

named Jucundus and Pelagia. At an early age he became an attendant, and at last chancellor at the court of Theodebert king of Austrasia. He there attracted the attention of Nicetius, bishop of Treves, and by him he was trained and raised to the priesthood (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. 29; *Vit. S. Arid.* cc. 1-5). He was Gregory's chief informant as to the facts in his memoir *de sancto Nicetio Treverorum episcopo* (Greg. Tur. *Vitae Patrum*, c. 17), and was an adviser of Guntramnus king of Burgundy (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* viii. 27). On hearing of his father's death he returned to Limoges to console his mother Pelagia, who devoted herself to a conventual life (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. 29, and *Lib. de Glor. Conf.* c. 104), while Yrieix, for the time, retired into solitude. He then returned, built the monastery of Atan, and gave himself up entirely to prayer, study, and active beneficence. His time was occupied for the most part in copying out books, which he distributed among the neighbouring churches and monasteries, and in giving alms to the poor: according to the *Vit. S. Arid.* he also aided them by numerous miracles. He showed a special devotion to St. Martin and his shrine, which he often visited (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* viii. 15; *De Mir. S. Mart.* ii. c. 39. iii. c. 24; *Vit. S. Arid.* c. 19 sq.), and he bequeathed to the monastery at Tours the possession of all his goods, monasteries, lands, &c. (The *Testamentum S. Aredii Abb. Attemensis*, published first by Mabillon, *Anal.* 208, and now by Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 1143 sq., is of singular interest: it is said to have been written in the eleventh year of Sigebert king of Austrasia, i.e. A.D. 572, by St. Yrieix for himself and his mother, and enters most minutely into the different forms of property belonging to the trust). St. Yrieix died A.D. 591, upwards of eighty years of age (*Vit. S. Arid.* c. 33), and was buried in the church of St. Hilary by his own arrangement (*ib.* c. 34): he seems to have outlived Fortunatus, who wrote an ode upon him (Ven. Fortunatus, *Misc.* v. c. 22 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxviii. 202. Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Scrip.* i. 486). His feast is Aug. 25, and he has given his name to St. Yrieix in the province of Vienne Haute. (The primary authority is Gregorius Turonensis, *Hist. Franc.* x. c. 29, based on this is *Vita S. Aridii*, attributed to St. Gregory, and given by Mabillon, *A. SS. O. S. B.* i. 349 sq., by Boll. *A. SS.* Aug. v. 178 sq., and by Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 1119 sq. The Boll. *ib.* 182 sq. give also another Life from Mabillon, *Anal.* iv. 194 sq., based on the same material. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 364-5; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. :24-5; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 595, cc. 85-9.)

[J. G.]

YSTYFFAN, a Welsh saint of the sixth century, son of Mawan, descended from Cadell Deyrnllug, and founder of Llanstyffan in Carmarthenshire and Llanstyffan in Radnorshire. He was bardic friend of St. Teilo, and supposed to be the author of some stanzas, entitled *Englynion Cain Cynwvryre (Achau y Saint, ap. Mye. Arch.* ii. 24, 56; Williams, *Iolo MSS.* 652; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 161, 251). He is probably Ystyffan, bishop of Margam, as represented in Iolo Morgannwg's list. (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 625.) [J. G.]

YVORES, Irish saint. [IBHAR.]

Z

ZACARDAS, duke of Sardinia. In A.D. 594, Gregory the Great wrote to him praising him for making it a condition of peace with the Barbaricines that they should become Christians, and asking him to help the missionaries he was sending there. (*Epp.* iv. 24.) [F. D.]

ZABDAS (ZAMDAS, ZEBEDAEUS, EUTYCHBAZAS), the thirty-seventh bishop of Jerusalem. According to Clinton (*Fast. Rom.* i. 343) he succeeded Hymenaeus in the 14th year of Diocletian, A.D. 298, and after having sat 2 years was followed by Hermon, A.D. 330. Later hagiologists in defiance of chronology and historical likelihood ascribe to Zabdas the conversion of St. Maurice and the Theban legion. He is commemorated as Zamdias in the Roman Martyrology, Feb. 19 (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32; *Chron. Euseb.*; *Chron. Hieron.*; Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, i. 343). [E. V.]

ZACCHAEUS (1) (otherwise ZACHARIAS), the fourth bishop of Jerusalem. The commencement of his episcopate is placed in the 14th year of Trajan, A.D. 112 (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5. Epiphanius *Haer.* lxxvi. 20. *Chron. Armen.* Euseb.) Eutychius (351) assigns seven years to his episcopate. [E. V.]

ZACCHAEUS (2), bishop of Caesarea, is named by the anonymous author of *Prædestinatus* (lib. i. cc. 11, 13; Migne, *Patrol.* liii. 591) as having passed an official condemnation on the Valentinians, and the Ptolemeites (a Valentinian sect). No such bishop of Caesarea however is named by Eusebius or any early writer. The legend that makes the publican of Jericho (Luke xix. 2-10) a bishop, found in the Clementines (*Hom.* ii. 1; *Recog.* iii. 65) seems to point to the same person, but is too late to be trustworthy. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 538.) [E. V.]

ZACCHAEUS (3), martyr in Palestine, on June 7, with Alphaeus in the persecution of Diocletian (Euseb. *Mart. Pal.* c. 1). In the *Menologium Graecorum*, Nov. 18, he is called a deacon of Gadara. The acts of these martyrs are printed by Assemani (279. n. 4). See also Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* [C. H.]

ZACCHAEUS (4), purveyor of the monastery of Tabenna, in 347, when Pachomius died, and mentioned in the life of Theodore the successor of Pachomius (Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. 305; *Vit. Patrum*, lib. i. c. 29). [C. H.]

ZACCHAEUS (5). A treatise styled *Consultationum Zacchaei Christiani et Apollonii Philosophi Libri Tres* is attributed to a monk named EVAGRIUS (14), who lived in the first twenty years of the 5th century. He was devoted to controversy, as he was also the author of the *Altercatio Simonis Julaei et Theophili Christiani*, lately republished by Harnack in his *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, Bd. i. Hft. 3, Leipzig,

1883, which he regards as based upon and reproducing the very words and arguments of the anti-Jewish literature of the 2nd century; and specially of the long lost *Altercatio Jasonis et Papisci* [ARISTO PELLAEUS]. The *Consultations* of Zacchaeus shows the style of argument used by Christian controversialists as against the Pagans of the 4th century. It is divided into three books. The first replies to the Pagan objections of Apollonius, the second expounds the doctrines, and the third the practice of the Christian religion. In these books we find various circumstances which help to fix the date of its composition. Thus the author refutes the various heresies which had arisen prior to his time. He mentions all the leading ones down to the Arians and Novatians, but makes no reference to those of the Pelagians or Nestorians. The pagan retorts on the Christian the adoration paid to the images of the emperors when pressed about the adoration paid to pagan idols. The Christian replies (i. 28) that the custom is a vicious one, and that the priests endeavour to repress it, but points out that the Christians do not adore the images with incense, nor place them on their altars to be worshipped; a point which Ceillier cleverly manages to misrepresent (viii. 428), as if Evagrius sanctioned instead of rejecting the adoration of images. He refers to the institutions of monasticism which were then rapidly extending in Gaul, and laments the threatening aspect of political affairs. There is a great deal of incidental information afforded in these dialogues concerning the internal condition, ritual, and usages of the church about the year 400. The third book treats of the subject of Antichrist and his expected appearance, which the writer regarded as then imminent. The *Consultations* will be found printed in Migne's *Pat. Lat.* t. xx. col. 1061, with D'Achery's learned dissertation prefixed. Ceillier (*l. c.*) gives a full analysis of it. [G. T. S.]

ZACCHAEUS (6), addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. epp. 397, 398). [C. H.]

ZACHARIAS (1), bishop of Pella in Palaestina Secunda. After the visit of St. Sabbas to Constantinople, who had been deputed by Peter, patriarch of Jerusalem, to lay before Justinian the impoverished condition of Palestine in consequence of the ravages of the Samaritans (*Vit. S. Sab.* c. 75), Zacharias was appointed by the emperor joint commissioner with Antonius of Ascalon to visit the ravaged districts, and to report to him on their condition, with liberty to remit the imperial taxes and to cause the sacred buildings destroyed by the Samaritans to be rebuilt at their expense, with assistance out of the imperial treasury (Fleury, *livre* 32, c. 29). He subscribed the condemnation of Anthimus in 536 (Labbe, v. 283). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 699.) [E. V.]

ZACHARIAS (2), surnamed SCHOLASTICUS, bishop of Mitylene, and an ecclesiastical writer of the 6th century. He studied philosophy at Alexandria, and civil law at Beyrout. He then became bishop of Mitylene, the capital of the island of Lesbos. He was present at the council of Constantinople held under Mennas A.D. 536, where Anthimus Severus and the other chiefs of the Acephali were condemned. He published

the following works:—(1) A dialogue called *Ammonius*, wherein he discusses with a disciple of Ammonius, the Alexandrian philosopher, the doctrine of the eternity of the world. (2) A treatise against the Manicheans. (3) He is reckoned among the commentators upon Aristotle (Fabric. *Bib. Graeca*, ed. Harles, t. x. pp. 633-35. For his works see Migne, *P. G.* t. lxxxv. col. 1011). See next article. [G. T. S.]

ZACHARIAS (3), usually styled RHETOR, and described as bishop of Melitene, circ. 540, and author of an Ecclesiastical History in Syriac extending from Constantine to the twentieth year of Justinian, the first part derived from Socrates, the second from Theodoret, and the third relating his own experience. Mai printed a fragment of it in his *Scriptt. Vet. Nov. Coll.* t. x. The entire work has been discovered among the Nitrian MSS. It is described in Wright's *Cat. Syr. MSS.* iii. 1046. It has been printed in twelve books in *Anecdota Syriaca*, t. iii., Leiden, 1870, by Land; who however has shown (*Praef.*, pp. vii., xii.) that this Zacharias is identical with Zacharias of Mitylene, that he wrote in Greek, and that of the twelve books but five (iii.-vii.) are due to him. Wright (*l. c.* p. 1126) mentions two other tracts written by him—viz., A Life of Isai h of Scete, and a narrative of the death of Theodosius, bishop of Jerusalem. See Assem. *B. O.* ii. 54-62. This history is often quoted by Evagrius, *H. E.* [G. T. S.]

ZACHARIAS (4), patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 609-629 (Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* ii. 558), who according to Theophanes, Anastasius, and the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, succeeded Isaac in the seventh year of Phocas, A.D. 609. In the sixth year of his patriarchate, the devastating arms of Chosroes II. of Persia reached the walls of the Holy City, which fell after 18 days' siege, with a loss of 17,000 lives, more than double that number being led away as slaves. The conqueror also became possessed of the most sacred treasure of the Christian world, the wood of the true cross, which he took back with him into Persia as a magical talisman and Zacharias with it to be its keeper and chaplain. Modestus, abbot of the Monastery of St. Theodosius, was appointed vicar of the captive patriarch. After 14 years' captivity, Zacharias was set at liberty, and returning to Jerusalem, A.D. 628, with the hallowed relic, resumed his episcopal duties, which he continued to exercise till his death, which, according to the Greek Menaea, occurred Feb. 21, A.D. 629. Immediately after his arrival as prisoner in Persia, Zacharias addressed a letter to his "shepherdless flock," τῇ ἀποιμάντῳ ποίμνῃ, and to the other churches which had suffered from the inroad of Chosroes, and "the orphan children left in them." Zacharias describes himself as ποιμὴν ταπεινὸς ἔρημος ἀιχμάλωτος Ζαχαρίας ἐλάχιστος. He draws a terrible picture of the moral condition of the remaining population of Jerusalem, whom he charges with luxury, avarice, and godless carelessness of life. He admonishes them that, so far from its being for any good deeds of their own that they were spared, God had rather been gracious to them as reprobates, to give them time for repentance and amendment of life. Let them profit by the warning, hear and fear and not forget God's terrible judgments which they had so unde-

servedly escaped. He goes on to remind them that they and the captives were still one body, and calls on them to stretch out a helping hand according to their ability, and concludes with a moving description of the captives, greyheaded men, widows, infants, all fellow prisoners, fellow slaves, deserving their compassion and their aid. This letter was first published by Combefis as an appendix to Chrysostom, *De educandis liberis* Par. 1655. It is to be found in the *Bibl. Patrum* ed. Lugd. xii. 984, and Migne, *Patrolog.* Ser. Graec. xvi. pars 2, pp. 3227-3234. (*Fabr. Bibl. Graec.* x. 635. *Le Quien, Or. Christ.* iii. 249.)

[E. V.]

ZACHARIAS (5), bishop of Dora in Palestine in cent. viii. There is an epistle extant from Peter Mansur to Zacharias, concerning the Body and Blood of Christ in St. Joan. Damasc. opp. t. i. p. 655, Paris, 1712. (*Le Quien, Or. Christ.* iii. 580.)

[G. T. S.]

ZACHARIAS (6), bishop of Rome, from Nov. 30, A.D. 741 to 14 March, A.D. 752: elected four days only after the death of his predecessor Gregory III. He was a Greek, and the son of one Polychronius (Anastas.). The circumstances of the time (see GREGORIUS III.) precluded any confirmation of the election by the Exarch of Ravenna; nor was this token of Rome's political subjection to the eastern emperors ever afterwards resumed. The old connection between Rome and Constantinople was not, however, so far theoretically broken. For Zacharias, after his accession, sent the customary synodical letters to the Constantinopolitan church, and emissaries to the emperor Constantinus. They found the imperial city in the possession of the usurper Artabasdus, but remained there till the emperor's restoration in the latter part of the year 743, when he sent for them, and granted to the pope, agreeably to his request made through them, the perpetual possession of certain lands called Nymphae and Noraias (Anastas. *in Vit. Zach.*). It will be seen below that Zacharias had meanwhile done the emperor good service in checking the Lombard king's intended invasion of the exarchate of Ravenna, which was still included in the empire.

Zacharias, on his accession to the see, found the affairs of Italy in a troubled state. Charles Martel, whose protection against the Lombards the previous pope had implored, and who had at length responded by sending an embassy to Rome, had died, Oct. 22. The Lombard king, Luitprand, who had retired from the Roman territory after the arrival of Charles Martel's emissaries, still retained the four cities (Ameria, Hortae, Polimartium, and Blera), seized by him therein; and he was preparing for another invasion. Recent events had been such as to incense him against the Romans: for Trasimund, the revolted duke of Spolegium, who, with the duke of Beneventum, had been protected against him by Gregory III., had, with aid of a Roman army, recovered his dukedom; but he had failed to fulfil his alleged promise to the pope who had aided him of recovering also for Rome the four cities aforesaid which were held by Luitprand. Zacharias, therefore, immediately after his accession, sent an embassy to the Lombard king, which obtained from him a promise to restore these four cities; but on condition, apparently,

of his being aided, instead of being opposed, by the Roman forces against duke Trasimund. Such aid was given, and the feudatory duke was compelled to surrender himself to the king. But the latter still delayed the restoration of the cities. Thereupon the pope, accompanied by a body of his clergy, went himself to Luitprand, who was still in the territory of the duchy of Spolegium, where he had received the submission of Trasimund. Anastasius gives a glowing account of the reception which the pope met with, and of the impression he made upon the Lombard king. An honourable escort, it is said, was sent to conduct him on his way, and the king himself came out from the city of Interamna (*Terni*) to meet him. There, after services in the church of St. Valentinus, the king, on the following Saturday, in a private interview, was so moved (we are told) by the pope's pious eloquence that he solemnly conceded to him, not only the four cities, but also the papal patrimony that had been seized in the Sabine territory, concluded a treaty of peace with the Roman duchy for twenty years, and granted also the liberation of the Roman prisoners that had been taken during previous hostilities. Subsequently, during the ordination of a bishop in the same church of St. Valentinus, at which the king was present, we are informed further that the sweetness of the pope's prayers was such as to move many of the Lombards to tears; and also that the pope one Sunday invited the king to dinner, and received him with such sweetness and hilarity of heart that the latter declared that he never remembered having been entertained so well. Zacharias, thus successful, returned to Rome, where with the assembled people he returned thanks to heaven, having visited and received possession of all the ceded cities on his way. But the peace thus made with Rome did not involve any cessation of Luitprand's designs against the exarchate generally. Accordingly in 743 he invaded it, took possession of the citadel of Caesena, not far from Ravenna, and prepared to besiege the latter city. The exarch Euty chius and the bishop John sent to implore the intervention of the pope, who at their request again sought an interview with Luitprand, in order to deter him from his purpose. He went first to Ravenna, whence, having been hailed there as a deliverer, he proceeded to Ticinum (*Pavia*), where the king then was. The pope's ambassadors, who had preceded him, Luitprand had refused to receive; but the pope himself, when he heard of his approach, he caused to be honourably escorted from the banks of the Po, and received him with distinction as before. The personal influence and pious persuasions of Zacharias were again successful, though it was not without difficulty (*post multam duritiam*, says Anastasius) that he obtained his request. At length the king consented to relinquish his designs against the exarchate, retaining only a third part of the territory of Caesena, as a security till ambassadors, sent to the emperor, should return. The arrival of Zacharias at Pavia was at the end of June, A.D. 743, and the final cession of the whole territory of Caesena was agreed to be made on the 1st of June in the following year; before which time Luitprand died; viz., in the January of 744. He was suc-

ceeded at first by his nephew Hildebrand, whom he had previously associated with himself in the kingdom; but this prince being unacceptable to the Lombards, they conspired against him, and elected Rachis, duke of Forum Julii (*Friuli*) as their king. To him Zacharias immediately sent an embassy, and obtained from him a confirmation of the treaty of peace for twenty years that had been concluded with Luitprand. Rachis, however, after observing it for four or five years, at length broke it by laying siege to Perugia (*Perugia*). Zacharias, trusting once more to his personal powers of persuasion, at once sought him there, with a company of clergy and notables, and induced him to raise the siege and give up the city into his hands. He effected still more: Rachis proved so amenable to his religious influence that he repaired to Rome, abdicated, and became a Benedictine monk in the monastery on Mount Cassino. His wife and daughters also accompanied him to Rome, and adopted the monastic life in a convent for nuns, which they themselves founded and endowed in the neighbourhood of Mount Cassino. Rachis was succeeded by his brother Aistulph, A.D. 749, to whom Zacharias immediately sent a legation, and obtained from him a confirmation of the treaty of peace for twenty years. How little Aistulph afterwards regarded this treaty will be seen under STEPHEN III. The recorded action and success of Zacharias in the transactions above described show his character as well as his capabilities in a very favourable light. He took prompt and effective measures to meet exigencies as they arose, and was ever ready to act personally, regardless of trouble or danger. Peculiarly striking was the power of his personal influence over the Lombard kings. It is true that Luitprand appears to have been a man neither headstrong nor violent, and open to religious influences; he had yielded previously to the personal remonstrances of Gregory II. when on the point of besieging Rome, and had treated that pope also with honour and deference. But neither the action nor the success of Gregory II. were on a par with those of Zacharias. The former had gone in person to the besieger's camp, when Rome was in immediate danger, and had succeeded so far as to save the holy city, but no more:—the latter, when not himself in immediate danger, and in one case when it was not the Roman duchy but the emperor's exarchate at Ravenna that was threatened, undertook long journeys to the Lombard kings wherever they might be, and induced them to relinquish their entire schemes of conquest. Zacharias must have been a man of great courage, faith, and self-reliance, to make such bold attempts; and there must also have been something peculiarly winning and persuasive in his character and bearing, over and above the authority and sacredness of his office, to produce such results as these. We may well believe that Anastasius is not merely indulging his habit of laudation of popes, when he describes him as “*vir mitissimus, atque suavis, omnique bonitate ornatus, tardus ad irascendum, et velox ad miserandum, nulli malum pro malo reddens, neque vindictam secundum meritum tribuens, sed pius et misericors a tempore ordinationis suae omnibus factus.*” The mention made above of some of the warlike Lombards having been

moved to tears by the very manner of his saying prayers in church may suggest one element of his personal influence over them; and it is further significant that Luitprand is said to have been not only deeply moved by his pious exhortations in private interviews, but also charmed with him as a pleasant host, when, gravity laid in due season aside, he was entertained by him at dinner.

The action of Zacharias, so far described, was of great historical importance. He was the means of saving the exarchate of Ravenna from becoming part of the Lombard kingdom; for it is evident that, but for him, the eastern emperor would have been powerless to retain it. Not less important, as the sequel shewed, were the relations he maintained with the kingdom of the Franks, his most memorable action in this regard being the sanction he gave to the deposition of Childeric, and to Pippin's consecration as king. The kings of the Merovingian dynasty, descended from Clovis, of whom Childeric was the last, had become effete puppets in the hands of the mayors of the palace, who were already kings *de facto*, though not *de jure*. Such had been notably the great Charles Martel: and such was his son Pippin, who, after the retirement of his brother Carloman to monastic life (of which hereafter), had become the sole ruler. With the concurrence of the magnates of the kingdom, he conceived the idea of deposing the useless puppet, and himself assuming the title and prerogatives of royalty, of which he already exercised the power. But it was considered necessary, or at any rate desirable, to get full ecclesiastical sanction for the change proposed. Accordingly, an embassy (consisting of Burchard, bishop of Wurzburg, and Fulrad, abbat of St. Denys) was sent to pope Zacharias, to ask him whether it were lawful from a religious point of view. The question has been raised among controversialists as to whether this application implied an acknowledgment at that period of history of the pope's power to dispose of earthly kingdoms at his will, or whether he was only consulted, as the highest ecclesiastical authority, on a point of casuistry. There is nothing in the recorded terms of the application to support the first of these contentions; and possibly, even if Zacharias had refused his sanction, the thing would have been done. Still, there can be no reasonable doubt that Pippin and his Franks regarded the pope's sanction as carrying with it that of heaven, which they were sincerely anxious to obtain. The Franks, since the conversion of Clovis, had been Catholics in faith, and were accustomed to look up to the pope with peculiar reverence, as St. Peter's representative and the church's head. The recent work of St. Boniface in the kingdom, bearing as he did the pope's commission, himself devoted in his allegiance to him, and inculcating everywhere his supreme authority, would tend to strengthen the hold of the Roman see on the consciences of the Franks; and hence it was natural that Pippin, a devout believer in the religion he had been taught, should shrink from his contemplated step till he had been assured from Rome itself that he might take it without danger to his soul. Such appears to have been the meaning and purpose of the transaction. Eginhard, indeed (*Vit. Carol.*

Magn.) says the change was made "jussu," and "auctoritate" of the Roman pontiff; but such language does not imply any theory then held as to the pope's power to dispose, on his own mere motion, of earthly thrones. The chronicler's purpose is to justify the change as not having been made without the sanction of the highest ecclesiastical authority. The reply of Zacharias being favourable, Childeric was sent into a monastery, having had his long hair, the token of royalty, cut off; and Pippin was formally elected as king, elevated on a shield, according to the custom of the race, and also anointed at Soissons by the Frank clergy;—by St. Boniface, according to some accounts, though this is doubtful. (See BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS.) The pope's action in thus sanctioning the usurpation of Pippin is not likely to offend any of the present day, except such as still believe in a divine right inherent in all kings of ancient dynasty. The Merovingian dynasty seems at that time to have outlived its usefulness, and its retention to have become a farce; and it was evidently best for the kingdom which desired it that the real rulers should be recognised as having the right to rule, and that the theory of allegiance to a useless shadow should cease. Nor is it fair to accuse Zacharias of having been actuated by interested motives. True it is that his action was politic: for it bound the Carolingian kings more firmly than ever to the Roman see; and Pippin may be supposed to have been in a great measure moved by gratitude, when he afterwards rescued the exarchate from the Lombards, and bestowed it on St. Peter in the person of pope Stephen III. Zacharias may have foreseen some such possible result; but still, if his verdict was justifiable in itself, he should be allowed the credit of disinterested motives. He had shown previously no desire to usurp the rights of the emperor over the exarchate. He had saved it from being taken possession of by Luitprand, with no apparent design of alienating it from the emperor, to whom he had left it to hold it as he could. Nor are the popes before and after him to be justly reproached, as they are by some Protestant writers, for seeking or accepting dominion which belonged of right to the emperor, whose subjects they were. Gregory III. had indeed invited Charles Martel to come to the rescue, offering him the title of patrician of Rome, and the allegiance which had been in former times due to Constantinople; but this was when the only hope of rescue was from France, and when the emperor could or would do nothing for him. Stephen afterwards accepted gratefully from Pippin temporal dominion over territory that had been once the emperor's; but it was then no longer his. It had been wrested from him by the Lombard king, and then from him by Pippin; and, if it had been nominally restored to the emperor, he would have been powerless to retain it. These were the only two practical alternatives; that of the pope becoming a subject of the Lombard king, or that of his becoming a temporal potentate under the protection of the king of the Franks. And the popes are surely not to blame for preferring the latter alternative, whatever may be thought of the subsequent results of the "damnosa haereditas" thus acquired.

The deposition of Childeric was probably in the year 751. Four years previously (A.D. 747) Carloman the brother of Pippin (who, after their father Charles Martel's death, had shared with him the government of the kingdom ruling over Austrasia, Alamannia, and Thuringia) had resigned his dominion to his brother, and gone to Rome to devote himself to monastic life. His renunciation of the world was not due to any incapacity for the position he held (for he is said to have been an efficient ruler, and successful in war), but to religious aspirations, induced by his intercourse with St. Boniface, whom he had supported and aided in his work of evangelization, and whose disciple he had been. We are told (*in Vit. Bonifac.* lib. 1, c. 36, apud *Sur.* 10, 3, *die 5 Jun.*) that, before receiving instruction from the saint, "he had known little of the Christian religion, but that through his exhortations he so advanced in the fear and love of God that he learnt to administer alike wisely divine and human things, and became aware that secular powers profited nothing apart from the celebration of divine worship, to which the monastic life is joined." His conversion and retirement from the world illustrate the influence of St. Boniface in the kingdom of the Franks, and the increased reverence which would thence accrue towards the Roman See. According to Anastasius (*in Vit. Zachar.*) Carloman went first to Rome, where he offered himself to St. Peter, and was by pope Zacharias himself devoted to monastic life. Thence, according to the Frank annalists, he went in the first place to the monastery on mount Soracte, which he restored from the state of ruin to which it had been reduced by the Lombards, and remained there some years; but, being disturbed and annoyed by the visits of Frank nobles on their way to Rome, he escaped by night with only one companion, and knocked for admission at the door of the Benedictine monastery on mount Cassino without revealing his name, but representing himself as a homicide, and guilty of all manner of crimes, who craved a place of penitence. There he was for some time subjected to severe probation, as being an unknown novice of barbarian race, was sent to work in the kitchen, and beaten by the cook. At length his companion who had entered the convent with him, having retaliated on the cook by hitting him with all his force with a pestle, and having been called to account in consequence, revealed the unknown stranger's name and rank. The terrified monks fell down at his feet, imploring pardon; but he in return fell down at theirs, declaring that he was not Carloman, but a sinner and a homicide. After this, we are told, he was treated with great reverence, but continued to lead the life of a humble and obedient monk. (*Eginhard, in Vit. Car. Magn.*; *Regino, in Chron.* an. 576; *Leo Ostiens. in Chron. Cassin.* l. 1, c. 7.) For his subsequent journey to France in obedience to his abbat's orders, and his death in a monastery at Vienne, see under STEPHANUS III.

Many interesting letters, that passed between pope Zacharias and Boniface, remain, showing the close intercourse kept up between them. In 742 Boniface wrote to the new pope, professing his devout obedience to him, and his desire to maintain the unity of the church

under St. Peter's see; informing him also that he had constituted three sees in Germany (Würzburg, Buraburg, and Erfurt), and desiring the pope's confirmation of them. He also requested leave to assemble a synod, as he had been desired to do by Carloman, for correcting the grievous abuses of the church, and especially the immorality of the clergy, in the dominions of that prince. He asked further for permission to nominate (as he says he had been directed to do by Gregory III.) a successor to himself, to take his place after his own death. At the end of his letter he ventures to complain of the retention and allowance at Rome of certain pagan customs, the report of which impeded his own success, and which he therefore requests the pope to prohibit; and also of Frank bishops and priests who had been guilty of fornication and adultery resorting to Rome, and coming back with the pope's alleged licence to them to resume their ministry. To this letter Zacharias replied, according the requested sanction of the new sees and of the synod; forbidding Boniface to designate his own successor unless he should be on the point of death; promising to put a stop to the pagan rites at Rome; and bidding him give no credence to the immoral clergy who said they had got the pope's licence to officiate. Afterwards (probably A.D. 743) two letters were addressed by Zacharias to Boniface, one in August, the other in November; in the first of which he assents to the formation of three metropolitan sees in northern Gaul (at Rouen, Rheims, and Sens), desired by Boniface after a council that had been held under the auspices of both Pippin and Carloman; and he sends therewith three palls, with directions for their use. But in the second letter he expresses his extreme surprise that Boniface had subsequently applied for one pall only (viz. in behalf of Grimo, appointed to the see of Rouen), and had complained (this being presumably the reason why one only was asked for) of the simoniacal exaction of large sums of money for the granting of palls at Rome. In a later letter (not dated) Boniface attributes the failure of the promised application for the three palls, not to his own change of purpose, but to that of the Franks (meaning, we may suppose, Pippin and Carloman), who, he says, were still hesitating. Whether the cause of their hesitation was the alleged expense of procuring palls from Rome, or some other difficulties in the way, we are not told. Zacharias, in his reply to the first of the above mentioned letters, earnestly denies the existence of the abuse complained of. It may have been practised by his officials without his knowledge; for it is not likely that Boniface would have complained without ground. That it had existed previously appeared from its being said of Gregory I. that he had himself refused to accept any gifts in return for palls, and had also passed a decree in council, prohibiting the abuse in all future time. But it may have continued notwithstanding, whether with the personal connivance of the popes or not; and it is well known how it became in later times a large source of revenue to the Roman see. In this same letter Zacharias confirms to Boniface the jurisdiction given him by previous popes over all Bavaria, and extends it, to be exercised in the name of

Rome, over the whole of Gaul (*Epp. Zachar. iv. and v.*) In the year 745 (this is the probable date: see Pagi, *critic., ann. 744, iv.*) two notable heretical impostors, Aldebert, a Gaul, and Clemens, a Scot, who had been condemned and deprived by Boniface in a council held under Pippin and Carloman, were at his request condemned also in a council held by Zacharias at Rome. For an account of their errors and pretensions see ALDEBERT, and CLEMENS (4). Boniface, in his letter to the pope about them (see *Concil. Roman. II.*; Labbe, t. viii. p. 299), complains that they still continued to have a following, and to incense the people against himself, and prays that they may not only be condemned at Rome, but that Carloman should be directed by the apostolic see to put them in prison, and thus preclude their further intercourse with men. Zacharias did not comply with this latter request. They were only condemned, deprived, and excommunicated in the Roman synod, but with place allowed them for repentance (*ib., and Ep. Zachar. ix.*). In a subsequent epistle (*Ep. viii.*) the pope directs Boniface to bring the case of these two heretics, who were evidently still at liberty, before a council about to be held, and deal with them according to the canons in concert with the prince, if they should be found penitent, but otherwise to send them to Rome for the judgment of the holy see. The main purpose of the council here referred to was to receive answers from the pope to certain questions on religious matters which had been referred to him by Pippin. The answers are arranged under twenty-seven heads, and contained in a letter addressed "ad Pippinum Majorem Domûs, itemque ad episcopos, abbates, et proceres Francorum." They relate to the powers of metropolitans, the dress of clergy and monks, the marriage of clerics, the discipline of monks and nuns, private chapels, unlawful marriages, adultery, and other kindred subjects.

In one instance of reference to Rome the pope decided against Boniface, though generally supporting him in all he did, and enjoining full obedience to him. A Bavarian priest, ignorant of Latin, had administered baptism with the words, "Baptizo in nomine Patria, et Filia, et Spiritua Sancta;" and Boniface had declared the Baptism invalid, and ordered the person to be baptized again. Two presbyters, Virgilius and Sidonius, who appear to have been in other respects hostile to Boniface, informed the pope, who thereupon wrote to Boniface forbidding repetition of the baptism, on the ground that a mere mistake in language, involving no heretical intention, did not invalidate the Sacrament (*Ep. Zach. vi.*). One of the complainants on this occasion, Virgilius, was afterwards himself accused of heresy by Boniface, who wrote to the pope on the subject. His heresy consisted in holding that there is another world, with sun and moon and other men, below the earth. The man had probably got hold of a more correct view of the solar system than was understood at the time; which view was construed into heresy. Zacharias (*Ep. x.*) directs Boniface to expel him from the church, if convicted of such tenets, and says that he had requested the Bavarian duke Otilo to send him to Rome to be examined. Various other questions, many of

them relating to minutiae of ecclesiastical observance, appear from the extant correspondence to have been from time to time referred by Boniface to Zacharias, and to have been replied to by the latter.

From one of the pope's letters (*Ep.* ix.) it appears that it had been proposed to make Cologne the metropolitan see of Boniface, and that the pope had confirmed this arrangement. But, some difficulties having arisen, he allowed him afterwards to remain at Mainz, which he constituted the metropolitan see of him and his successors, with jurisdiction over all Germany as legate of the apostolic see. He also allowed him at length to nominate a successor to himself, in consideration of his age and infirmity (*Epp.* x., xiii.). In another letter exemption for ever from all episcopal jurisdiction except that of Rome is granted to the Benedictine monastery of Fulda, which Boniface had founded, and to which he had expressed his desire to retire at last, and to be buried there.

Previous to the Roman synod assembled, as aforesaid, for entertaining the case of Adelbert and Clemens, one was held by Zacharias, A.D. 743, after his return from his visit to Luitprand at Payia, at which canons were passed, directed against clerical irregularities and incestuous marriages. On the latter head it is observable, as also in repeated injunctions to Boniface and the Franks, that spiritual relationship, contracted by sponsorship in baptism, is insisted as a bar to intermarriage equally with consanguinity.

Zacharias is named by pope Hadrian (*Ep. ad Irenem et Constantin.*) as having, as well as other popes, remonstrated with the emperor Constantine Copronymus on the subject of image-worship. He is said by Anastasius to have restored and embellished the Lateran palace, to have offered various ornaments to St. Peter's and other churches, to have redeemed at his own cost Christian slaves who had been bought by Venetian merchants for sale in Africa, to have established, furnished, and devoted to the perpetual possession of the Roman see, several farms (called "domus cultae") in the papal patrimony, to have translated the Dialogues of Gregory I. into Greek, to have discovered in the Lateran palace a great treasure, viz. the head of St. George the Martyr, and also to have been bountiful in almsgiving, a lover and benefactor of the clergy, and in all respects kind, forgiving, and charitable. He died 14th March, A.D. 752, and was buried in the church of St. Peter. He is thus noticed as a saint in the Roman Martyrology: "Martii xv., Romae Natalis S. Zachariae Papae, qui Dei ecclesiam summa vigilantia gubernavit, et clarus meritis quievit in pace." [J. B.—Y.]

ZACHARIAS (7), adopted son of Gegnoeus, the eminent Paulician teacher. At his father's death, in 745, he became his successor as leader of the sect, in the neighbourhood of Samosata, Mananalis, etc. (*Phot. c. Man.* i. 19; *Pet. Sic. Hist. Man.* i. 30; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 345.) [M. B. C.]

ZACHARIAS (8), bishop of Edessa, originally a Stylite monk, who was dragged from his pillar and forcibly consecrated on the retirement

of Simeon to a solitary life among the mountains of Samosata. He was deposed A.D. 761, and was succeeded by Elias. (*Assem. Bibl. Graec.* i. 428; ii. 112, 114; *Dionys. Chron.*) [E. V.]

ZALLA, an Arian Goth in the time of Totila who put to death all the clergy or monks who fell into his hands. A peasant he was torturing to make him disclose where his property was concealed, exclaimed that he had committed it to St. Benedict. Zalla then bound his arms with thongs, and desired him to conduct him to the monastery, where they found the saint sitting reading outside. Zalla shouted to him to give up the peasant's property, whereupon St. Benedict lifted up his eyes, and at his glance the thongs fell off the peasant's arms. The terrified Zalla fell down at the saint's feet, and besought his prayers. The saint continued reading, but directed the monks to take in and refresh Zalla, and on his return warned him to desist from his cruelties in future. (*Gregorius, Dial.* ii. 31.) [F. D.]

ZEBENNUS, bishop of Eleutheropolis in Palaestina Prima, in the reign of Theodosius, to whom the graves of the prophets Habakkuk and Micah were said to have been made known by divine revelation (*Soz. H. E.* vii. 29). He attended the council at Diospolis against the Pelagians in 415 (*Augustin. c. Julian.* lib. i. c. 5; *Labbe, ii.* 1532) (*Le Quien, Or. Christ.* iii. 639.) [E. V.]

ZEBINAS (1), martyr. [GERMANUS (31).]

ZEBINAS (2), a celebrated solitary and ascetic of Syria, who according to the account received by Theodoret from those who had seen him, was accustomed to spend whole days and nights standing in prayer, supporting himself in his advancing years on a staff. He was also famous for his hospitality, and was regarded by the ascetics of his time as their father and master and the exemplar of all virtues. Zebinas was buried in the village of Citta, near his place of retirement, and a church was built over his grave. He had as disciples the famous ascetics Polychronius and Jacobus (*Theod. Hist. Relig.* c. xxiv.) [E. V.]

ZEBINUS (ZEBENNUS), the eleventh bishop of Antioch, succeeded Philetus, A.D. 229. He sat for nine years, and was followed by Babylas, A.D. 238 (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 24; *Euseb. Chron. Armen.*; *Hieron. Chron.*; *Clinton, Fast. Rom.*) [E. V.]

ZENAS, monk. [SERENUS (2).]

ZENO (1), soldier and confessor at Alexandria in the Decian persecution. [PTOLEMAEUS (1).] [C. H.]

ZENO (2) I., bishop of Tyre, successor to Paulinus. According to Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxx. § 4, p. 730), he was one of the bishops to whom Alexander of Alexandria wrote to warn them against Arius, when banished from Alexandria he was endeavouring to worm himself into the confidence of the Palestinian clergy. The succession of the bishops of Tyre at this epoch is uncertain, and cannot be determined satisfactorily. Tillemont seeks to solve the difficulty by inferring from Epiphanius's epithet, ἀρχαῖος

of "long standing" (*Ζηνωνί τινι ἀρχαίῳ ἐν Τύρῳ*), that Zeno had resigned his see through old age to Paulinus, as Narcissus had done to Alexander at Jerusalem (Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* vi. 222, vii. 648). But unless the authority of the catalogues be discarded altogether, it is certain that Zeno was among the bishops at the council of Nicaea (Labbe, ii. 51). [E. V.]

ZENO (3) II., bishop of Tyre. He was ordained by Meletius to the see of Tyre, which was then filled by Diodorus, in violation of the canons, because the latter refused to withdraw from the communion of his rival patriarch, Paulinus; thus perpetuating and extending the unhappy Antiochene schism (Rufin. *H. E.* ii. 21; Facundus, lib. iv. c. 2). He attended the orthodox synod at Tyana in 365 (Labbe, ii. 837; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 12); that held by Meletius at Antioch in 379 (Holstein. *Vet. Rom. Eccl. Monum. Collect.* i. 176; Labbe, ii. 894); and the oecumenical synod at Constantinople in 381 (*ibid.* 955). In 372 he united with Basil and other leading eastern prelates in the memorial drawn up by Meletius to the bishops of the western church imploring their help in the struggle they were carrying on against heresy (Basil. *Ep.* 92 [69]; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 805; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* viii. 367, 767, note xiii.; Ceillier, *Aut. Ecclés.* tom. vi.). [E. V.]

ZENO (4), a young man of Gaza, who with his brothers, Eusebius and Nestabis, was martyred by his heathen fellow-townsmen under circumstances of peculiar atrocity in the reign of Julian, c. 362. (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 9.) [E. V.]

ZENO (5), bishop of Majuma, the port of Gaza, at the close of the 4th century. He was the cousin of the three brothers, Eusebius, Nestabis and his namesake Zeno, who in the early part of the reign of Julian, c. 362, were martyred by their fellow townsmen. On the outbreak of the persecution Zeno fled to Anthonon, where, however, he was discovered, brutally scourged, and ejected from the city. He then returned to Majuma, where he remained concealed till the pagan fury was past. While there, a Christian woman brought to him the half-calced bones of his martyred relatives, which she had collected with pious care. These, after he had been made bishop of Majuma in the reign of Theodosius, Zeno deposited beneath the altar of the basilica he erected outside the walls of the city, in which also he placed the relics of a confessor in the same persecution, Nestor by name, who had died of his ill-treatment at Zeno's house, to which he had been carried. Zeno embraced a celibate and ascetic life in his youth. He supported himself and ministered to the wants of others from his handicraft as a linen weaver, which he continued to exercise after he had obtained the episcopate. (Soz. *ibid.*) He lived to his hundredth year, revered by the other bishops of the province both for his age and his virtues. Sozomen, himself a native of a neighbouring village, bears personal testimony to his life of devotion, never absenting himself from the daily services of the church in spite of his advanced age, unless detained by sickness. He had a brother named Ajax, also a confessor, a married man, who, after becoming the father of three sons, embraced a life of continence, and

became the parish priest of Sozomen's native village of Bethelia. (Soz. *H. E.* vii. 28.) [E. V.]

ZENO (6), eighth bishop and patron saint of Verona, is, it is almost certain, the same as the Zeno, who, according to St. Ambrose in his letter written about A.D. 386 to Syagrius, bishop of Verona, had received INDICIA into the order of consecrated virgins (Ambrosius, *Epp.* i. 5). This would place his episcopate a few years previously. He is praised in a sermon of Petronius, one of his successors, c. A.D. 412; finally, Gregory the Great (*Dial.* iii. 19), who styles him a martyr, narrates how he miraculously protected his church from an inundation of the Adige. He is sometimes placed in the reign of Gallienus, but the date above given is not only supported by better authority, but coincides with the indications given in his sermons, c. g. three (ii. 1-3) are directed against the Arians, who were powerful in North Italy in the second half of the fourth century; the author speaks of himself as living about 400 years after St. Paul (i. 5); he imitates Lactantius in several places (i. 3, 12, 16; ii. 2), and Hilary of Poitiers; one of the sermons (i. 14) was preached at the consecration of a new church; in another (i. 10) the mention made of the redemption of prisoners very probably refers to the great defeat of Valens in A.D. 378. The brothers Ballerini, from a minute examination of all these and other indications place his episcopate between A.D. 362 and 380.

The first edition of his ninety-three sermons, which is very rare, was published at Venice in 1508, and the second at Verona in 1586. As in this edition a number of sermons by other authors, which were at the end of the MSS. of Zeno's, were mixed up with the genuine ones, and the whole assigned to him, many, including Tillemont (*M. E.* iv. 585), doubted if any were really the work of Zeno. In 1739, the edition of the brothers Ballerini (reprinted in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xi.) appeared with elaborate Prolegomena, in which they prove the genuineness of the sermons, and discuss all the disputed questions relating to the date and life of Zeno. They are of opinion from his style, and his mention of the Mauritanian martyr Arcadius (ii. 18), that he came from Africa. His style is flowing, and he is fond of allegorical expressions. His Latin is good, and shows that he was acquainted with the classical writers. In particular he twice quotes the Sixth Aeneid.

Zeno is commemorated on April 12th, May 21st, and December 8th, the supposed dates of his death, his translation, and consecration; or, according to others, of the consecration of his basilica, that most glorious of all the churches of Verona. He is represented holding a fishing-rod, to which a fish is attached, in reference to the legend that he used to fish in the Adige. (*AA. SS.* Ap. ii. 69.) Canon Giuliani of Verona published in 1877 a short life of St. Zeno, in which he promises a new edition of the Sermons. [F. D.]

ZENO (7), a sea-captain, who brought letters to Jerome, probably from Aquitaine. He delivered those from Amabilis the bishop, but though he gave a message from Vitalis (q.v.), he did not deliver his letter. (Jerome, *Ep.* 72, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

ZENO (8), a person addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. iv. ep. 22) on Philip. ii. 3, 5, and (v. 286) on the difference between *νουθετεῖν* and *θέλειν*, also (v. 448, 446) in praise of bishop Hermogenes; likewise — (9), a presbyter (i. 212, 216, 217, ii. 250, iii. 190); (10), a deacon (ii. 111); (11), a monk (iii. 408). [C. H.]

ZENO (12), a solitary in the neighbourhood of Antioch, visited by Theodoret when he was still a young reader of the church. Zeno was a native of Pontus, born of a wealthy family, who, adopting the military profession, had become a confidential officer under Valens, being entrusted with the transmission of the imperial despatches. Having been a heaver and convert of Basil the Great, on the death of Valens he threw aside his military insignia and betook himself to a rock-hewn tomb in the mountains above Antioch, where he practised the sternest asceticism. Theodoret gives a very pleasing narrative of his visit to the holy man in his mountain solitude. Every Lord's Day he repaired to the nearest church for public worship, hearing the word of God and partaking of the eucharist. When the Isaurian banditti ravaged the neighbourhood and murdered many male and female solitaries, Zeno was saved, as he believed, by special miracle in answer to his prayer. Being unable to distribute the whole of his property to the poor in his lifetime, in consequence of his nephews being under age, he made Alexander bishop of Antioch his executor for the purpose (Theod. *Hist. Reliq.* cxii.). [E. V.]

ZENO (13), bishop of Curium in Cyprus, A.D. 430. He was present at the general council at Ephesus, where he defended the independence of the Cypriot church against the claims of Antioch. (Mansi, iv. 1465-1470; Hefele's *Councils*, t. iii. p. 72, Clark's edition.) [G. T. S.]

ZENO (14), magister militum, and consul in A.D. 448. Though unbaptized, and still a heathen, Theodoret wrote to congratulate him on his accession to the consulate in very laudatory terms. (Theod. *Ep.* 71.) He also wrote a consolatory letter to him on the death of an intimate friend who had been his companion in arms. (*Ep.* 65.) Zeno was in command in Syria at the time that Theodosius issued his mandate forbidding Theodoret to leave his diocese, the execution of which was committed to Zeno. (*Ep.* 80.) Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xv. 271, 272.) [E. V.]

ZENO (15), bishop of Seville, was granted vicariate authority by pope Simplicius (A.D. 468-483). Felix III. (A.D. 483-492) wrote commending to him one Terentianus, who was returning to Spain after a long visit to Italy. Terentianus had praised Zeno highly to Felix. (Simplicius, *Epp.* 1, Felix III., *Epp.* 8, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 35, 927; *Esp. Sag.* ix. 138; Gams, *Kirch. von Sp.* ii. (1), 415.) [F. D.]

ZENO (16), emperor of the East, A.D. 474-491. His secular history will be found in the *DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY*. In church history he is famous for the publication of the Henoticon [HENOTICON], and for the active part he took in the interminable disputes about Timotheus Aelurus, Timotheus Salo-

phaciolus, Peter Mongus, and Peter the Fuller. Pope Simplicius and Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, used him very effectually against their opponents. A full analysis of the letters addressed to him by popes Simplicius and Felix III. will be found in Ceillier, t. x. pp. 401-420. See also the articles upon the various names mentioned above. [G. T. S.]

ZENO (17), one of the four bishops mentioned under PHILIPPUS (16).

ZENO (18), bishop probably in Sicily, to whom Gregory the Great directed the deacon Cyprianus to give a thousand, or if necessary, two thousand bushels of wheat to relieve the poor of his city. (*Epp.* vi. 4.) [F. D.]

ZENO (19), doubtful bishop of Merida. Certain Latin verses, cited by Florez (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 223), describe the restoration of the bridge at Merida by Salla in the reign of king Erwig, and state he did so from his affection for "summus sacerdos Zeno." As Erwig abdicated in A.D. 687, and as Stephen was bishop of Merida in A.D. 684, and Maximus in A.D. 688, if Zeno was bishop at all, his episcopate must have been a very short one. [F. D.]

ZENOBIA, queen of Palmyra, famous for her magnificence, beauty, and wars with the Romans under Aurelian. Her secular history will be found in the *DICTIONARY OF CLASSICAL BIOGRAPHY* under the names Zenobia, Aurelianus, Herennianus, and Timolaus. Some additional information derived from lately discovered monuments will be found in Le Bas and Waddington, *Voy. Archéol.* iii. 603-606, where we learn (Ins. 2611) from a monument of the year A.D. 271, that her Shemitic name was Septimia Bathzebinah or the daughter of the Merchant, Zenobia being a Greek name used by the Greeks and Romans. She was probably of the family of Julius Aurelius Zenobius, whose *cursum honorum* is found *l. c.* Ins. 2598, and who filled important offices under Severus Alexander and Gordianus. The names of Zenobia and her son Wahballath appear frequently on milestones of military roads in Syria, proving that their dominion was regularly established and of long duration. Some Christian writers have maintained that she was a Jewess (cf. Jost, *Geschichte der Israel*, iv. 166; Milman's *History of the Jews*, iii. 175). She is famous in church history as the patron of the philosopher LONGINUS (5) and of the heretic PAUL of Samosata. Professor Robertson Smith has gathered up all the modern discoveries about Zenobia in his article on Palmyra in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, to which may be added Alf. von Sallet's *Die Fürsten von Palmyra*, Berlin, 1866. [G. T. S.]

ZENOBIANA, a lady of wealth, rank, and high character, at Chalcis in Syria, one of those who erected oratories in honour of the local Saint MARCIANUS (3) while yet alive. (Theod. *Hist. Rel.* cap. 3.) [C. H.]

ZENOBIUS (1), bishop of Aegae in Cilicia Secunda, c. 285-304 (Gams), martyred in Diocletian's persecution. According to the Greek *Menaea* (Oct. 30), he was born at Aegae of

Christian parents named Theodorus and Thecla, and was raised to the episcopate of his native city. He is accredited with the miraculous cure of many persons given over by the physicians. When apprehended and brought before the prefect his sister Zenobia voluntarily joined herself to him. After being tortured he was beheaded (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 893; Baron. *Annal.* ad ann. 285). [E. V.]

ZENOBIUS (2), presbyter and martyr at Sidon during the Diocletian persecution. He must be distinguished from Zenobius of Aegea, Oct. 30, martyr with Zenobia his sister (*Mart. Rom.*). (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13.) [G. T. S.]

ZENOBIUS (3), surnamed GAZIRAEUS, deacon of the church of Edessa, and a disciple of St. Ephrem. He wrote against the Marcionites. (Ceillier, viii. 2.) [G. T. S.]

ZENOBIUS (4), a friend of Augustine, and a zealous student of moral philosophy, with whom Augustine held frequent communications on philosophical subjects. The treatise *de Ordine* is dedicated to Zenobius (*Aug. de Ord.* i. 1, 4; 7, 20; *Retract.* i. 3). A letter of his to Augustine of about the same date, A.D. 386, speaks of his anxiety to conclude their discussion and their mutual love for each other (*Ep.* 2). He appears afterwards to have been made *magister memoriae*, i.e. a keeper of public records (*Aug. Ep.* 117; Böcking, *Not. Dig.* i. 50; ii. 414). [H. W. P.]

ZENOBIUS (5), bishop of Zephyrium, in Cilicia Prima, one of the victims of Cyril's tyrannical determination to force his theological views on the recalcitrant oriental church. During the long struggle which followed the council of Ephesus Zenobius took his stand unflinchingly with the opposition party, headed by John of Antioch and Theodoret, maintaining his position even after the leaders were accepting overtures for peace. He joined Helladius of Tarsus, Matronianus of Pompeiopolis, and Cyril of Adana, in a letter to Alexander of Hierapolis, Theodoret, and other chiefs of the oriental party, expressing their full sympathy and that of the other bishops of Cilicia, with them in their distress, which they had desired to signify more formally by a synodical letter, but the near approach of Easter had prevented the synod being held (*Trag. Iren.* c. 130; Baluz 833).

In 434 Zenobius was present at the synod of Cilician prelates summoned at Tarsus by Helladius, for the purpose of accepting the concordat made between John of Antioch and Cyril, to which Helladius, deserting his party, had recently given in his adhesion (*ib.* 941). He however maintained his consistency, and wrote to his old friend, the uncompromising Alexander, who had been his guest on his return from the council of Ephesus, lamenting that with the exception of Meletius of Mopsuestia, who had been driven from his see by a military force, and himself, all the bishops of Cilicia had proved time-servers, and, consulting their own safety, had deserted the orthodox cause (*ib.* 876). His unyielding consistency caused his fall. He abdicated his see voluntarily, but the vengeance of his enemies yet unsatisfied secured his banishment to Tiberias, from which their untiring

malice subsequently drove him (*ib.* 886; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 883). [E. V.]

ZENOBIUS (6), a lawyer and Monophysite heretic of Emesa in 6th cent., with whom the patriarch Ephraim had a controversy (cf. Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. ccxxviii.). [EPHRAIM (6).] [G. T. S.]

ZENODORUS, praised by St. Nilus (lib. ii. ep. 293) for his attachment to the writings of Chrysostom. [C. H.]

ZENODOTUS, addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. ep. 203). [C. H.]

ZENONIS, wife of the usurping emperor Basiliscus (A.D. 475), instigated him to restore Timothy Aelurus and Peter the Fuller to the sees of Alexandria and Antioch, and to abrogate the decrees of the council of Chalcedon. She also used her influence to obtain the promotion of her paramour Armatus. When Zeno was restored in A.D. 476, she shared the fate of her husband; they were banished to Cappadocia, and starved to death there. (Theodorus Lector, i. 29, 36; Theophanes; Marcellinus; Candidus; Suidas, s. v. *Ἀπαύτος*.) [F. D.]

ZENOPHILUS, a Roman officer, holding the rank of *Consularis* of Numidia. He was a Christian, and presided at the inquiry ordered by Constantine into the case of Silvanus, A.D. 320, in which he decided against him. The record of the proceedings was fully extant in the time of Augustine, who quotes passages from it in his letter to Cresconius (*Ep.* 43, 17; 53, 4; c. *Cresc.* iii. 28, 32; 29, 33). Allusion to these, but without mention of Zenophilus, is made by Optatus, i. 14. A portion of the record still remains, and is printed in the appendix to the works of Optatus (*Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. p. 168, Oberthür, p. 167, Dupin). It was said by Cresconius that Silvanus was banished because he refused to communicate with Zenophilus and Ursacius (*Aug. c. Cresc.* iii. 30, 34; SILVANUS; URSACIUS). [H. W. P.]

ZEPHYRINUS, bishop of Rome after Victor, under the emperors Septimius Severus and Caracalla. According to Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 28; vi. 21) his accession was in the ninth year of Severus (202), and his death in the first year of Elagabalus (218). But these dates are inconsistent with the duration assigned by Eusebius himself to his episcopate, viz. 18 entire years. The *Liberian Catalogue* gives it as 19 years, seven months and ten days, from 198 to 217. Lipsius, the recent investigator of the dates of the early popes, concludes it to have been either 18 or 19 years, from A.D. 198 or 199 to A.D. 217.

His reign was marked by serious disturbance in the church at Rome owing to doctrinal controversies and schism thence ensuing. Zephyrinus himself seems, from evidence that will appear below, to have been a man of no sufficient mark to take a personal lead at such a time, but to have been under the guidance of Callistus, a man of more practical ability than himself, who succeeded him as pope. This Callistus and his learned opponent Hippolytus, both of whom will be noticed presently, appear

to have been the leading spirits of the time at Rome.

The two notable heresies then occupying the attention of the church were Montanism and Monarchianism. Montanism arose in Phrygia (c. 150), where Montanus of Pepuza had declared that the Paraclete had imparted itself to him in order to give perfection to the church, two prophetesses also, Maximilla and Priscilla, being associated with him. His position was that the dispensation of Grace, being, like that of Nature, progressive, had not reached its completion through the manifestation of the Word in Christ, but that a further manifestation of the Paraclete was intended to come afterwards, and was now come. Under such supposed special inspiration the Montanists aimed at purer and more ascetic lives, and stricter discipline, than satisfied the church at large: ordinary Christians they called *ψυχικοί*, regarding themselves alone as *πνευματικοί*. But for the above peculiarities they held orthodox doctrine; and this circumstance, together with their inculcation of purity and the strictness of their lives, gained them at first considerable regard and countenance. Tertullian is well known as having been their most distinguished adherent and champion; and he states (*adv. Praxeam*, c. 1) that a bishop of Rome, whom he does not name, at one time gave credence to the claims of Montanus and his prophetesses, till induced by Praxeas, after his arrival at Rome, to condemn them. Whether the bishop thus referred to were Eleutherus or Victor (on which question opinions are divided), it follows that the see of Rome, when occupied by Zephyrinus, had already declared against Montanism. During his reign we read of Proclus as a leader of the sect at Rome, who was disputed against by one Caius, about whom little else is known, but whose *Dialogue*, a written account of the disputation, is referred to by Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 25; iii. 28, 31; vi. 20). See art. on CAIUS (2). Thus Zephyrinus, though no action of his in the matter is recorded, may certainly be concluded to have been no favourer of the Montanists:—but neither he nor Callistus, who succeeded him, are equally free from the imputation of having in some degree countenanced one school of the Monarchians, which the same Praxeas, who had influenced a former pope against Montanism, had himself introduced into Rome. Montanism and Monarchianism represented two opposite tendencies of thought and feeling. The former was the product of emotional enthusiasm, the latter of intellectual speculation, being grounded on the difficulty of comprehending the mystery of the Godhead in Christ. Those called by the general name of Monarchians, though differing widely in their views, agreed in denying a Divine personality in Christ distinct from that of the Father, being jealous for the Unity, and what was called the *Monarchy* of God. Those of one school were also called Patripassians, because their position was held to imply that in the sufferings of Christ the Father suffered. Supporting themselves by such texts as "I and my Father are one," "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," they taught that the one Godhead, not one Person thereof only, had become incarnate, the terms Father and Son with them denoting only the distinction between God in His Eternal

Being, and God as manifested in Christ. Such views were obviously inconsistent with orthodox Trinitarian doctrine, and their outcome was the Sabellian heresy. Noetus, whose followers were called Noetians, had taught a doctrine of this kind in Smyrna, and had been excommunicated there c. 230: Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, had taught to the like effect, but had been brought round to orthodoxy by Origen at a council there in 244 (Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 33). Praxeas, who (as has been said above on the testimony of Tertullian) influenced the Roman see against Montanism, appears to have been the first to introduce this form of the heresy at Rome. For the same Tertullian says of him, "Iste primus ex Asia hoc genus perversitatis intulit Romanæ humo, et alias iniquitatus.—Ita duo negocia diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit; prophetiam expulit, et hæresim intulit; Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit" (*adv. Praxeam*, c. 1). And, if Tertullian is to be believed, the popes of the time supported Praxeas and his doctrine, rather than otherwise: for he says with regard to one of them (if indeed, as seems most probable, by Victorinus he means pope Victor), "Praxeas quidam hæresim introduxit, quam Victorinus corroborare curavit" (*De Præscript. hæres.*). And of Praxeas he says (*adv. Praxeam*), "Denique caverat pristinum doctor (i.e. Praxeas) de emendatione sua: et manet chirographum apud Psychicos, apud quos tunc gesta res est; exinde silentium." This seems to mean that Praxeas had given to the Catholics of Rome (called *ψυχικοί* by the Montanist Tertullian) a written exposition of his doctrine, which had satisfied them, so that no condemnation of it ensued (*exinde silentium*). In addition to this testimony of Tertullian (whose treatise against Praxeas, written in the time of Zephyrinus, has been supposed, not without reason, to have been directed against the reigning pope as much as against the original heresiarch) we have that of the work entitled "A Refutation of all Heresies," now generally attributed to Hippolytus, of whom and of Callistus (spoken of above as the leading spirits at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, the latter being his adviser and successor in the see) something must now be said. For a fuller account of them see CALLISTUS and HIPPOLYTUS (2) ROMANUS.

With respect to Hippolytus, it may be enough here to remind the reader that he was undoubtedly a learned writer of great note in his day;—referred to by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 20, 22), who gives a list of his works, and speaks of him as a bishop, though apparently ignorant of his see; by Jerome also (*Catal. Ep. ad Damasum*, and *Comm. on S. Matth.*), who calls him "martyr;" by Theoderet, who quotes him several times, and speaks of him as "holy Hippolytus, bishop and martyr;" by the Pseudo-Chrysostom, as "ὁ γλυκύτατος καὶ ἐνούστατος;" regarded in Eastern tradition as bishop of Rome; by pope Gelasius (*de duabus naturis*), as bishop of the metropolis of Arabia; and in later times as bishop of Portus Ostiensis. What his real ecclesiastical position was, is still open to discussion. The idea of his having been an Arabian bishop (unlikely in itself, since his scene of action was in Italy) was probably due to an erroneous inference from an expression of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 20); that of his having been bishop of Portus

(usually accepted
tion sufficiently
he was not a
erious, and ag
a recognized
absence in the
effect. Still
(Hollinger) he d
a community a
the true churc
pope after the
also (though D
his professor
exposition will
Among the
Hippolytus, w
mentioned by
elsewhere quot
(21) describes
beginning with
Noetus and the
abstract of disc
will be seen in
the year 184
Paris from Mo
containing wh
heresies." in t
A.D. 1851, by M
under the nam
whose work it
agreed that it
and all modern
still doubts) e
work of Hippo
into the stat
Zephyrinus an
fully trusted)
career of the la
According to
share of one C
household, and
to him by his
best dealing
chronicled, but
after attempti
to the postum
plus that, if he
to collect mo
criticisms, he
the mines in
factus Criti, fo
ogue. An
emperer Com
his countenanc
commended to
though not on
managed, by
get his disc
returned to R
displeased at
man being res
* The Nicæna
Zephyrinus),
of the book wh
can have been
reason is that
dine so slight
ecclesiastical
the author of "
pope." He ge
relative to the H
of Hippolytus
Callist. 23

(usually accepted till lately) rests on no tradition sufficiently early to give it weight. That he was not a recognized bishop of Rome is obvious, and against the idea of his having been a recognized anti-pope may be alleged the absence in the West of any tradition to this effect. Still it is probable that (as is supposed by Döllinger) he did actually preside as bishop over a community at Rome, which considered itself the true church, out of communion with the pope, after the accession of Callistus, and possibly also (though Döllinger does not think so) under his predecessor Zephyrinus. The reason for this supposition will appear below.

Among the works, anciently attributed to Hippolytus, was one "against all heresies," mentioned by both Eusebius and Jerome, and elsewhere quoted or referred to. Photius (*Cod.* 121) describes it as a book against 32 heresies, beginning with the Dositheans and ending with Noetus and the Noetians, purporting to be an abstract of discourses delivered by Irenaeus. It will be seen in the art. on HIPPOLYTUS that in the year 1842, Minoides Mynas brought to Paris from Mount Athos a 14th century MS. containing what was called a "refutation of all heresies," in ten books, which was published, A.D. 1851, by Miller for the University of Oxford, under the name of the *Philosophumena* of Origen, whose work it was supposed to be. It is now agreed that it cannot be the last work of Origen, and all modern authorities (except Lipsius, who still doubts) concur in regarding it as the work of Hippolytus.^a It gives a curious insight into the state of the Roman Church under Zephyrinus and Callistus, and (if it is to be fully trusted) into the character and previous career of the latter of these two popes.

According to it, he had been originally the slave of one Carpophorus, a Christian of Caesar's household, and had the charge of a bank entrusted to him by his master. After a course of fraudulent dealing in this position of trust, he absconded, but was captured on board ship, after attempting suicide, and sent by his master to the *pistrinum*. Thence released on the false plea that, if he had his liberty, he would be able to collect money due to him so as to satisfy creditors, he was sent, after being scourged, to the mines in Sardinia, by Fuscianus, the Praefectus Urbi, for raising a riot in a Jewish synagogue. An amnesty having been granted by the emperor Commodus, at the instance of Marcia his concubine, to the Christians who had been condemned to the Sardinian mines, Callistus, though not on the list furnished by pope Victor, managed, by falling on his knees and crying, to get his dismissal with the rest, and so returned to Rome. The pope Victor was much displeased at his return, the charges against the man being recent and well known; but being of

^a Dr. Newman, it is true (*Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical*), is unwilling to allow that the part of the book which depreciates Zephyrinus and Callistus, can have been written by Hippolytus. But his only reason is that he thinks it "simply incredible" that a divine so singularly honoured, whose name no breath of ecclesiastical censure has ever even dimmed, could be the author of "that malignant libel on his contemporary popes." He grants that that portion of the work which relates to the Holy Trinity closely resembles the works of Hippolytus in style and in teaching.

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

a merciful disposition, left him alone for a time, till having regard to the prevalent feeling against him, and to the action which his old master Carpophorus was prepared to take, he sent him to Antium, supporting him there with a monthly allowance so as to get him out of the way. It might be that Victor, though he did not trust him, thought it right to protect one who had become in some sort a confessor, having been sent to the mines with other Christians.^b Zephyrinus, however, the successor of Victor, seems to have had no misgivings about the man; for, on his succession, he recalled him to Rome, gave him some position of authority over the clergy, and "set him over the cemetery." Zephyrinus, himself, is described as an unlearned and ignorant man, as well as avaricious and open to bribes, and as being entirely managed by Callistus, who induced him, for his own purposes, to declare sometimes for the Patripassians and sometimes against them, though in the main supporting them; his object being to sow dissension among the brethren, and to curry favour with both parties, as to pave the way for his own election to the popedom, which was the object of his ambition. Hippolytus, meanwhile, the supposed writer of this account, represents himself as associated with the orthodox community at Rome, holding apart from and opposing the pope and his adviser, and being accused by them of being *ditheists*. Further, after the death of Zephyrinus, Hippolytus and his party appear in still more marked opposition to Callistus, who succeeded, apparently regarding themselves as the true church, and Callistus as but a pseudo-pope, or the mere head of a heretical school (*διδασκαλείον*).^c Hence the probability, above referred to, that Hippolytus had been elected by his followers and regarded by them as the true bishop of the Roman church; a supposition which may account for the Eastern tradition to that effect, and for his name having been handed down in the West also as that of a bishop, though with no certain designation of the see he occupied. And he may possibly (though not so probably) have held this position even in the time of Zephyrinus, since he speaks of him as only "thinking that he governed the church" (*διέπειν νομίζοντος την ἐκκλησίαν*). This expression, however, may only imply that Zephyrinus was a puppet in the hands of Callistus. It is certainly somewhat remarkable, if Hippolytus was really an anti-pope, that no record of the fact has come down to us. But, on the other hand, he may not have sought recognition as bishop of Rome from other churches, so as to make the position he held notorious, and in Rome itself care may have been taken under subsequent popes to suppress lasting evidence of the true facts of the case. Nor may the circumstances of a separate community, having its own bishop, and claiming to be the true church, have been at that time so

^b The account of his adventures is thus introduced; observe the vein of irony:—Ὅτος ἐμαρτύρησε ἐπὶ Φυσικακοῦ ἐπάρχου οὗτος Ρώμης. Ὁ δὲ τρόπος τῆς αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίας τοίωσθε ἦν.

^c Οὕτω μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Ζεφυρίνου τελειτὴν νομίζον τετυπημένα οὐ ἐθηράτο (ix. 12).—Τοιαῦτα ὁ γόης τομῆσας συνεστήσατο διδασκαλείον κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οὕτως διδάσας (ib.).—Τινὲς δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ καταγνώσει ἐκβλητοὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑφ' ἡμῶν γενόμενοι, προσηκούσαντες αὐτοῖς, ἐπέλθον τὸ διδασκαλείον αὐτοῦ (ib.).

remarkable as to cause great sensation. We shall see below, that another community in the time of Zephyrinus—that of the Theodotians—had also for a short time its own bishop, though we should have known nothing of the fact but for a quotation from an unnamed writer, preserved by Eusebius. In any case the picture of the Roman church during the episcopate of Zephyrinus, as given in the work from which the above account is taken, discloses a state of discord and disruption of which we should have had no idea from the records of historians. It does not, indeed, necessarily follow that the picture is not somewhat overcoloured under the influence of *odium theologicum*, or that Callistus was the unprincipled adventurer, or Zephyrinus altogether the greedy and ignorant tool, that the writer describes. Dr. Döllinger (*Hippolyt. und Callist.*), who attributes the whole work to Hippolytus, takes this view. While he earnestly defends Callistus against the libel on his character, which, however, he allows may have had some ground, he at the same time acquits Hippolytus of wilful misrepresentation. He supposes the latter to have been partly misled by false reports and partly influenced by prejudice, being himself a strict maintainer of ancient discipline, while Callistus was a liberal. It is difficult, however, to acquit the writer of deliberate and malignant slander unless the picture given of the popes was, in the main, a true one. There remains the idea of Dr. Newman, which has been referred to in a note, that “the libellous matter which has got a place in,” the *Elenchus* of Hippolytus, was not his; an idea for which there is no foundation beyond the supposed difficulty of believing it to be his. And, if Hippolytus was the writer, it is to be remembered that he, himself, was undoubtedly a divine of great learning and repute, superior in this respect to his rivals, and that he seems to have left a name without reproach behind him. All three (as is the case with some others who are known to have been bitterly at variance during life) are now together in the Calendar of Saints.

With regard to Zephyrinus's alleged countenance, under the advice of Callistus, of Patripasian heresy, it may be observed that it is no serious charge even against popes (except in the minds of those who maintain their infallibility), that on so difficult and mysterious a subject, the first broached, they did not see their way to a definite judgment. And it is to be remembered that Callistus, after his accession, distinctly condemned Sabellianism.

Zephyrinus is further accused of undue laxity in matters of discipline, which is said by the writer of the *Elenchus* to have been carried to a greater, and even scandalous, extent by Callistus after his accession to the papedom. As to Zephyrinus, our informant is Tertullian, who, writing in his time, speaks indignantly of a penal edict, which allowed admission of adulterers, after penance, to communion. According to the ancient discipline of the Church, Christians who had been guilty of grievous sins, including adultery, were excommunicated till the hour of death. Zephyrinus appears to have ordered that adulterers might be readmitted to communion, after penance done, though still excluding, as of old, idolaters and murderers. Tertullian expresses himself thus:—“Audio

etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium, Pontifex scilicet maximus, episcopus episcoporum,^a dicit; Ego et moechiae et fornicationis delicta poenitentia functis dimitto. O edictum cui ascribi non poterit bonum factum! . . . Sed hoc in ecclesia legitur, et in ecclesia pronuntiatur, et virgo est. Absit absit a sponsa Christi tale praeconium! . . . Adscit idoloratres, adscit homicida, in medio eorum adscit et moechus. Pariter de poenitentiae officio sedent, in sacco et cinere inhorrescunt, eodem fletu gemiscunt, eisdem precibus ambiunt, eisdem genibus exorant, eandem invocant matrem. Quid agis mollissima et humanissima disciplina? Aut omnibus eis hoc esse debetis (beati enim pacifici), aut si non omnibus, nostra esse. Idololatrem quidem et homicidam semel damnas, moechum vero de medio excipis? Idololatrae successorem, homicidae antecessorem, utriusque collegam?” The rigorous views of Tertullian, as a Montanist, account for the indignant language. Dr. Döllinger (*Hippolyt. und Callist.*) conceives that the opening by Zephyrinus of the door of reconciliation to adulterers after penance was only a wise relaxation of old discipline, which was too severe for the times. And when Callistus, after his accession, extended such relaxation to sinners of all kinds, and was so bitterly accused by Hippolytus of encouraging general immorality, Dr. Döllinger further supposes that the pope might be justified, though Hippolytus, as an ecclesiastical conservative, was shocked at any relaxation of ancient discipline to meet the needs of the day, while the prejudice against Callistus personally predisposed him to overstate the case.

Apart from the Patripassians there was another school of Monarchians, who escaped the difficulty of conceiving a distinct Divine Personality in Christ by regarding Him as human only, though conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin. This school also existed at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus, adding to the discord; but it is certain that the Roman see gave it no support. On the contrary, when one Theodotus (called *δ σκουρεός*) had come from Byzantium to Rome declaring Christ to have been a mere man, he had been excommunicated by pope Victor (Euseb. v. 28; Tertullian, *de praescript. haer.*). Another Theodotus also (called *δ τραπεζιτης*), a disciple of the first, who taught at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus that Christ, though conceived by the Holy Ghost, had been a mere man, and even inferior to Melchizedek, had his sect apart, and out of communion with the church (Euseb. H. E. v. 28; Tertull. *de praescript.*); and Eusebius (*loc. cit.*), quoting from an unnamed writer of the time, tells a story of Natalius, who had been a confessor for the faith, having been persuaded by Theodotus and by his colleague Asclepiodotus to be made bishop of their sect, of his having been subse-

^a It has been questioned whether the *Pontifex* here referred to was the Roman bishop: but it cannot well have been any one else. Baronius cites the lofty titles assigned to him as proof of his then recognised supremacy over the whole church. But the vein of sarcasm in the passage is obvious. It shows only what the popes asserted of themselves; not what others thought of them.

quently warned in dreams and chastised by angels, and having at length thrown himself in sackcloth and ashes with many tears at the feet of Zephyrinus, and been thereupon received into communion. Another of the same school, Artemon or Artemas, taught also at Rome under Zephyrinus, and apart from his communion. This man alleged that his own doctrine was that which the Apostles had held and handed down, and which had been accepted by the Roman see itself till pope Victor's time, Zephyrinus having been the first to falsify the ancient creed. To this bold assertion his opponents replied that the fact of Victor having excommunicated the elder Theodotus, who was "the leader and father of this God-denying apostasy," was proof that the doctrine of Artemon had not in former times been that of the Roman church. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 28; cf. Epiphani. *Haer.* lxx. 1, 4; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* ii. 4; Photius, *Biblioth.* 48.) Possibly Artemon's views differed in some particulars from those of the elder Theodotus, was to give some colour to his allegation. But doubtless their general complexion was the same. During the episcopate of Zephyrinus the emperor Severus, A.D. 202, issued an edict which forbade any person to become a Jew or a Christian (Aelii Spartiani Severus, c. 17), which was probably interpreted so as to include existing converts; for in some parts it was followed by severe persecution, especially in Alexandria; so much so that it was thought by some to denote the coming of Antichrist (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 1, 7). But there is no record of the church at Rome having suffered under it. Tertullian informs us (*ad Scapulam*) that Severus himself was favourably disposed to the Christians, having been cured by means of oil by Proculus, a Christian, whom he kept with him in his palace till the time of his death; also that his son Caracalla had been brought up on Christian milk, meaning that he had had a Christian nurse; also that knowing many distinguished ladies as well as men to be of that sect, Severus not only did not molest them, but testified in their favour, and opposed the popular rage against them. Hence there is no reason to suppose that Zephyrinus or the Christians at Rome in his time were molested by persecution.

Some time during this episcopate we are informed by Eusebius that Origen paid a short visit to Rome, having, as he himself expressed it, "prayed to see the most ancient church of the Romans" (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 14); but there is no record of what passed between him and the pope on that occasion.

It has been mentioned above that when Zephyrinus brought Callistus back to Rome, he is said, in the work ascribed to Hippolytus, to have put him over "the cemetery" (*εἰς τὸ κοιμητήριον κατέστησεν*). The expression seems to imply that this was some one cemetery common to the Roman Christians. There had been Christian cemeteries earlier than that which (as will appear below) seems to be here referred to; some being perhaps those of private families of position. They were liable to attack, mainly, it would seem, because of their being used for secret Christian worship. The emperor Valerian,

e.g., in 257 issued on this ground an edict against Christian cemeteries. It is conjectured with great probability by De Rossi that after the death of pope Victor (who is the last pope said to have been buried beside St. Peter on the Vatican) the Roman Christians had availed themselves of the protection afforded by law to certain *collegia*, or corporate bodies, if represented by a syndic, in whose name the property might be held, and business transacted; and that Zephyrinus, having obtained possession of a piece of ground, had made it over to the church for a common place of burial in the hands of a *collegium* of which Callistus was the syndic. Such confraternities for the burial of their members were common at Rome. Callistus, having been a man of business, and probably of good practical ability, may have commended himself to the pope as well suited for this office; and it is not unlikely that he occupied the position of an archdeacon also, being said by Hippolytus (as we have seen above) to have been placed in some capacity over the clergy. The situation of this cemetery was doubtless that of the one known as the Cemetery of S. Callistus on the Appian Way, in which thirteen out of eighteen popes from Zephyrinus to Sylvester were buried, and which has been lately excavated by De Rossi with such interesting results of discovery.[†] Zephyrinus himself is said (*Catal. Felic.*) to have been buried "in cimiterio suo juxta cimiterium via Appia"; *i.e.* apparently not in "the cemetery" itself, but in one of his own adjoining it. Lipsius explains by supposing that the cemetery here called that of Zephyrinus was the one which he had himself acquired, and that, Callistus having greatly added to it, the larger extension was afterwards called "the cemetery." It may be observed here that this was quite distinct, and far apart, from the cemetery of Calepodius on the Via Aurelia, which in after years was sometimes called "ad sanctum Callistum," Callistus himself having been buried there, and a basilica to his memory having been erected there: for it is said of pope Julius (d. 352) in the *Catal. Liber.* that he built "basilicam in via Aurelia mil. iiii. ad Calistum."

Zephyrinus is said in *Catalog. Felic.* to have ordered that no cleric of any order should be ordained except in the presence of the clergy and faithful laity, and to have made a constitution, the purport of which, as it stands now in the texts of *Cat. Fel.* it is not easy to understand, but which is given in the *Lib. Pontif. (Vit. S. Zephyr.)* as meaning that "the ministers should carry patens of glass in the church before the priests when the bishop celebrated masses, and that the priests should stand in attendance while masses were thus celebrated." There is other conclusive evidence that anciently, and to a date considerably later than that of Zephy-

[†] De Rossi supposes that the ground, already containing the sepulchral crypt of the Caecilian family, was given to Zephyrinus for the church by that family, which had become a Christian one. He conceives that the crypt called that of S. Caecilia, which adjoins and opens into the papal crypt, was the original one, previously existing, though afterwards enlarged, and that the papal and other surrounding crypts were added after it came into the possession of the church. See some notice of this conjecture in this Art. on URBAN I.

* καὶ αὐτὸς που γράφει λέγων, Εὐξάμενος τὴν ἀρχαιοτάτην Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν ἰδεῖν

rinus, glass patens as well as chalices were in use. (See Labbe, p. 619—*nota Bini* (c.) in *Vit. Zephyrini*.)

Together with most of the early popes, St. Zephyrinus is commemorated as a martyr; "Aug. 26. Romae S. Zephyrinus Papae et martyris." (*Martyr. Rom.*) There is no ground for supposing him to have been one. Two spurious epistles have been assigned to him. (See Labbe.) J. B.—Y.]

ZETUS succeeded EVARISTUS when removed from his see, Cyp. *Ep.* 50; see Routh, R. S. vol. iii., p. 36. (Fell without authority reads *succensorem*, and proposes to read *succussorem* for the perfectly simple *successorem*, which he apparently did not see was to be referred to Zetus.) [E. W. B.]

ZEUZIUS, an African bishop, addressed by Constantine A.D. 330 (*Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 215 Ob., p. 189 Dupin). [H. W. P.]

ZITANUS, magister militum in Sicily, wrote to Gregory the Great in Greek, complaining that certain religious foundations refused to pay taxes on their property. Gregory in May A.D. 600 wrote admitting the justice of the claim, and stating that he had written to Fantinus the defender about it. (*Lpp.* x. 27.) [F. D.]

ZOARAS (1), a Syrian martyr of uncertain date, in whose honour a church was erected at Amida, giving a name to a gate of the city. The church was in being in A.D. 503, and also in A.D. 650, when Simeon, bishop of Edessa, was buried in it. (*Asseman. Bibl. Orient.* i. 117; 425, 558; ii. 226, note 2.) [E. V.]

ZOARAS (2), a turbulent Monophysite Syrian monk, of the 6th century (*Zoapās tis Zūpos*), a contemporary and zealous adherent of Severus, associated with him and Peter of Apamea, in the petitions of the orthodox clergy of Syria, presented to the council of Constantinople under Mennas, A.D. 536, as leaders of the Monophysite heresy, and condemned with them by the synod. The Syriac form of his name, according to Prof. Wright, is *ܙܘܪܐ* *Zéuró*, or according to the eastern pronunciation of the Nestorians, *Zéurá*, meaning "small in stature." We learn from his biography given by Laud (*Anecdot. Syr.* ii. 12-22) that the "blessed Zoaras," as he is called, was a disciple of Habib, "small indeed of stature, but in mind high above high things." He became a Stylite, and made himself a pillar, on which he remained for some years. On being driven from it by the orthodox party (the "Synodites") he started for Constantinople, accompanied by ten of his monks, to make a personal complaint to Justinian of the persecutions of his co-religionists, "the supporters of the true faith." Hostile letters from the orthodox bishops and clergy had preceded him. On his arrival a local synod was hastily summoned by Justinian to give him audience. Zoaras spoke with calmness, and uncompromisingly denounced "the accursed council of Chalcedon." This greatly irritated Justinian, who rebuked him for his presumption. On this Zoaras fired up, and in no measured terms denounced the emperor for his support of heresy, declaring that if he needed a sign he should

have it in his own person. He was speedily attacked by a tumour on the face, which was only cured on the intercession of the empress Theodora after due submission (p. 16). A monastery in the suburb of Sykas (cf. Stabo, vii. 319) was assigned as a residence to Zoaras and his followers by the emperor, where he lived quietly, exercising great liberality (p. 21). The embassy of Agapetus, patriarch of Rome, "of evil memory," with whom Zoaras held a very stormy encounter (p. 17), which resulted in the deposition of the patriarch Anthimus as a concealed Monophysite, and the appointment of Mennas, A.D. 536, caused an outbreak of orthodox fury against Zoaras and his followers. In the various "libelli" presented to the synod under Mennas he and his heresy are denounced in no measured terms. He is described as *ἀλόγιστος, πλήρης πάσης ἀνοίας καὶ ματίας*, a leader of the Acephali, in their impious design of throwing the church of God into confusion, who had learned from Eutyches and Dioscorus to anathematize the holy fathers (Labbe, v. 108). Zoaras had been already condemned and excommunicated by Anthimus's predecessor Epiphanius (*ibid.* 251). Mennas and his synod repeated the condemnation, describing him as one equally incapable of understanding any sacred doctrine and of performing any reasonable action, using his hypocrisy as a bait to the unwary and a cloak for covetousness (*ibid.* 253). The sentence was confirmed by Justinian, who banished Zoaras from the imperial city and its vicinity, and from all the chief cities of the empire, charging him to live in solitude (*ibid.* 267). According to the biography in Land, however, probably under the influence of Theodora, Justinian used entreaties to induce Zoaras and his followers to leave Constantinople (this may have been at an earlier period), and assigned him a monastery in Thrace, named Dokos, thirty miles away, as his residence. Here, too, Theodorus, the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, was living and propagating his doctrines. The length of Zoaras' residence here is uncertain. After a time he left Thrace, and at the interval of some years died, leaving as his successor his disciple, the presbyter Ananias. (*Asseman. Bibl. Or.* ii. 58, 235; Land, *Anecdot. Syr.* ii. 12-22; Bar. Heb. *Chronicon Eccles.* ed. Abbeloos, i. pp. 206-208; Labbe, v. 108, 254, 267.) [E. V.]

ZOCOMUS (*Zókomos*), a Saracen chief in Egypt in the middle of the 4th century, who being childless consulted a famous monk of the neighbouring desert in his affliction. The father having prayed for him assured him that if he would believe in Christ his desire should be gratified. Zocomus complied, and a son was born to him, the result being that he and his whole tribe adopted the Christian faith and were baptized (Soz. vi. 39). [C. H.]

ZOILUS (1), bishop of Larissa in Syria Secunda, a semi-Arian, who united himself to the Acacians at Seleucia and signed their profession of faith (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxiii., no. 26). We find him however uniting himself with the orthodox party on the accession of Jovian, and signing the letter to the emperor drawn up by them at Antioch in 363 (Soz. *H. E.* iii. 21; Soz. *H. E.* vi. 4; Labbe, ii. 828; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 917). [E. V.]

ZOILUS (2), a correspondent of Basil, who having apologized for writing, Basil replies that he hopes that he will send him as many letters as he can, as they are a great delight to him. The severity of the disease under which he is labouring is greater than can be described or even believed. He prays that God may give him strength to bear what He sends for his good. (Basil, *Ep.* 194 [368].) [E. V.]

ZOILUS (3), a presbyter addressed by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. 168, 169) on John xv. 1, xix. 34, Prov. ix. 5, Acts ii. 13, Is. i. 22. [C. H.]

ZOILUS (4), a disciple of ARSENIUS. He and his fellow disciple Alexander were with their master at his death and received his last instructions (*Vitae Patrum*, lib. v. libell. xv. 9). [C. H.]

ZOILUS (5), patriarch of Alexandria, appointed by synod of Gaza A.D. 542 as successor to Paul deposed by it. Zoilus was deposed A.D. 551. He joined in the condemnation of Origen pronounced A.D. 543. (Le Quien, ii. xvi. 435; *AA. SS. Boll.* Jun. v. 66.) [G. T. S.]

ZOIS. [SATURNINUS (11).]

ZOSARIUS, a tribune addressed by Nilus in his Epistles, lib. i. *Epp.* 55-58, in Migne, *P. G.* t. lxxix. col. 107. These letters are interesting for two reasons: first as showing the method of scriptural exegesis followed by Nilus (the first letter begins with a quotation from Isaiah i. 5-7, of which Nilus makes a curious application); and secondly, as illustrating the state of the Jewish controversy in the 5th century. Zosarius had been assailed by Jews who tried to convert him. Nilus replied by pointing to the state of Palestine as fulfilling the words and threats of Isaiah. The Jews when they committed idolatry were exiled into Babylon, but only for seventy years, and even then they enjoyed the ministry of the prophets Ezekiel and Daniel. When, however, they murdered the Son of God, their exile lasted for five hundred years, and they had no prophets. [G. T. S.]

ZOSIMAS (SOSIMAS), an anchorite in Palestine, of uncertain date. The narrative of his converting St. Maria of Egypt, given by Rosweyd as from the pen of Sophronius, bishop of Jerusalem, and translated by Paulus Diaconus, is apocryphal (Rosw. *Vitae Patrum*, pp. 331, etc. See MARIA (4) in this dictionary). [I. G. S.]

ZOSIMUS (1), bishop of Tharassa, in Numidia, which is given in Notit, but otherwise unknown by geographers (Morcelli) or inscriptions; fifty-sixth sufrage in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. [E. W. B.]

ZOSIMUS (2), bishop of Naples, appointed bishop by the emperor Constantius, the Catholic bishop Maximus being deprived and banished. Maximus sent from exile a written sentence of condemnation against the intruder. When LUCIFER of Cagliari passed through to Naples he refused to receive Zosimus, who in the mean time had become a Catholic, and declared he should be deprived by the special judgment of God of the bishopric he wrongfully held. Soon

afterwards, when Zosimus was performing service, his tongue suddenly protruded, and he could not draw it in again. When he left the church he recovered power over it, and the same thing happened regularly whenever he entered a church. Recognizing that the sentence of the two bishops was thus fulfilled, he resigned his bishopric, and passed the rest of his life in penitence. The whole story rests only on the suspicious testimony of Faustinus and Marcellinus, the zealous Luciferians (*Libellus Precum* 16, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 95; Tillemont, *M. E.* vi. 391). [F. D.]

ZOSIMUS (3), a person addressed in numerous epistles by Isidore of Pelusium (lib. i. epp. 22, 61, 118, 128, &c.); a presbyter addressed in very many (ii. 28, 44, 59, 65, 75); a bibliophorus in one (iii. 86). [C. H.]

ZOSIMUS (4), bishop of Rome after Innocent I., from 18th March, A.D. 417, to 25th December, A.D. 418, under Honorius as the western, and Theodorus II. as the eastern emperor. That his ordination was on the 18th of March is concluded from the fact that, Innocent having died on the 12th of that month, Zosimus is spoken of by Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybaeum, in a letter to St. Leo, as having been pope at the time of Easter in the same year, of which the proper day was the 22nd of March, though it was erroneously kept on the 25th; and, popes having been usually ordained on Sundays, it follows that the only Sunday intervening between the 12th and the 22nd, viz. the 18th day of the month, was the day of his ordination. (See Pagi in Baron. ad ann. 417; xvii, xxi, lxxv;) vii. Kal. Jan. (*Dec.* 26) is given as the day of his burial in the *Lib. Pontif.*

Though the episcopate of Zosimus was of short duration, it was full of important action, and therefore memorable. It fell to his lot to entertain and give the final verdict of the Roman see on the burning question of the day, Pelagianism; and also to adjudicate on the less important, yet still long disputed, question of the jurisdiction of the see of Arles in the church of Gaul. These two questions, and the commencement of that of the African Apianus, are what mark his episcopate. In the first he lies under the imputation of having for some time favoured the heresy which he at length condemned; with what justice will appear as we proceed.

The stage at which the Pelagian controversy had arrived when Zosimus became pope was as follows: Coelestius, accused by Paulinus, a deacon, had been condemned at Carthage under the bishop of that see, Aurelius, A.D. 412. Pelagius, accused by two Gallican bishops, Heros and Lazarus, had been acquitted at the synod of Diospolis in Palestine, but condemned along with Coelestius by councils at Carthage, and at Milevis in Numidia, A.D. 416, the great Augustine of Hippo being the leading and most influential opponent of the heresiarchs: letters from these councils had been sent to pope Innocent, seeking his concurrence in the condemnation, but expressed in terms that seem to imply some uncertainty as to what his action would be: but he had in his reply strongly condemned Pelagianism (INNOCENTIUS I.). Coelestius having

fled from Carthage to Ephesus, and thence to Constantinople, and having been expelled from the latter place by the patriarch Atticus, went to Rome, A.D. 417, hoping for the support of Zosimus, who had succeeded to the Roman see. It is to be observed that Atticus, when he expelled Coelestius, had written letters about him to Asia, Carthage and Thessalonica, but not to Rome; this omission being accounted for by the fact that the churches of Rome and Constantinople were not at that time in full communion with each other, owing to the name of John Chrysostom not having been restored to the diptychs of the latter church. On the other hand, Zosimus had before him, when Coelestius appealed to him, letters that had been addressed by Pelagius to pope Innocent, but not received by him before his death. These letters had by no means satisfied St. Augustine (*de Peccat. Orig.* c. 17, 21; *de Grat.* x. 30, 31); but he describes them as being expressed so as to evade the main points at issue, and they may have seemed a sufficient exculpation to the pope, less sharp-sighted than the great African controversialist in detecting heresy, and, as it would seem, less ready to find fault with it in this case. Thus Zosimus was already disposed to receive Coelestius with favour, while the independent action of the African bishops in the time of Innocent may have further inclined him to give the condemned persons a chance of clearing themselves. Coelestius appeared before him in the church of St. Clement; he presented his defence of himself; he was questioned as to whether he spoke sincerely, and as to whether he assented to what pope Innocent had written to the African bishops against the heresies imputed to him and Pelagius; and this Augustine tells us he did, but refused to condemn the alleged errors imputed to him in the *libellus* of Paulinus (his original accuser at Carthage, A.D. 412), which had been sent to Rome. He further, according to Augustine, desired the pope's correction of any error through ignorance that he might have been guilty of; "Si forte (ut hominibus) quispiam ignorantiae error obreperit vestra sententia corrigatur" (*Aug. de Pecc. Or.* c. 607). The result was that Zosimus took up his cause, as of one who had been unfairly and improperly condemned. He wrote accordingly to this effect to Aurelius and the African bishops, desiring them to send persons to Rome to convict the accused of heresy, or to hold him innocent. In the same letter he inveighs against the two Gallican bishops, Heros and Lazarus, who had been the accusers of Coelestius, and pronounces them to be suspended and excommunicated on the ground of their previous lives and characters, of which Coelestius himself had probably told him; and he further complains of the unfairness of the recent proceedings at Carthage, in that neither these two accusers nor the accused had been present at the council; the latter having been condemned unheard at the instance of absent calumniators. [On Heros and Lazarus see Article under their names.] It does not seem to have occurred to him, when he thus wrote, that he was himself condemning absent persons on the testimony (it may be supposed) of a witness likely to be prejudiced against them. After this Zosimus wrote a second time to

Aurelius and the Africans, having meanwhile received a letter in favour of Pelagius from Praylius, bishop of Jerusalem, and others from Pelagius himself. These last had entirely satisfied him of the writer's orthodoxy; they had been publicly read at Rome, and received (says Zosimus) with universal joy; and thereupon, as has been said, Zosimus wrote again to Carthage, declaring Pelagius as well as Coelestius to have fully vindicated themselves against the calumnious accusations as those "whirlwinds and storms of the Church," Heros and Lazarus; to have been condemned by unjust judges; and to be still in the church's communion. He sent with his letter copies of those which he had received from Pelagius. Fragments of these letters, no longer extant entire, are cited by Augustine as being so framed (as his former letter to Innocent had been) as to seem orthodox by evading the real question. Of the letter of Pelagius to pope Innocent a copy is given by Baronius from an old Codex in the Vatican. In it, after repudiation of earlier heresies of which the writer had not been accused, he thus touches on the points at issue: "We confess that the will is free, but so that we always need the help of God, and we condemn those who say with the Manichaeans that man cannot avoid sin, as well as those who assert with Jovinian that man cannot sin;" and he concludes thus: "This is the faith, most blessed pope, which we always have held and hold, in which if anything has been perchance expressed unskillfully or incautiously, we desire correction from thee, who holdest both the faith and the see of Peter. But, if this our confession is approved by the judgment of thy apostolate, then whoever shall wish to asperse me will prove himself to be unskilled, or malevolent, or even not a Catholic, but not me to be a heretic." In his letters to Zosimus he is quoted by Augustine as further repudiating the charge of denying baptism to infants in the same form in which it was administered to adults, or of promising the kingdom of heaven apart from Christ's redemption (*Aug. de Grat. Chr.* 32, &c.; *de Pecc. Or.* 20). It is evident that, as Augustine contended, the real points of the controversy between himself and the Pelagians were untouched in a confession of this kind: there was no definition of what was meant by the divine aid required by man, or of the purposes for which it was required; and it was left uncertain whether or not it was for the remission of original sin that infant baptism was needful. It is difficult to suppose Zosimus to have been so ignorant as not to perceive this, when he declared Coelestius and Pelagius orthodox. It is more probable that he was willing to accept what they did acknowledge as sufficient, leaving the difficult and mysterious questions of grace and free will undefined by authority. Such an attitude appears in the course of his first letter to the Africans, where he says, "Ipsum sane Coelestium et quoscumque qui eo tempore et diversis regionibus aderant sacerdotes admonui, has tenculas quaestionum et inepta certamina, quae non edificant sed magis destruant, ex illa curiositatis contagione profluere, dum unusquisque ingenio suo et intemperanti eloquentia suprascripta abutitur." If this were so, modern theologians of the liberal school may be inclined to approve

rather than censure the action of Zosimus at this period of his career, though it certainly cannot be justified by any who regard Pelagianism as a heresy of vital importance, rightly condemned by the church. For Zosimus must have either been culpably ignorant and unappreciative of the gist of the pending controversy, or, if he understood it, allowed the Pelagian position to be orthodox. Indeed, according to Augustine (*de Pecc. Or.* c. 5, 6) Coelestius, in his defence at Rome, had not even attempted to disguise his denial of inherited guilt: having in his *libellus*, after allowing that infants must be baptized for conferring grace to aid their natural weakness, added further, "In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos infantes non idcirco dicimus ut peccatum ex traduce firmare videamur, quod longe a Catholico sensu alienum est; quia peccatum non cum homine nascitur quod postmodum exercetur ab homine, quia non naturae delictum sed voluntatis esse demonstratur. . . Et hoc praemunire necessarium est, ne per mysterii occasionem ad Creatoris injuriam malum antequam fiat ab homine trudi dicatur homini per naturam." He is not said to have retracted this emphatic statement, or to have been asked to do so; and if so, Zosimus accepted it. The view that has been taken in the pope's defence, namely, that he did not acquit the heresiarchs, but only suspended judgment till they should have a fair hearing in the presence of their accusers, is inconsistent with the obvious drift of his letters to the Africans, and especially of the second. He says in it, speaking of Pelagius and his followers, "Tales etiam absolutae fidei infamari potuisse? Estne ullus locus in quo Dei gratia vel adjutorium praetermissum est? Quod quisque potest praeter eandem vel mente concipere, nec illi supernae sententiae subjectus quae de sancto Spiritu lata est, quod neque hic neque in futuro venia vel remissione donetur?" Inconsistent also with these letters is the view put forward by Augustine in his anxiety to excuse the pope, namely, that the latter acquitted Pelagius and Coelestius, not as being ignorant of or excusing their errors, but as accepting their expressed willingness to correct them if they were in the wrong. (See Baron. *ad ann.* 418, vi.)

As was to be expected, Pelagius and Coelestius were and are still accused of having endeavoured to impose upon the pope by artful and dishonest statements of their views. It is more charitable, and probably more correct, to suppose that all they meant to say was this: "So far we agree with our opponents. Is this confession of our faith enough to satisfy you?" That this was the case with Coelestius, in his defence at Rome,

^a Augustine's words are:—"Sed cum hoc Coelestius in suo libello posuisset inter alia duntaxat, de quibus se adhauc dubitare et instrui velle confessus est, in homine acerrimi ingenii qui profecto, si corrigeretur, plurimis profuisset, voluntas emendationis, non falsitas dogmatis approbata est. Et propterea libellus ejus Catholicus fictus est, quia et hoc Catholicae mentis est, si qua forte aliter sapit quam veritas exigit, non ea certissime definire, sed detecta et demonstrata respuere" (*Ad Bonif. c. cp. Pelag.* l. r. c. 3). He wrote thus in reply to the charge of prevarication made afterwards by Julianus the Pelagian against the Roman bishop, in that he had finally condemned what he had once approved.

certainly appears from Augustine's above-cited extracts from his *libellus*.

By the same messenger (a subdeacon, Basilicus) by whom Zosimus sent his second letter to the bishops at Carthage, he summoned also Paulinus, the original accuser of Coelestius, to repair to Rome. The *libellus* of this Paulinus had been before the pope at the hearing of Coelestius, and the latter had retorted on him the charge of heresy; neither he nor any other accusers had come to Rome, as invited, to make good their accusations; and so Zosimus now summoned him to give an account of himself. But he respectfully refused to go, saying that there was no need; and he assumes in his reply, which is extant, that the pope's verdict had already been on his side, in that Coelestius had been called upon at Rome, however in vain, to condemn the heresies which he, Paulinus, had charged him with. Aurelius also, and the other African bishops, remained resolute in their position. Several letters, no longer extant, appear to have passed between them and Zosimus, alluded to by Augustine (*contra duas Ep. Pelag.* l. 2, c. 3), and by Zosimus himself in his letter to be next cited. Early in the year 418 they held a council of 214 bishops at Carthage, in which they confirmed their condemnation of Pelagius and Coelestius, and declared, with regard to Rome, that they must hold the verdict of Innocent against the heresiarchs to be still in force, unless the latter should recant. The decrees of this council were sent to Zosimus; and he in his extant reply, dated 21st of March 418, begins by a lengthy and high-flown assertion of the authority of the Roman see inherited from St. Peter, which was such, he says, that none might dare to dispute its judgment. Still he declares himself willing to consult his brethren, though not as being ignorant of what ought to be done, or requiring their concurrence. With respect to Coelestius who had appealed to him, he had thought that in former letters he had sufficiently explained the state of the case; but, being informed now that he was considered to have approved him in all respects, he says that his meaning had been misunderstood:—he had only desired to decide nothing rashly; the matter remained as it was, still unsettled; and he had taken no further step with respect to it since the Africans had last heard from him. If he had written at first in this strain, the plea might here be better made out for him that he had only suspended judgment: but the difference between the tone of this letter and that of his former ones is evident. He seems now to be at length aware that he had acted with something of the rashness which he deprecates, while his grand words about his own independent authority as pope, seem meant as a protest against the idea that he is yielding to the Africans, as was in fact the case.

On the 1st of May in the same year, a plenary council representing all Africa, met at Carthage (subsequent, it would seem, to the previous one, the letters from which Zosimus had replied to as above), which passed nine doctrinal canons condemning in detail all the distinctive doctrines of Pelagianism. About the same time the emperor Honorius, moved apparently by the African bishops, issued from Ravenna a Rescript, dated 30th of April 418, and addressed to

Palladius, Praefectus Praetorio, in which he ordered Pelagius and Coelestius with all their adherents to be banished. Zosimus now summoned Coelestius to appear again before him; but the latter escaped from Rome; whereupon the pope at last issued a letter, called by Mercator *Epistola Tractoria*, condemning him and the Pelagian heresy (Marius Mercator, in *Comminitor.*; August. l. 2. *ad Bonifac.* c. 3). This document has not been preserved; but Augustine gives us intimation of its drift (*de Peccat. Orig.* 25; *Ep.* 190, 23). It entered into the whole doctrine of Redemption, which Pelagius and Coelestius were declared to have contravened, but it allowed them the position of penitents in case of their recanting. Baronius, Norisius, Garnier, and others, suppose that this *Tractoria* was issued before the plenary African council and the rescript of the emperor, and that the latter was issued in consequence of it, and at the pope's instigation. Tillemont (t. xiii. pp. 738, 739) proves the contrary. That Honorius issued his edict at the instance of the pope is unlikely, from the mere fact that the pope is in no way referred to in it; and further in a letter addressed in the following year to Aurelius of Carthage (given by Baron. A.D. 419, lvii.) the emperor, alluding to his rescript, speaks of it as issued in deference to the judgment, not of the pope, but of Aurelius; "In quo secuta est clementia nostra iudicium sanctitatis tuae." Further, Augustine (*c. duas ep. Pelag.* ii. c. 3) speaks of Julianus the Pelagian reproaching the Roman clergy with having at length condemned Pelagianism under the influence of fear inspired by the emperor's edict: *Eos jussionis terrore percussos non erubuisse praevaricationis crimen admittere, ut contra priorem sententiam suam, qua gestis catholico dogmati adfuerant, postea pronuntiant malam hominum esse naturam.*"

The *Tractoria* was sent to all parts of the church, and was generally accepted and subscribed, except by nineteen bishops of Italy, headed by Julianus, bishop of Clenum in Campania, who became thenceforth the chief representative of Pelagianism. Julianus wrote two letters of remonstrance to Zosimus in behalf of himself and his friends, and appealed to a general council;—which demand was successfully resisted by Augustine and the Count Valerian. They were deposed by Zosimus, and banished by the emperor. Some are said to have consequently recanted, but not Julianus (Mar. Merc., *Comminit.* c. 3; Aug. *c. Julian.* i. 13; iii. 5; *c. duas ep. Pel.* iv. 34, &c.)

The celebrated case of Apiarius in the year 418 affords evidence, in addition to what has appeared above, of the relations at that time between the African church and the see of Rome. Apiarius was a priest of Mauritania, who, having been excommunicated by his bishop, Urbanus of Sicca, appealed to Zosimus. The latter ordered the restoration of Apiarius, but was not obeyed by the bishop of Sicca, the pope's jurisdiction in the matter being disputed by the Africans. He then deputed Faustinus, bishop of Potentia, with two presbyters, charged with a *Commonitorium*, to go to Carthage in his name. They attended a council there, prepared to pronounce the excommunication of Urbanus, and alleging the pope's authority in the matter on the ground of the

Nicene canons. At the request of the council the pope's *Commonitorium* was read, in which the alleged Nicene canon was quoted. But this canon was not known in Africa as among those of Nice, and the case was adjourned till inquiry should be made; and in the meantime Apiarius was restored to the office of priesthood, but forbidden to officiate in the church of Sicca. For further proceedings in the matter after the death of Zosimus see COELESTINUS I. The canon quoted by Zosimus as Nicene was in fact one of Sardica, with respect to which see under JULIUS (5). The Sardican canons continued to be quoted by subsequent popes—Boniface, Coelestinus, Innocent I., Leo I.—as Nicene, though it had been proved that they were not so, Zosimus, in the case before us, having been the first thus to quote them. He at least is not of necessity to be charged with dishonesty for doing so, since it is not unlikely that the Sardican canons were preserved at Rome as an appendage to those of Nice, and were regarded there as forming part of them.

Zosimus is further memorable for his adjudication on the question of the jurisdiction of the see of Arles in Gaul, and for some of the Gallic bishops having been as little ready as the Africans were to submit to his authority. Patroclus had become the metropolitan of Arles. He had been elected and ordained A.D. 412, on the expulsion by the people of the former metropolitan, Heros—the Gallican bishop, above named, who subsequently, with Lazarus, accused Pelagius of heresy in Palestine and Africa. Hence Zosimus, who as aforesaid, acted and expressed himself so strongly against Heros and Lazarus, was likely to be predisposed to support Patroclus. There had been a long rivalry and struggle for jurisdiction between the two ancient sees of Arles and Vienne. A recent synod at Turin had decided against the claim of Arles to general jurisdiction over other provinces.^b Consequently other Metropolitans—Simplicius of Vienne, Hilarius of Narbonne, and Proculus of Marseilles—had claimed the right of ordaining bishops in their respective provinces independently; and, notably, Proculus, acting on the powers assigned him by the Turin synod as Metropolitan of Narbonensis Secunda, had ordained Lazarus (the friend and

^b "Illud deinde inter episcopos urbium Arelatensis et Viennensis, qui de primatus apud nos honore certabant, a S. Synodo definitum est, ut qui ex eis approbaverit suam civitatem esse metropolim, is totius provinciae honorum primatus obtineat" (*Conc. Taurinense, can. 2*). The Turin synod which passed this canon, assigned by Baronius to the year 397, is said by Gieseler to have been held A.D. 491, and therefore long after the time of Zosimus. But it may express correctly the principle on which the earlier synod, referred to in the text, had gone; namely, that of following in ecclesiastical arrangement the political divisions of the empire. This principle had prevailed in the East, and had in fact been that on which metropolitane and patriarchal jurisdiction seems to have been at first assigned to certain cities. But the popes had often protested against it, as for instance in their maintenance of their own jurisdiction over the Illyrian provinces, after their transference to the Eastern empire, and their opposition to the claims of Constantinople, made on the mere ground of its being the imperial city. In opposition to this principle a special jurisdiction was claimed for Arles on the ground of its ecclesiastical origin.

associate of Heros) to the see of Aquae Sextiae (*Aix*). This was of course likely to be peculiarly displeasing to Zosimus. Patroclus appealed to him (A.D. 417), and he at once wrote to the bishops of Gaul, and also to Aurelius of Carthage, and to the rest of the African as well as to the Spanish bishops, asserting the authority of the bishop of Arles over the provinces of Vienne, and Narbonensis Prima and Secunda, and declaring all who should ordain bishops, or be ordained, within those provinces without his concurrence, to be degraded from the priesthood. In his letter to the bishops of Gaul he further requires that ecclesiastics of all orders from any part of Gaul whatever, proceeding to Rome, or to any other part of the world, should not be received without letters commendatory (*formatae*) from the Metropolitan of Arles. But this last privilege of the see he rests not on ancient right, but on the personal merits of Patroclus; "Hoc autem privilegium Formatarum S. Patroclio, fratri et coepiscopo nostro, meritorum ejus speciali contemplatione concessimus." The jurisdiction of Arles over the above-named provinces he rests on ancient right, derived from Trophimus having been sent from Rome as first bishop of the see, and all Gaul having received the stream of faith from that fountain. With respect to this allegation about Trophimus it may be observed that Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* i. 28), referring to *Passio S. Saturnini Episc. Tolos.*, speaks of seven missionary bishops, including Trophimus, who founded the see of Arles, having been sent from Rome to Gaul, "Decio et Grato consulibus," i.e. A.D. 250. But the see of Arles must have existed before the date assigned, since it appears from Cyprian (*Ep.* vi. 7) that in 254 Marcion had long been bishop of it. There may possibly have been some Trophimus of an earlier date who had been sent from Rome to Arles; but, if so, nothing is known about him. Zosimus is sometimes quoted as having identified this Trophimus with Trophimus the Ephesian (Acts xx. 4; xxi. 29; 2 Tim. iv. 20); but his letters contain nothing to this effect, though such may have been the current tradition. In like manner St. Dionysius, mentioned by St. Gregory of Tours as one of the seven bishops sent at the same time with Trophimus into Gaul, was traditionally identified with the Areopagite.

Zosimus wrote also to the bishops of the provinces Viennensis and Narbonensis Secunda, disallowing the independent authority conceded to the metropolitans of those provinces by the Turin synod; to Hilarius of Narbonne, the metropolitan of Narbonensis Prima, forbidding him to ordain bishops independently of Arles, declaring all whom he should so ordain excommunicate, and threatening him with the same sentence; and also to Patroclus, confirming to him the alleged ancient rights of his see, together with the privilege, above mentioned, of alone giving *Firmatae* to ecclesiastics from all parts of Gaul. Simplicius of Vienne so far deferred to the pope's authority as to send a legate to him; and Zosimus, in a letter to him, dated 1 Oct. in the same year (417), allowed him, for the sake of peace, to go on for the present ordaining bishops in the neighbouring cities of the province in accordance with the order of the

CHRIST. BIOGR.—VOL. IV.

Turin synod. No such deference to Rome was shown by Proculus of Marseilles, who continued to ordain, though the pope had pronounced his deposition. Tumults ensued at Marseilles, where there seem to have been two parties. Consequently in the following year (418) Zosimus wrote to the clergy and people there, warning them to oppose the attempts of Proculus, and to submit to Patroclus; and to Patroclus himself, enjoining him to assert his authority. Notwithstanding all this, Proculus maintained his position as bishop of Marseilles, and metropolitan of Narbonensis Secunda. With regard to the personal merits of Patroclus and Proculus, Baronius finds himself compelled to confess that the pope was deceived in his estimate and support of the former, who was himself an intruder in the see of Arles, and who bore a bad character. Prosper (*Chron.*) speaks of him as one who "infami mercatu sacerdotia venditare ausus est." Proculus, on the contrary, is commended by St. Jerome (*Ep.* 4) as "a holy man." The question of the jurisdiction of Arles, by no means settled (as has been seen) by Zosimus, long continued to be a bone of contention in Gaul, as will be seen in the lives of many subsequent popes. Zosimus died soon after writing the letters last mentioned, and was buried, according to the *Lib. Pontif.*, on the 26th of December, "via Tiburtina juxta corpus beati Laurentii martyris."

In the *Martyrolog. Rom.* he is noticed thus; Dec. 26, "Ibidem (sc. Romae) Zosimi papae et confessoris," with this note appended, "De eodem Beda; sed per errorem confusus habetur cum alio Zosimo, de quo idem *supra* 15 Kal. Januarii." The blunder appears to have been Baronius's, not Bede's. In Bede's *Martyrology* had been found, "xv. Kal. Jan., S. Zosimus martyr, qui pro confessione fidei passus est." The reference was to an early martyr of that name, who is mentioned by St. Polycarp. Some transcriber having ignorantly confused him with pope Zosimus, Baronius, in revising the Roman *Martyrology*, perpetuated the error, making two saints out of one.

The main authorities for his life, as above given, are his own letters and other documents, to be found in Baronius and Labbe, the works of St. Augustine, and Prosper (*Chron.*).

[J. B.—y.]

ZOSIMUS (5), one of the Byzantine historians, and worthy of particular attention, not only owing to his general merits as a writer of history, but because, as a heathen and bitterly opposed to Christianity, he gives us the heathen view of the causes of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire.

There is considerable uncertainty as to the date at which Zosimus flourished, some authors assigning him to the time of Honorius at the close of the 4th century (he succeeded his father A.D. 395), and others to that of Anastasius at the close of the 5th (he reigned from A.D. 491 to A.D. 518). The probability is that the first of these dates is too early, the second too late, and that Zosimus belongs to the first half of the 5th century. This is the conclusion come to by Cave, who speaks of him as flourishing A.D. 425 (*Hist. Lit.* p. 302). Reitemeier on the other hand, proceeding upon what he takes to be the evidence afforded by his own writings, places him as late as A.D. 470 (*Disquis. in Corpus Ser.*

H. B. p. 27). The middle of the century may perhaps be accepted as a probable date. Fabricius says that he wrote after A.D. 425. This much at least is certain, that he lived in the decline of the empire, and that it was the melancholy spectacle of its decay and ruin which led him to make the effort to discover the causes, and to commemorate the particulars, of so great a fall. The place of his birth is unknown, but he had fixed his residence at Constantinople, where he would seem to have held the position of a *Comes* and *Exadvocatus Fisci*. The office appears to have been connected either with the government of the city, or the administration of the royal revenues. In his work, *De Aed.* iii. 1, he tells us himself that the ruler of a province was called a *Comes*. Although a heathen, Zosimus was not a polytheist, for in one passage at least of his history, when referring to an oracle which had predicted the greatness of Old Byzantium, he speaks of the Deity in highly worthy terms. "Let no one think," he says, "that because a long period passed before the prediction was fulfilled it must refer to something else, for all time is short to the Divine Being who always is and shall be" (ii. 37). He paid honour, however, to the heathen religious rites, honouring them as rites which had come down from former generations (v. 23), complaining of the attempts of various emperors to extinguish them (ii. 29, iv. 59), lamenting the fact that the oracles of the gods were no longer listened to (i. 57), and finding in the abandonment of the old religion one main cause of the decline of the empire (iv. 59). At the same time he ridicules Christianity as an unreasonable conglomerate, *ἄλογος συγκατάθεσις* (iv. 59), sneers at Christian soldiers as only able to pray (iii. 2, iv. 23), and welcomes any opportunity of giving the most false representations of the Christian faith (ii. 29, iv. 59). A historian of such a spirit can hardly be relied on for an account of the events of a time when the old superstitions which he venerated were compelled to yield to the advancing power of a religion which he abhorred; and even his admirers are constrained to admit, that he is not to be trusted where his prejudices on religious matters come into play. Reitemeier, who defends him on the whole, allows that he was too partial to the heathen, too unjust to Christians (*Disquis.* p. 26); and Gibbon speaks of his "passion and prejudice," of his "ignorant and malicious suggestions," and of the "malcontent insinuations of the heathen Zosimus" (chaps. xvii. xx.). His accounts of the conversion of Constantine, and of the character of Theodosius (ii. 29, iv. 26-33), are in this respect particularly worthy of notice. To the former, as well as to many other of his most scandalous charges against that emperor, Evagrius replied in the fiercest language, addressing him as a "wicked spirit and fiend of hell" (iii. 41); and for the latter he has been condemned by Gibbon in milder but hardly less emphatic language (chap. xxvii.). De Broglie refers, for a full refutation of the story regarding the conversion of Constantine, to the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript.* 49, p. 470, etc.

From all that has been said, the inference must not be hastily drawn that Zosimus is, as a historian, unworthy of our regard. On the

contrary he may be justly described as one of the best historians of these early centuries. Even his views on church matters are highly interesting, as showing us the light in which they were regarded by the more intelligent of the heathen; nor are they always wanting in truth and forcibleness of statement. His description of the monks, for example, who so often troubled both the empire and the church, is an important counterpoise to the exaggerated estimate always formed of them by the professed ecclesiastical historians of the age. "They forswear lawful marriages, and fill their institutions both in cities and villages with unmarried men who are of no service either for war or for any work useful to the state, except that, making progress from their beginning to the present day, they have taken possession of a great part of the land, and that, on pretence of sharing everything with the poor, they reduce, so to speak, all to poverty" (v. 23). At the same time the exposure that he makes of the tyranny and crimes of several of the first Christian emperors cannot be set aside as inconsistent with the probabilities of the case. In any descriptions given by him of such things he has said nothing even approaching in severity the accounts that have come down to us from other sources, while we cannot forget that other historians, to whom we owe our knowledge of the persons of whom he speaks,—Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Philostorgius, and Evagrius—were naturally predisposed to conceal the vices, and to exaggerate the virtues of those who, in their public capacity, were defenders of the faith. In estimating, too, the value of Zosimus as a historian, it must be borne in mind that he treats more largely of civil affairs than these others had done, and that we owe to him many facts connected with the condition of the military, their degeneracy, exactions, and dissoluteness, which they passed over in silence, but which other historians have acknowledged to have contributed in no slight degree to the fall of the empire.

There seems indeed no sufficient ground to ascribe intentional bad faith to the history before us. That the writer was mistaken in many of his conclusions, and especially in those relating to the influence of Christianity, is unquestionable. That he occasionally gave too easy credence to unfounded statements is not less so; but it has never been proved that he wilfully perverted facts for the sake of establishing any theory that he held.

Zosimus is not to be considered in all respects as an original historian. It is probable that he would have exhibited more originality had he, according to his intention, been able to bring his history down to his own time. It closes, however, with the year A.D. 410. Either he had been hindered by death from prosecuting it further, or some portions of it have been lost. He is thus occupied throughout it all with events previous to his own day, and in relating these he seems rather to epitomize works of predecessors in the same field than to write original narrative. Reitemeier finds that in the first part of his history he followed the *Synopsis* of Denippus, in the middle and larger part the *Chronicon* of Eunapius, and in the last part the *Silva* of Olympiodorus (*Disquis.* p. 35). Photius

also charges him with extensive copying of Eunapius (comp. Fabricius, vi. p. 232, note). It seems to have been his admiration of Polybius that led him to write. That historian had described the rise of the Roman Empire, and Zosimus, beholding everywhere around him its majestic ruins, would describe its fall. Nor will he merely describe the phenomena: he proposes also to investigate their causes. He begins, accordingly, with the reign of Augustus, and, passing hastily over the time which intervened till the accession of Constantine, he occupies himself mainly with the reigns of that emperor and his successors. His theory upon the fall of the Roman Empire may be summed up in the following particulars:—The change of government to its imperial form (i. 5); the removal of the soldiery into cities where they were debased by luxury and vice (ii. 34); the iniquitous exactions of successive emperors (ii. 38, iv. 28, 29, 41, v. 12); above all, the casting aside of the old religion, and the neglect of the responses of the oracles (i. 57). There can be little doubt that he regarded this last cause as the most important, so frequently does he allude to it (ii. 7, iv. 37, 59, v. 38, etc.). He expresses what was often thought and said at the time, and it is not a little interesting to think that to the view thus taken we owe, in no small degree, the production of Augustine's immortal work, *De Civitate Dei*.

The style of the history of Zosimus has been praised by Photius as concise, perspicuous, pure, and, though not adorned by many figures, yet by no means devoid of sweetness (*Cod.* 98). Heyne has praised it in exactly similar terms (*Corp. Ser. H. B., Zosimus*, p. 16). These commendations are deserved. Zosimus is in a great measure free from the ambitious periods of most of the historians of his age. His narrative is circumstantial, but clear. His language is well chosen, and often in a high degree nervous and antithetical. He was not free from superstition; and the fact that a historian, generally so calm and so far removed from the credulity of his day, should have put his faith in oracles, and should have recorded without hesitation appearances of Minerva and Achilles to Alaric, together with various other miracles (see them in Fabricius, vi. p. 610), may show us how deep-seated such ideas were in the minds of his contemporaries, and may help to prove that the Christian belief in visions and miracles then prevailing was not inconsistent with sobriety of judgment and sound principles of criticism in other matters.

The history of Zosimus embraces the period between Augustus and A.D. 410. It may be consulted for the lives and actions of the emperors between these dates, more especially for those of Constantine, Constantius, Theodosius the

elder, Honorius and Arcadius; for accounts of the Huns, Alamanni, Scythians, Goths, and minor barbarous tribes; for the war in Africa in the time of Honorius, the campaign of Alaric in Italy, and the taking of Rome; for the right of asylum in Christian churches, and the changes introduced into the army; for an important description of Byzantium, old and new, and of Britain; and finally, among many other points which it is unnecessary to notice, for an account of the secular games to which, celebrated only once in 110 years, the people were summoned with the stirring, yet solemn, cry—*quos nec spectavit quisquam nec spectaturus est*. In addition to these things, some of the ancient oracles will be found preserved by Zosimus.

An edition of the history of Zosimus in Greek and Latin, with notes by Sylburgius, was published at Frankfort in 1590, and was followed by a similar edition at Oxford in 1672. The best edition is that of Reitemeier, in Greek and Latin, with the notes of Heyne, which appeared at Leipzig in 1784, after which Bekker published one in Greek and Latin, with the notes of Reitemeier, at Bonn, in 1837. [W. M.]

ZOTICUS (1), bishop of Comana, in Pamphylia Prima, stated by an anonymous anti-Montanist writer, also by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 18), as also by Apollonius (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18), to have proposed to exorcise the Montanist prophetess, Maximilla, when first she came forward at Pezuza, but not to have been permitted by the other Montanists to offer her this indignity. [G. S.]

ZOTICUS (2), bishop of Quintianum, according to Dupin, a town in the Tyrol, present at the council at Rome, A.D. 313 (*Opt.* i. 23). [H. W. P.]

ZOTION, deacon. [SOTION.]

ZUMURUS, or Zucius, a priest who neglected to carry a message to the bishop of Uzalis about the relics of St. Stephen, and received, it was said, a blow from an unseen hand by way of rebuke (*Aug. de Mirac. S. Steph.* vol. vii. app. p. 858, ed. Migne). [H. W. P.]

ZUNTFREDUS (SUNIFREDUS), thirteenth archbishop of Narbonne, in the last quarter of the 7th century. He was represented at the thirteenth and fourteenth councils of Toledo in 683 and 684, and was present in person at the fifteenth in 688. There is extant a letter addressed to him by Idalius, bishop of Barcelona, which accompanied the gift of a copy of the *Prognosticum Futuri Saeculi* of Julian of Toledo (*Migne, Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 818). After Zuntfredus there is an interval of about eighty years in the archbishops of Narbonne, the see being in the hands of the Saracens (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 14). [S. A. B.]

also charges him
Eunapius (comp.
seems to have be
that led him to
scribed the rise o
mus, beholding
majestic ruins, w
he merely describ
also to investigat
cordingly, with
passing hastily o
till the accessio
himself mainly w
and his successors
the Roman Empir
following particu
ment to its imp
of the soldiery int
by luxury and
exactions of succ
29, 41, v. 12); al
old religion, and
the oracles (i. 57
that he regarded
portant, so frequ
iv. 37, 59, v. 38,
often thought an
a little interesti
thus taken we ov
duction of Augu
tate Dei.

The style of t
praised by Photi
and, though not
by no means d
Heyne has prais
(*Corp. Ser. H. B*
mendations are o
measure free fro
of the historian
circumstantial, b
chosen, and often
antithetical. He
and the fact tha
and so far reme
day, should hav
should have re
pearances of M
together with v
in Fabricius, v
deep-seated suc
contemporaries,
Christian belief
vailing was no
judgment and s
other matters.

The history o
between Augus
consulted for th
perors between
those of Constan



the scale towards document

Arcadius; for accounts of
ai, Scythians, Goths, and
es; for the war in Africa in
s, the campaign of Alaric in
of Rome; for the right of
churches, and the changes
army; for an important
atum, old and new, and of
, among many other points
ary to notice, for an account
to which, celebrated only
the people were summoned
ret solemn, cry—*quos nec
ec spectaturus est*. In addi-
some of the ancient oracles
ved by Zosimus.

history of Zosimus in Greek
by Sylburgius, was pub
in 1590, and was followed by
Oxford in 1672. The best
temeier, in Greek and Latin,
Heyne, which appeared at
er which Bekker published
Latin, with the notes of
in 1837. [W. M.]

shop of Comana, in Pamphy-
y an anonymous anti-Mon-
y Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 18), as
Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18), to have
e the Montanist prophethess,
st she came forward at Pe-
ave been permitted by the
offer her this indignity. [G. S.]

bishop of Quintianum, ac-
town in the Tyrol, present
me, A.D. 313 (*Opt.* i. 23). [H. W. P.]

[SOTION.]

Zucius, a priest who neg-
ssage to the bishop of Uzalis
St. Stephen, and received, it
m an unseen hand by way of
rac. S. Steph. vol. vii. app. [H. W. P.]

(SUNIFREDUS), thirteenth
onne, in the last quarter of
He was represented at the
teenth councils of Toledo in
was present in person at the
There is extant a letter ad-
Idalius, bishop of Barcelona,
the gift of a copy of the
Saeculi of Julian of Toledo
xvii. 818). After Zunftfredus
of about eighty years in the
bonne, the see being in the
is (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 14). [S. A. B.]



