's Coll., Cambridge) prefix the condemnatory extract from Jerome (*in Ezech.*), the titles and colophons entitle him "pope" or "martyr."

"the angel" (God's minister to men),^e "to be saved"—which pertain to the peculiar vocabulary of Christianity. Of the Gnomes (about 450 in all), the majority indeed belong to the common field of the higher theism and ethics, but in many the spirit and even the language of the Gospel is unmistakable. It is impossible to attribute to a heathen compiler a collection which opens with, "Fidelis homo electus homo est" (1); "Electus homo homo Dei est" (2); and follows up this beginning by such sentences as "Dubius in fide infidelis" (6); "Omne membrum corporis quod suadet te contra pudicitiam agere, abiciendum; melius est enim sine uno membro vivere quam cum eo puniri" (13, and to like effect 273); "Immortales tibi crede manere in iudicio et honores et pœnas" (14); "Quae saeculi sunt saeculo et quae Dei sunt Deo" (20), "Utere teipso velut templo Dei propter illud quod in te simile Dei" (35); "Male viventes cum e corpore excesserunt cruciabit malus daemon usque quo exigit ab eis etiam novissimum quadrantem" (39); "Vir castus et sine peccato potestatem accipiet a Deo esse filius Dei" (60); "Non cibi qui per os inferuntur polluunt hominem, sed ea quae ex malis actibus proferuntur" (110); "Verbositas non effugiet peccatum" (155); "Difficile est divitem salvare" (193); "Scito te adulterum esse etiam si cogitasti de adulterio" (233); "Fidelem te professus spondesti pariter non peccare Deo" [surely a reference to the baptismal vow] (234); "Quae gratis accipis a Deo, praesta gratis" (242); "Ministrare aliis melius est quam ministrari ab aliis" (336); "Vestimentum putato esse animae corpus tuum, mundum igitur id serva" (346, and so 449). Yet the authority of Jerome has prevailed over this internal evidence so long and widely, that (contrary to the practice of the MSS., as stated above) most of the printed editions of the work, from the earliest (1502) down to a very recent date, have designated the author as a Pythagorean philosopher; and though included in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of De la Bigne of 1575, and that of 1589, and in all the more extensive patristic series of the following century, it has not been admitted into the recent *Patrologia* of Migne.^d The scholars who accepted Jerome's judgment concerning its authorship no doubt supposed that the Christian thoughts and phrases, which they cannot have failed to observe in it, were due to the translator, adding or altering in order to give colour to the ascription of it to a Christian writer. The character of the collection—which consists of sentences not indeed absolutely unconnected, but though gathered according to their topics into groups, more or less definite, yet arranged according to no regular and consistent plan—readily lends itself to the interpolator or adapter; and it is probable, as will be shown, that Rufinus did something towards giving his version a more definitely Christian complexion than the original wore. But we can adduce direct proofs that the book contained a distinct Christian element

^e It is to be noted, however, that Porphyry speaks of angels as spectators of men's conduct (*Ep. ad Marc.* 21).

^d Yet Migne has given the *Encheiridion* ascribed to Nilus (*Patrol. Gr.* t. lxxix. p. 1279), which is merely that of Epictetus with a few Christian modifications.

before it came into his hands; and farther, that Jerome was unjust in representing him as having originated the account which made it the production of Xystus, bishop of Rome.

II. Of these proofs, one which of itself would be sufficient, is found in the existence of the independent SYRIAC VERSION, or rather versions. This fact was first made known by Assemani, who in his *Biblioth. Orient.* described a version (t. i. p. 429) which he found in a MS. now in the Vatican, and also called attention (t. iii. p. 48) to the mention of it in the *Catalogue* of Ebedjesus. This Syriac Xystus has since proved to be contained in some Nitrian MSS. now in the British Museum, and has been made accessible by Dr. de Lagarde's edition of it, founded on a collation of seven of these MSS., contained in his *Analecta Syriaca* of 1858 (pp. 2-31). It is in the form of a book in three parts, of which the *third* is a short and supplementary compilation of sentences, of little interest; the *second* is a translation meant to be complete, and evidently only imperfect through the casual mutilation of an early copy, of a collection substantially the same as that which Rufinus has made known to us; while the *first* is a quite distinct version of a selection of 131 of the sentences as we have them in their completer form, ranging from 6 to 433 of the version of Rufinus, and preserving the same order as in it. This first part is suitably

headed "*Select Sayings* (قلا قاصدا) of

Mar Xystus, bishop of Rome," while the other two are simply introduced as "The Second" and "The Third" "of Mar Xystus." Of these two versions it is probable that the one which stands as *First Part* (Syr. I.) is the earlier. It is on the whole rather more accurate than the *Second* (Syr. II.), less paraphrastic, and freer from the additions with which Syr. II. abounds. It may perhaps be regarded as a translation of a Greek compendium of extracts from the original work, for (as will be shown presently) there is evidence of the existence of such a compendium; but there exists also (in a MS. as early as the sixth century) a Latin compendium of the version of Rufinus, which fact suggests by analogy the supposition that Syr. I. may be a selection taken from a lost Syriac version of the entire collection. Or again, it may be a *florilegium* formed by a Syrian at once selecting and translating from the Greek. It is observable that some MSS. exhibit one or other of these two versions as a separate book; as (*e.g.*) Syr. I. stands alone in Add. 18817 (ninth century), and Syr. II. in 12160 (eighth century). Both versions are as independent of that of Rufinus as they of one another. Their variations from it are frequent; and in passages where the Greek has been preserved or can be conjecturally restored, it usually proves that the Latin is more accurate as well as closer to the original. Yet instances to the contrary are occasionally to be met with; and it is interesting to note that in both Syriac versions a few sentences are preserved which Rufinus does not give, though they survive elsewhere in Greek. It is farther to be observed that the Christian element of the work appears even more pronounced in its Syriac than in its Latin form. In both Syriac versions numerous

instances occur of sentences to which a scriptural turn is given where none such appears in the Latin; and what is more significant, of the nineteen sentences above cited from the Latin as examples of its Christian character, all but two (39 and 60) are found, some literally, some in an altered shape, in one or other Syriac version; five of them (6, 20, 155, 273, 336) in both. Hence it follows of course that the Christian element was present in the common original of these three versions; and moreover it appears that Rufinus did not indulge in the same licence of Christian colouring in his treatment of his author as the Syrian translators did. At the same time there are points at which a comparison of his rendering with theirs proves that he as well as they occasionally did the work of translation with a Christian bias. When we find "the faithful" in the Latin represented in the Syriac (Syr. II.) by "the wise," as in 247, or *vice versa*, as in 436, we may safely infer that the original had δ σοφός; as in point of fact we know to be the case in 49, of which the Greek is preserved by Porphyry (*Ad Marc.* 11), $\Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \delta\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota \sigma\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma, \sigma\omicron\phi\omicron\varsigma \delta\epsilon \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\upsilon \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon,$ where for σοφός the Latin has *fidelis*, and the Syriac (Syr. I.)

ܫܘܫܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ("he who has faith in Him"). So again in 402, for ἀπερὴ Rufinus gives *fides*, as does also Syr. II., while in Syr. I. we find ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ("knowledge of truth").

The date of the Syriac versions is unknown, but they are probably older than the Latin. Of the existing MSS. which contain them in whole or part (more than twelve, not reckoning MSS. of extracts), three at least are of the sixth century. All appear to be derived from a common archetype, for all show (among minor variations) a close agreement of text, so far as they coincide in extent, even in passages that are clearly corrupt. Moreover they all differ from the Latin in the same extensive omission (ss. 44-77) in the earlier part of Book II., and in the transposition of a nearly equal quantity of matter (ss. 357, 359, 364-412) to a later part of that book; an imperfection which no doubt is to be explained by the loss of a leaf, and the consequent displacement of the conjugate leaf, of the archetype, which was therefore probably already an old MS. when the first copy was made. Further, it appears that the text of this ancient archetype had been arranged by some editor who, having fallen in with the two versions (Syr. I. and Syr. II.) already described, each bearing the name of Xystus,—and failing to perceive that though differing in wording they were in fact but two translations, one partial, the other complete, of the same original,—joined them together as First and Second Books of the *Sayings of Xystus*, completing his compilation by attaching to each a short appendix of such similar sentences as he could collect elsewhere, and subjoining a Third Book composed of like material.* It is clear that to

* As examples of the Christianizing amplifications of the Syriac versions, see s. 3, where Syr. I. (p. 2. 7) introduces the language of 1 Cor. ii. 15; and s. 271, where Syr. II. (20. 10) borrows from Gal. vi. 8. Sometimes, however, the Syriac additions are confirmed *aliunde*; as e.g. where Syr. I. (5. 15) prefaces to 270, "Count it great wisdom that a man should subdue his body," which

give time for all these processes of translating, editing, and copying, it is hardly possible to assign to either of these versions a date later than 400. It follows therefore that these Syriac versions confirm the opinion that the "*Gnomes of Xystus*" was originally a Christian work; and their evidence is not merely of weight because of its antiquity, but moreover, as being certainly independent of that yielded by the Latin version, corroborates the latter, and is in turn corroborated by it. They prove moreover that the tradition which ascribes the *Gnomes* to a bishop of Rome prevailed in the East at an early date, and was not invented by Rufinus; who indeed records it, but expresses no opinion one way or the other concerning its truth.

III. The GREEK ORIGINAL must have been known to Jerome, for in the sentence which (as above mentioned) he twice quotes, he does not follow the rendering of Rufinus. Many sentences of it are to be found scattered through the early collections of Demophanes, Stobaeus, and others, as well as in later *Florilegia* which are certainly Christian, such as the *Eclogae* of Maximus the Confessor (seventh century), and the compilations of Georgides and Antonius Melissa (eleventh or twelfth century). Most of these sentences reappear in the Latin; a few in the Syriac only: but some, noted by the Greek collectors as "of Sextus," appear to have escaped the translators. Much larger portions of it are embodied in an anonymous *Florilegium* of uncertain date, entitled *Γνώμαι Σοφῶν* (published by Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, t. i. pp. 127-134), consisting of 93 sentences, of which no less than 59 are to be met with either in the Latin or the Syriac, 42 of them within the first 49, standing for the most part (often continuously) in the same order as that of Rufinus. About the same number appear also, with like order and continuity, in Porphyry's *Epistle to Marcella* (written circa 350), not as quotations, but interwoven into its substance. But the earliest known citations by name of the "*Gnomes of Sextus*," and in every respect the most important, occur a century before Porphyry, in the writings of Origen. These are so instructive that it is worth while to give them at length.

1. The first is found in his treatise *Against Celsus*, viii. 30 (p. 763); where, in refuting his adversary's assertion that Christians were forbidden to use flesh as food, he cites the authority

sentence we find in Porphyry, *Ad Marc.* 34, $\text{Μεγάλη παιδεία ἀρχεῖν τοῦ σώματος}$ (cp. Syr. II. 20. 16). In 177 Rufinus is unintelligible, but Syr. II. (17. 6) correctly renders the Greek, which is extant here also. Similar instances are Syr. I. 4. 6 and 7; Syr. II. 16. 17. In 178 Syr. I. (4. 15), with Rufinus, rightly renders ὑποπόδιον; against Syr. II. (17. 6), which may represent a reading ὑποπόδι. So in 286 it may be that where Syr. II. (21. 6) gives "for beauty of *body*" where Rufinus has "proprio *ore*," the translator follows a misreading σώματι for στόματι. But the rendering (Syr. II. 13. 12) of κρηπίς by "shoe," instead of "foundation" (86), is a mere blunder, and is a strange one, inasmuch as Syr. II. (26. 21) correctly translates the same word in 371. In at least one case (123) Syr. II. (14. 27) enables us to correct the Latin, *lex for lux*. A serious interpolation in the Latin (230), and a slight one shortly after (231), find no countenance from either Syriac. But in 61 and 62, where the only grave misrendering made by Rufinus occurs (*chorus* for *χάρμη*), both Syriac versions are wanting.

of our Lord (Matt. xv. 11, 17, 19), of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 28), and of St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 15, 21; 1 Cor. viii. 13), and then proceeds, "And when I am on this topic, it is not without cogency (*ἀπιθανόν*) that I should make mention of a very admirable sentence which also most Christians meet with, as it stands in the *Sentences* of Sextus (*ἡ καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀναγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς Σέξτου γνώμας ἐντυγχάνουσιν*), as follows: 'Εμψύχων χρῆσις μὲν ἀδιάφορον, ἀποχὴ δὲ λογικώτερον.'" This is s. 109 in Rufinus, "Animantium omnium usus quidem in cibis indifferens, abstinere vero rationabilis est." He then goes on to contrast the rule laid down for Christians on this subject in Acts xv., its limitations and its grounds, with the absolute prohibition against eating flesh which Pythagoras founded on the doctrine of the transmigration of human souls into the bodies of lower animals. Some scholars have understood Origen to refer here to Sextus as a heathen authority, and Heumann (*ap. Harles' ed. of Fabricius' Biblioth. Gr. t. i. lib. ii. c. 13, p. 870*) even asserts that he describes him as a Pythagorean. But this is not so; on the contrary, it is plain that Origen is contrasting the teaching of Sextus, who held that to eat flesh was ἀδιάφορον, with the Pythagorean doctrine, according to which it was an abomination tantamount to cannibalism. And it seems that the general drift of the passage is pretty nearly as follows: "I have adduced passages from the New Testament to show what are the Christian rules and principles touching the use of animal food; I have to add, as bearing on the same point, that a work also in the hands of most Christians pronounces that use to be a thing indifferent." If this be a fair representation of his meaning, it is not easy to avoid the conclusion that a book quoted thus to yield evidence on a matter of Christian teaching and usage—a book which "most Christians" (*οἱ πολλοί*, not merely *many*) knew familiarly—must have been a Christian work.

2. The second passage where Origen refers to Sextus is in his *Commentary on Matthew*, t. xv. 4, p. 654, where on the text Matt. xix. 12 he cites two of our *Sentences* as bearing on the interpretation of the saying, "There be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." He holds it needful (he says) to discuss the subject, because he has met with (*ἐντετύχομεν*) some teachers who have wrought on ardent souls, stronger in faith than in reason, to act on a literal construction of that saying, and he thus proceeds, "Sextus in his *Gnomes*, a book current among many as approved (*δοκίμω*), says, Πᾶν μέρος τὸ ἀναπεῖθόν σε μὴ σωφρονεῖν, ῥίψον ἡμῖνον γὰρ χωρὶς τοῦ μέρους ζῆν σωφρόνως, ἢ μετὰ τοῦ μέρους ὀλεθρίως [= Rufinus 13 (as above cited), 'Omne membrum corporis quod suadet te contra pudicitiam agere, abiciendum; melius est enim sine uno membro vivere quam cum eo puniri']. Then again, farther on in the same book, he gives a suggestion to the like effect when he says, Ἀνθρώπους ἴδους ἐν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ σώματος ἔχειν ἐρρωμένον ἀποκόπτοντας αὐτῶν καὶ ῥίπτοντας μέρη· πῶσω βέλτιον ὑπὲρ τοῦ σωφρονεῖν; [= Rufinus 273, 'Solent homines abscidere aliqua membrorum suorum pro sanitate reliquorum· quanto id praestantius pro

pudicitia fiet?']" He here distinctly classes Sextus as a writer held in repute among many Christians, as one of the teachers by whom enthusiastic spirits were in danger of being misled in this matter; a fact which surely leads, as before, to the conclusion that he knew him as a Christian writer. And Origen's citation of these two sentences, which carry on their face evidence of their Christian origin and of their author's knowledge of St. Matthew's Gospel, proves them to be no interpolation of Rufinus, but to belong to the Greek original which Rufinus had before him, and whence he translated them with substantial fidelity.⁴

Assuming then that the work which is known to us in the Latin and Syriac versions is substantially identical with that which Origen knew as familiarly current among Christians in his time, and that he regarded it as a Christian work, we may accept it on his authority as the production of a Christian author prior in date to him,—Sextus, Sixtus, or Xystus. Nor does this conclusion rest on Origen's opinion merely; but on the proof which lies in the fact that of the three sentences preserved by him, two bear such close affinity to the singular passage of the New Testament on which he quotes them as to exclude the possibility of heathen authorship. The work was therefore composed, or at least put into its present shape, before Origen's time, and is thus determined as belonging to the second century; and there is no direct evidence to prove that it ever existed in an earlier shape, in which the Christian sentences such as Origen found in it were not present. It is true indeed that, except the two sentences referred to, none of the fragments preserved in Greek has a distinctively Christian character; but it does not follow hence that the original Greek collection contained no sentences of such character. It is easy to understand that a thought or precept borrowed by Xystus from the Scriptures would be unlikely to attract the choice of a compiler of extracts, inasmuch as such thought or precept would already be familiar to his readers in the superior authority and force of its original form. It must however be admitted that the *Gnomes* as a whole savour more of Greek philosophy, and its exclusiveness, than of the world-wide Gospel.⁵ But there is nothing improbable in the theory that we have here the work of a Christian writer of the early period specified, deeply imbued by early training in the tenets of that philosophy, possibly a recent convert to the faith of Christ, who has made for Christian use a collection of the best results of Gentile wisdom, modified more or less by an infusion of the spirit of the Gospel, and interspersed here and there with sentences founded on the Christian Scriptures. Such a combination of ethnic and evangelic teaching might naturally be suggested by the example of St. Paul, in his references to the moral and theistic principles

⁴ Both these sentences are found in Syr. II. (11. 10; 20, 13), the latter also in Syr. I. (5. 18). It is interesting to observe how both Syriac translators modify its concluding words: Syr. I. so as to avoid, Syr. II. so as to give warning against, the dangerous suggestion it implies.

⁵ The translators showed themselves conscious of this when they replaced ὁ σοφὸς by "the faithful." The character of the work is well brought out by the summary of its topics in Gilden-eister's edition.

set forth by Aristotle, Menander, and Aratus (Rom. i. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 33; Acts xvii. 28). The idea of it certainly did not seem incongruous to the compilers of the later *florilegia*; as for example to Maximus, in whose *Eclogae* Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Demosthenes, Isocrates, and many others, appear intermixed with Solomon, Isaiah and the Son of Sirach, St. Matthew and St. Luke, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom. This practice (it is to be remarked in passing) renders it impossible to draw any inference, one way or the other, from the fact that sentences "of Sextus" are included (as has been above stated) in the collections of Maximus and other Christian compilers. In the *Parallels*, however, attributed to John Damascene (A. 24, p. 362), we find a sentence of Sextus placed among excerpts from Scripture and Christian writers so as to make it clear that the compiler regarded him as a Christian; as indeed he shows by entitling it Ζέξτρον Ποῦ. [sic].

On the other hand, however, we have to account for the facts (already mentioned) that some of our *Gnomes* are found in the collections of Demophanes and of Stobaeus (though with no author's name attached), which are Gentile works, neither being of certain date, but the former at least admittedly pre-Christian; and also that they are largely and continuously incorporated not only in the *Γνώμαι Σοφῶν*, probably a heathen, even a pre-Christian production, but in the *Epistle* of Porphyry, an author especially unlikely to borrow from a Christian source. It may be, however, that Porphyry having fallen in with the work was attracted by its Pythagorean character and philosophic value, and used it for the sake of its contents, most of which would, irrespectively of their origin, commend themselves to a theistic moralist such as he was. We may even conjecture that it was through Origen, whose pupil he had been in his youth, that he first became acquainted with it and learned its merits. Or, again, it may be that the "*Gnomes* of Sextus" known to Origen had for its basis an earlier, non-Christian, probably pre-Christian manual of *Gnomes*, chiefly Pythagorean, and that from this manual, not from Sextus, Porphyry borrowed.^b This latter solution has the advantage of accounting likewise for the knowledge of our *Gnomes* which the early non-Christian compilers above mentioned appear to have possessed. In its favour we can adduce the parallel case of the adaptations to Christian use of the *Encheiridion* of Epictetus, one by a Paraphrast of (probably) the fifth century, another by a writer who passed his production as a work of Nilus.¹

^b Against this supposition is the fact that Porphyry seems (*Ep. ad M.*, 34) to cite s. 273 which is founded on Matt. xix. 12 (see above). But the citation is doubtful. The language differs totally from that of Sextus (*ap. Oriz.*), and the lesson suggested by Sextus (self-mutilation) is very different from Porphyry's, which is clearly suicide. The context and order also do not favour the opinion that the sentence is from Sextus.

¹ The former was first printed by Méric Casaubon (1659). The latter is usually appended to the works of Nilus. Most of the alterations made by the Paraphrast consist in substituting θεός for θεοί, ἀδελφός ἢ φίλος for παῖδιον ἢ γυνή, and so forth. But we also find "the

There are thus two admissible theories of the formation of the collection known as the *Gnomes* of Sextus: that it is (a) the production of a Christian philosopher, freely working up heathen material with a leaven of the Gospel, for Christian use; or (b) an anthology, originally heathen, of philosophic sayings, worked over and interpolated at an early date by a Christian redactor. And these two theories really run into one, or at least approximate so closely as to be practically undistinguishable one from the other. If however we are to choose between them, the weight of argument seems to be distinctly in favour of the hypothesis that the book was originally Christian. The Christian element in it, though unquestionably present, is nowhere obtruded, and is to all appearance woven into the original texture, rather than wrought upon it or inserted in it in a process of rehandling such as the Syriac versions plainly betray. The method, however, pursued in the work seems to be not so much to impart a Christian tone to the maxims of Gentile wisdom embodied in it, as rather to intermix with them a selection of Christian maxims moulded into form and expression similar to theirs.

Whether Sextus (Sixtus or Xystus) is to be regarded as the name of the Christian author or redactor who gave the work its existing shape, or of the heathen philosopher who may be supposed to have supplied him with its basis, is a question hard to answer, but of little moment. In favour of the former opinion is the fact that the Christian anthologists quote it under the name of Sextus, whereas Porphyry and the heathen compilers use it without naming the author. The ascription of it to "Sextus a Pythagorean philosopher" originated apparently with Jerome (who no doubt took it from the entry in the *Chronicon* of Eusebius: see below), and, so far as it has prevailed, owes its acceptance to his authority. But while we may prefer to adopt the view which regards the *Gnomes* as the work of a second-century Christian named Sextus or Xystus (= Sixtus), it by no means follows that we are to accept the tradition mentioned by Rufinus, confirmed though it is by Syriac evidence, that he was Sixtus (either I. or II.), Bishop of Rome. The words of Rufinus, who speaks of "Xystus bishop and martyr," seem to point to Sixtus II., who certainly was a martyr; whereas there is no sufficient early evidence to show that Sixtus I. was entitled, and no reason to think that Rufinus believed him to be entitled, to that designation (see articles SIXTUS (2) I., XYSTUS II.). But our author could not be Sixtus II.; for that prelate was contemporary with and outlived Origen, who as we have seen quotes our *Gnomes* as already current and commonly read among Christians in his day; not to mention that the work is also apparently quoted (though not by name) still earlier by Clement of Alexandria. The theory which assigns them

Apostles and martyrs," or "Paul," cited as examples in place of "Socrates," and "the Scriptures" instead of "the writings of Chrysippus;" and towards the end many chapters are boldly rewritten, and scriptural language is freely introduced. Though Christ is not named, we find "the Saviour and his Spirit" in the last section; and the closing quotation from the *Apology of Socrates* is blended with Matt. x. 28.

to Sixtus I, is a possible one, and has found advocates; yet it is hard to believe that if this be true, Origen should not have known it, or if he knew it should have omitted to designate the Sextus whom he quotes, as bishop of so great a church. Thus it appears that of the two Christian personages to whom the authorship has been attributed, one is out of the question, and the claims of the other, though possible, are not only not proved, but hardly probable. Yet the ninth-century fabricator of the *Decretals* apparently knew our *Gnomes* as the work of Sixtus I, for in his *Epistola I. Sixti I.* (Hinsch's edn., p. 107; cp. Angilr. iii.) he has had the skill to give something of verisimilitude to his forgery by introducing Sentences 6 and 166.

Still less successful are the attempts which have been made to identify the author as a heathen philosopher. It is true we find in Jerome's translation of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, under Ol. 195. 1 (= A.D. 1), the entry "Xystus [*al.* Sixtus] *Pythagoricus philosophus agnoscitur;*" and so in Syncellus, p. 252, *Ξέστος φιλόσοφος Πυθαγορικὸς ἠκμαίεσεν*, which no doubt preserves the name as written by Eusebius, and makes it probable that Jerome altered it with a view to the identification of this person as the Xystus (=Sixtus) of the *Gnomes*. But of this philosopher no other trace survives; and it is idle to conjecture, as Orelli does, that he may have been the author of the heathen work, on which the collection translated by Rufinus was based. Another person has been confidently upheld as the true claimant of the authorship by Gale (*Opuscula Mythol., Eth., Phys.*, 1671), followed by J. A. Fabricius, Mosheim, and many others, —Sextius, a Roman philosopher, extolled and often cited by Seneca, who describes him as combining Stoic with Pythagorean doctrine, and mentioned by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xviii. 28, 274) and Plutarch (*Prof. in Virt.* 5). He is recorded to have declined the offer of Julius Caesar to make him a senator, which fact implies that he was over twenty-five years of age in the year 43 B.C., and over seventy at the date assigned in the *Chronicon* for the prime of "Sextus the Pythagorean philosopher." We infer, therefore, that he is probably not the person described in these words by Eusebius, and apparently regarded by Jerome as the author of our *Gnomes*. All ancient authority is against the theory which attributes them to this Sextius; indeed the fact that it was never heard of until put forward by Gale in 1671 is almost sufficient to condemn it. It is hardly credible that a work, if originally put forward under a name so considerable as that of Sextius, extolled by a writer so widely read as Seneca, not only as a great thinker but as the founder of a school, could be transferred in popular acceptance from its true author to a Roman bishop. Besides, Origen, Rufinus, and Jerome alike name the author Xystus, Sixtus, or Sextus—never Sextius. The account, moreover, which Seneca gives of the philosophy of Sextius, that though conveyed in the Greek language it was Roman in morals, and though professedly Pythagorean partook largely of the Stoic ("Graecis verbis, Romanis moribus," *Ep.* lxxiii. 12; "vir licet neget Stoicus," *Ep.* lxxiv. 2), ill suits the character of our *Gnomes*, which is distinctly Greek of the Pythagorean school modified by the infusion of Chris-

tian certainly not of Stoic) teaching. Again, a saying of Sextius preserved by Seneca, "*Jovem plus non posse quam bonum virum*" (*Ep.* lxxiv. 11), is alien from the pure theism of the *Gnomes*. And finally, the only sentence of the *Gnomes* which has an apparent resemblance to anything recorded of the teaching of Sextius, is really conclusive evidence that he cannot have composed them: it is the first of those cited by Origen (s. 109), which treats of the use of animal food. We learn from Seneca (*Ep.* cviii. 17), on the authority of his master Sotion, who was a pupil of Sextius, that Sextius abstained from animal food, not on the ground laid down by Pythagoras, namely the doctrine of metempsychosis,^k but because it led to cruelty, self-indulgence, and injury to health. Knowing then that he thus trebly condemned the practice, we cannot suppose him to be the author of the Sentence in which it is pronounced to be "indifferent."

The view advanced by Ott (*Sprüche des Philos. Sextius*, 1863), who attempted to prove that the *Gnomes* are the work of the younger Sextius, son (as is supposed) of the elder, and successor as head of the Sextian school, seems to have found no supporter. It is hardly worth while to discuss or even mention this theory, inasmuch as absolutely nothing is known of this Sextius, whose very existence indeed is but a matter of conjectural, though probable, inference.

It is to be noted that Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 27; followed by Jerome, *De Viris Ill.* 50) names a Sextus as one of the Christian writers of the reign of Severus (193–211), and gives the title of his principal work, *On the Resurrection*. And we may here remark that Maximus, whose extracts from the *Gnomes* "of Sextus" have been above mentioned, in his *Scholia* on Dionysius the Areopagite (*De Myst. Theol.* c. v. p. 238), adduces "Sextus the ecclesiastical philosopher" as having expressed an opinion concerning the Being of God to the same effect as that which he quotes from "Gregory the theologian," scil. *ὡς οὐτε ἡ θεότης οὐτε τὸ ἀγέννητον οὐτε ἡ πατρότης οὐσίαν σημαίνει Θεοῦ*. Nothing of this is found in the *Gnomes*; but the designation here applied to Sextus aptly describes a Christian writer trained in Gentile wisdom, such as the balance of probability inclines us to suppose their author to have been. And it may well be that other works of the same writer were known to Maximus. The *Catalogue* of Ebedjesu, classing him as a Greek writer of the fifth century, assigns to him, with the *Gnomes* (ܟܝܨܬܘܨ), a Treatise "*Of those that love God.*"^l An early MS. in the British

^j The Stoic doctrine that all sins are equal is condemned in s. 297; the lawfulness of suicide in 321. Again, the *kósmos* as regarded by the writer of the *Gnomes* (ss. 15, 20, &c.) is as remote as possible from the Stoic conception of the *kósmos*.

^k Zeller (*Philosophie der Griechen*, Period III., s. ii., 7, p. 681, n. 6; 3rd ed.) strangely misunderstands Seneca, when he represents him as stating here that Sotion was the first to assign this reason for prohibiting animal food.

^l Add. 14581 (sixth century) contains in Syriac a Discourse "*On the Perfection of the Path of the Fear of God,*" also assigned to Xystus, but apparently in a later hand (Wright, *Catal.*, p. 65).

Museum (Add. 14612, of sixth or seventh century) preserves extracts in Syriac from an "Instruction" (ܘܢܝܘܨܬܐ) of Mar Xystus, bishop of Rome"; and in another (12155, eighth century) we have portions of an *Epistle* of the same personage.

An "*Anaphora* of Xystus, bishop of Rome," is found in many MSS., was printed in the Maronite Missal at Rome, 1594, and is given by Renaudot (ii. p. 398) in Latin. Assemani, though accepting (iii. 48) Jerome's judgment concerning the *Gnomes* and Rufinus, inconsistently ascribes them (i. 429), with the *Anaphora*, to a fifth-century bishop, whom, against all the evidence, he supposes to have been a Syrian. As regards the *Gnomes*, this view is of course impossible. The *Anaphora* indeed is of the Syrian type; but there is no doubt that the Xystus whose name it bears was (as the MSS. testify) understood by the Syrian Church to be a Roman Pontiff. Thus we find Anaphorae "of Clement of Rome," "of Julius bishop of Rome": the reason being, as explained by a Syrian authority (ap. Assem. i. 430), that those prelates and others were believed to have left "canons and commandments" which were embodied in the many Syriac Anaphorae that bear their names. Accordingly, of all these Anaphorae that of Xystus alone bears the feature, which marks the "General Liturgy" of the Syrian use,—that the *Tersanctus* is said not only by the people *before*, but also by the priest *after*, consecration; which fact corresponds with the Roman record in the *Liber Pontificalis* (sixth century), that Xystus I. "constituit ut inter actionem sacerdos incipiens populum hymnum decantaret *Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth*" (pp. 56, 57, Duchesne's edn. 1886). This is a noteworthy coincidence, remarkably confirming the Syriac tradition which prefixes the name of Xystus to this Anaphora.

The best edition of the *Gnomes* is that of Gillemeister (1873), to which this article is largely indebted. It gives the only critical text of the version of Rufinus, with a Latin translation of the Syriac versions, and a collection of the remains of the original Greek, fuller than is elsewhere to be found. To this edition all the above references relate. In his Prolegomena he declines to commit himself to any definite judgment on the question of authorship, but he gives ample information concerning the work, especially its Latin form, including full particulars of the MSS. employed, fourteen in number, and of the printed editions. Of these latter, the earliest is that of Abstem (1502), now very rare; which was followed in 1507 by that of Champerius, usually accounted the *editio princeps*, and afterwards by several others within the sixteenth century. Among more recent editions the most important (besides those already mentioned) are those of Siber (1725), and of Orelli (in *Opusc. Gr.*, 1819, t. i. p. 244), both of whom assign the work to Sixtus II., the latter however attempting (Praef. p. xiv) to compromise between the claims of heathen and Christian authorship. The latest supporters of the view of Gale, who ascribed it to the elder Sextius, are De Lasteyrie, who has published a French version of the *Gnomes* with notes (1843), and Mullach, in his *Fragmenta*

Philosophorum Graec. (1860). Of the historians of philosophy, Brucker (Period II. pt. 1, bk. i. c. 2, s. 2, §§ 3, 4) follows Gale and Fabricius against Siber on the side of Sextius; Ritter (t. iv. bk. xii. c. 3, p. 172) admits it as possible that he may have been the author of the original work, which he believes to have been recast by a Christian hand into the shape in which it reached Rufinus; Zeller (p. 679) holds it to be certainly a Christian work, but places it late in the second century, and conjectures that the writer meant his work for non-Christians as well as Christians, and therefore assumed the name of Sextus (not Sextius) the Pythagorean. Neander (*Hist.* vol. ii. p. 462, Bohn's transl.) advances a like opinion. (Cp. *Eus. H. E.* v. 27, above cited.) Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, bk. viii. pt. ii. s. 3) is alone in the untenable opinion that in the Syriac, in its three books as given from the MSS. in Lagarde's text, we have the true and original form of the *Gnomes*, the production of "a Greek or Roman philosopher who has in this book become Christian," working on the basis of the Sermon on the Mount and the writings of St. James and St. John, and (in a less degree) of St. Paul; and this philosopher he confidently identifies with Xystus I., Bishop of Rome.

See the article *SEXTUS PYTHAG.* in the *DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY.*

[J. Gw.]

Y

YFFI, son of Osfrid, and grandson of Edwin, king of Northumbria. He was baptized by Paulinus at York, on Easter day A.D. 627 (Beda, *H. E.* ii. 14). On the death of Edwin, in A.D. 633, he was taken to Kent, and thence was sent, for additional safety, to Dagobert, king of France, to be brought up in his court. He died there in his childhood. (*Ib.* ii. xx.) [J. R.]

YNYR GWENT, regulus of South Wales about the close of the 5th century. He married Madryn, daughter of Vortimer, by whom he became head of one of the holy families of Wales. He (or more probably his son Iddon) was patron of St. Tathai, to whom he gave a college at Caerwent. (Prof. Rees, *Welsh SS.* 132, 164, 233 sq.; W. J. Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 301, 580.) [J. G.]

YRIEIX (YRIER, AREDIUS, ARIDIUS, ARIDUS), abbat of the monastery of St. Yreix, near Limoges. The *Vita S. Aridii abbatis*, attributed to St. Gregory of Tours and coinciding with much that he says in the *Historia Francorum*, is probably the work of a monk of St. Yreix, but is fuller of references to miracles than to historical points: it appears to be based on St. Gregory's notes, and thus is valuable as a key to the composition of other medieval lives. Yrieix, whose name is latinised Are dius and Aridius, was born at Limoges, of noble parents