St. Claudius, in the Jura, circ. A.D. 696–731. He was prior, or praepositus, under his predecessor St. Claudius, and after becoming abbat, governed for thirty-five years (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 245). He is said to have been the author of a work illustrating the piety of the monks of the Jura, possibly a life of his predecessor. But it has not survived (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 649). Though a saint he appears to have no day. [S. A. B.]

S

SABAOTH. Some of the Gnostic sects indulged in a rather complicated mythology, and without much knowledge of the language, had recourse to Hebrew for their nomenclature. Irenaeus (I. xxx.) and Origen (*Adv. Cels.* vi. 31) agree in telling us of Ophite sects who gave names to the seven rulers of the planetary spheres. The highest was Ialdabaoth, whose planet we are told was φαίνων or Saturn. The next two were Iao and Sabaoth, who, it may be presumed, answered to Jupiter and Mars respectively.

Epiphanius tells several times (*Haer.* xxv. 2, xxvi. 10, xl. 5, xlv. 1) that, besides the Gnostics who gave the highest place to Ialdabaoth, there were others who gave that place to Sabaoth, and who identified him with the God of the Jews. Some of them ascribed to Sabaoth the form of an ass or a swine (Epiph. xxvi. 10), accounting thus for the Jewish prohibition of the use of swine's flesh. There were those who said that Sabaoth had hair like a woman; and who taught that after death the fully enlightened Gnostic, having climbed through the realms of the other Archons, would step on the head of Sabaoth in order to attain the upper district presided over by Barbelo.

Both Irenaeus and Epiphanius censure the ignorance of Hebrew exhibited in the Gnostic appropriation of Scripture names. Irenaeus (ii. 35) tells us that Sabaoth with the long o denotes "Voluntarius," but with the short o (Sabaōth) manifests the first heaven [HEBREW LEARNING, Vol. II. p. 854.] But Epiphanius (xxvi. 10, xl. 5), correcting with more skill, explains that Sabaoth in the Bible ought not to be translated as if it were a noun in apposition to Κύριος, but as a genitive case, and that Ἀδωναὶ Σαβαώθ was to be translated Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, or as Aquila had rendered, Κύριος στρατιῶν.

In *Pistis Sophia* we have at least three personages called Sabaoth, viz. (1) Sabaoth magnus ἀγαθός, whom Jesus describes as his father, as having received from him a power which in him took the place of the ψυχή (pp. 14, 193). (2) Sabaoth parvus ἀγαθός, "quem vocant in κόσμῳ Δία" (p. 232), and (3) Sabaoth Adamas, once ruler over six of the twelve Archons (p. 360), now one of the archons of punishment, whose satellite hands the cup of oblivion to souls about to migrate into new bodies (p. 380). [G. S.]

SABARIUS, of Auxerre. [SAVARICUS.]

SABAS (1), ST., Apr. 24, a Gothic officer, martyred at Rome, with seventy others, under Aurelian. (*AA. SS.* Boll. 24 April. iii. 261.)

SABAS (2), April 12, a more celebrated Gothic martyr, who suffered under Athanaricus king of the Goths towards the end of the fourth century. His acts seem genuine, and contain many interesting details of Gothic life in the lands bordering on the Danube. Thus village life, with its head men and communal responsibility, appear in cap. ii. After various tortures he was drowned in the river Musaeus, which flows into the Danube. The acts are in the form of an epistle from the Gothic church to the church of Cappadocia, whither Soranus, who was "Dux Scythiae," had sent his relics. (Ruinart. *Acta Sincera*, p. 670; *AA. SS.* Boll. April. ii. 88; Ceill. iv. 278); C. A. A. Scott, *Ulfilas, Apostle of the Goths*, 1885, p. 80. On the topography of the region where he suffered there is an exhaustive article in the *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 1881–82, t. xcix. p. 437–492, by Professor Tomaschek, of the University of Graz. [G. T. S.]

SABAS (3), a monk of Mount Sinai. He suffered, with many of the brethren, at the hands of the Saracens, who invaded Palestine and Arabia under Mavia their queen, December, 373. Soz. *H. E.* vi. 38.) [G. T. S.]

SABAS (4), one of the original Messalian or Euchite leaders, condemned at a council, and exiled by Flavian of Antioch. [EUCHITES, Vol. II. p. 259; cf. Ceill. x. 47.] [G. T. S.]

SABAS (5) (Σάββας), bishop of Paltus in Syria Prima (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 799). He was present at the council of Antioch, c. 445, in the matter of Athanasius bishop of Perrha, and took an active part (Hard. i. 579, 583, 587, 594, 595; Tillem. xiv. 650). He was also prominent at the council of Constantinople, 448, against Eutyches (Hard. ii. 138, 170; Tillem. xiv. 659, xv. 283, 285, 511–513, 534), and at Chalcedon in 451 subscribed the condemnation of Dioscorus (Hard. ii. 370; Tillem. xv. 663). In 458 he subscribed the letter of his province to the emperor Leo I. (Mansi, vii. 549). [C. H.]

SABAS (6), ST., Dec. 5, abbat in Palestine and founder of the Laura of St. Sabas. He was born in A.D. 439, near Caesarea in Cappadocia. At eight years old he entered a neighbouring monastery and at eighteen went on a pilgrimage to the holy places at Jerusalem, where he entered the monastery of St. Passarion. At the age of thirty he established himself as an anchorite in the desert, where he lived in a cavern. Several persons joining him there, he laid the foundations of his monastery on a rock on the Kidron river, where it still remains. Cf. Murray's *Handbook for Syria*, p. 229. He was ordained priest by Sallustius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the year 491. Several Armenians united themselves soon after to this community, which led to a mixture of Greek and Armenian rites in the celebration of Holy Communion. Sabas ordained that the first part should be celebrated in Armenian, but the actual words of consecration be said in Greek. In 493 the original monastery had increased so much that he built another at a short distance. He was sent as an ambassador

to Constantinople in A.D. 511, by the patriarch Elias, to counteract the influence of Severus and the Monophysites with the emperor Anastasius, [ELIAS (1)] and again by Peter, Pat. of Jerusalem, in A.D. 531, to ask from the emperor remission of the taxes due by Palestine, and help to rebuild the churches ruined by invasion. He died Dec. 5, 531, aged 91 years. His life was written by Cyril of Scythopolis [CYRILLUS (13)]. Copious extracts from it will be found in Ceillier, xi. 274–277; and Fleury, *H. E.* lib. vii. § 30–32. The whole life is in Coteler. *Monument.* t. iii. [G. T. S.]

SABAZIUS, a Phrygian deity, under whom the Fathers recognised Jupiter. In the mysteries connected with his cult, variously called Sabazia, Sabadia, Sebadia, the serpent was made use of, a shape which Sabazius assumed in order to make love to his own daughter Proserpina. (Cf. Arnobius, v. 21; Firmicus Maternus *de Errore Prof. Rel.* c. 11; *AA. S. Theodot.* c. 24, in Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.*). Lenormant collects all the references to the cultus of the deity and his mysteries in a learned article in the *Rev. Archéol.* (1874), t. xxviii. p. 300. (Cf. A. Maury's *Religions de la Grèce*, t. iii. 101–106.) [G. T. S.]

SABBATIANI. [SABBATIUS (2).]

SABBATIUS (1), Sep. 19, martyr with Trophimus at Antioch in Pisidia, under Heliodorus the governor, in the reign of Probus. (*Vid.* refs. in *D. C. A.* and Tillem. iv. 366.) [C. H.]

SABBATIUS (2), a Novatianist presbyter, ordained by Marcianus as Novatianist bishop of Constantinople. He seceded, previous to 380, from the main body of that sect, with two others, Theoctistes and Macarius. They maintained that Easter ought to be celebrated on the same day and in the same manner as the Jews. Sabbatius also complained that unworthy persons were admitted to the Novatianist communion. In fact, he and his followers found the same fault with the Novatianists which the Novatianists found with the church. The same tendency to repeated schisms has often been seen among some modern sects of the same type. Any minute question forms a basis for renewed separations. He became bishop of a small sect called after him, Sabbatiani, whose baptism was recognised in the seventh canon of the second general council. Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. 18) gives a long account of his secession, and thereupon takes occasion to treat of the various times and modes of observing the Paschal feast. [G. T. S.]

SABBATIUS (3), a great friend of the monks, but himself married. He was a native of Jericho, and visited, in the secrecy of the night, all the cells round Jericho, where he left food for the monks. (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* c. 112.) [J. G.]

SABELLIANISM is the Eastern name for the movement designated Patripassianism in the West. It formed a portion of the great Monarchian movement, and can only be rightly understood in connexion therewith We can trace the rise of this heresy back to the age of Justin Martyr. In his *Apol.* i. § 63, he refers to those "who affirm that the Son is the Father," and condemns them; a condemnation which he repeats in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, § 128, cf. Bull's *Defence of Nic. Creed*, t. i. 138; t. ii. 626; *Judgm. Cath. Ch.* iii. 198; Dodwell, indeed, in *Dissert. Iren.* vi. 26, ascribes its origin to Simon Magus, cf. *Iren. Haer.* i. 23. However this may be, its development came only later on. The 2nd century was the age of Gnosticism. Now one of the essential principles of Gnosticism is the emanation theory, which places a number of aeons, emanations from the Divine Being, intermediate between God and the Creation. The champions of Christian orthodoxy were led, in opposition to this view, to insist most strenuously upon the Divine Monarchy, God's sole, independent and absolute existence and being. Thus we find Irenaeus writing a treatise περὶ μοναρχίας some time about A.D. 190 [IRENAEUS, Vol. III. p. 263], addressed to a Roman presbyter, Florinus, who had fallen away to Gnosticism. Asia Minor had always been the chosen haunt of Gnosticism. There too the reaction to the opposite extreme found its chief development. Asiatic Gnosticism placed many emanations, subordinate divine beings, between God and man; and pointed to the Son and the Holy Ghost as specimens of such aeons or emanations. Cf. Tertull. *Cont. Prax.* c. 8. Their opponents, as Christians, were obliged to uphold the existence of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and yet had to devise some theory whereby that existence could be reconciled with the Divine Monarchy. Some therefore adopted the view which Dorner calls Ebionite Monarchianism. They defended the Monarchy by denying the deity of Christ. Others fell back on the theory which identifies the Persons of the Godhead with the Father, and which goes by the name of Sabellianism, though, as with many another sect and heresy, that name is not derived from the original inventor of this view. Sabellianism in fact was one of the inevitable mistakes men must fall into, while groping their way to the complete Christological conception. It was in the 2nd century an orthodox reaction against Gnosticism, as in the 4th century the Sabellianism of that period in the hands of Marcellus of Ancyra was a reaction against Arianism. Tertullian indeed expressly asserts, in the opening of his treatise against Praxeas, that this heresy had sprung out of a desire to maintain orthodoxy. We might conclude *à priori* that Sabellianism would have sprung up first of all in Asia Minor. But we are not left devoid of positive evidence to this effect, for all the earliest leaders of this party belonged to that district. Praxeas was a confessor from Asia Minor, Noetus and his brother were from Smyrna. The secondary leaders of the sect, Epigonus, Cleomenes and Sabellius, were members of the Roman Church, but yet its Eastern origin is still further confirmed by the persistent description of Sabellius as an Egyptian or African in the writers of the 4th or 5th centuries. In fact, in the second, as in every succeeding century, the Roman Church was devoid of speculative ability sufficient to originate a heresy. Historians naturally concluded therefore that such a theory must have been devised in the East. But yet though unable to originate, the Roman

Church was one of the chief stages whereon the controversial struggle was waged. From the year 190 till the death of Hippolytus, about A.D. 236, the anti-Gnostic party at Rome was divided into three great sections; 1st, there were the followers of Noetus, or the Patripassian party; 2nd, the party of Hippolytus, which insisted so strongly upon the personal distinction between the Father and the Son, as to be called by their opponents, Ditheists; while there was, 3rd, the intermediate party of Zephyrinus and Callistus. Hippolytus in fact accuses Callistus (*Refut.* ix. 7) of inventing a new heresy, which identified the Father and the Son, and taught that they both were one with the Holy Ghost, which became incarnate in the Virgin's womb. The visit of Origen to Rome, which happened some time in the years 211–217, must have introduced him to a knowledge of the controversy, as we find abundant reference to it and refutations of it in his various writings. The materials for tracing the development of Sabellian views during the 3rd century are very defective. Novatian on the Trinity, capp. 12, 18, 21, 22, deals with the subject and treats it as an acknowledged heresy, using the very same Scripture arguments as Justin Martyr in his *Dial. cum Tryp.* §§ 126–129. Novatian is indeed the earliest author who distinctly calls this view the Sabellian heresy. The controversy next emerges into the full light of day in North Africa, about the year 260. It permeated very largely the district of Pentapolis in Libya, under the leadership of two bishops of that district, Ammon and Euphranor [EUPHRANOR]. Dionysius of Alexandria wrote against their teaching, whereupon he was himself accused of heresy to his namesake, Dionysius of Rome. The documents bearing on the discussion between these two fathers have been industriously collected in Routh's *Reliquiae*, t. iii. 370–400, while the merits of the controversy have been already explained under DIONYSIUS of Alexandria. In the 4th century the controversy again burst forth in connexion with the teaching of Marcellus of Ancyra, who, in his opposition to Arianism and the subordination theory of Origen, was led to a denial of any personal distinction between the First and Second Persons of the Trinity. Marcellus, indeed, was probably only guilty of loose expressions, but his disciple Photinus worked out his system to its logical conclusions and boldly proclaimed Sabellian views. Eusebius of Caesarea wrote against Marcellus, and it is from the extracts in his two treatises, *Cont. Marcell.* and *De Ecclesiast. Theolog.* that we derive most of our information concerning Marcellus. [EUSEB. of CAESAREA, Vol. II. p. 341.] (Cf. Epiph. *Haer.* lxxii.) The controversy continued to rage throughout the remainder of the 4th century. Athanasius, Basil, Hilary, Chrysostom, all condemned Marcellus and his teaching. Basil's letters are a repertory of information about the state of this controversy during the latter half of 4th century. Basil first called Sabellius an African, solely, as it would seem, because of the prevalence of Sabellianism in the Pentapolis, under Dionysius of Alexandria, when probably Sabellius himself was long since dead. The interest in the controversy ceased by degrees as men became engaged in the great Nestorian and Eutychian discussions of the 5th cent. Yet Sabellianism continued to linger on in various quarters. Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxii.) says that in his time they were still numerous in Mesopotamia and in Rome—a fact which an inscription discovered at Rome in 1742 confirms; it runs thus, "qui et Filius diceris et Pater inveniris," evidently erected by Sabellian hands. (Northcote's *Epitaph. of Catacombs*, p. 102.) Augustine speaks of them, however, as practically extinct in Africa. Cf. *Ep. ad Dioscorum*, cx. We have thus sketched the direct history of Sabellianism, but we can trace it in other directions. The Montanist section of the church was in general enthusiastically orthodox, Tertullian's work against Praxeas is sufficient evidence of this. Yet one portion of it fell into this speculative error. The Pseudo-Tertullian in his treatise against heresies, c. 21, tells us of one section of the Montanists, headed by a certain Aeschines, who, in addition to the ordinary theories of the sect, held that Christ was both Father and Son. This subdivision of the sect may have spread into Pontus and given employment to Gregorius Thaumaturgus, whose writings were, in the 4th century, quoted on both sides of this question. Thus in Basil, *Epistles*, no. ccx, we find him arguing against the Sabellian party in Gregory's own episcopal city of Neo-Caesarea and striving to explain away the force of a sentence they brought forward out of Gregory's Ἔκθεσις τῆς πίστεως which ran as follows: Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν ἐπινοίᾳ μὲν εἶναι δύο, ὑποστάσει δὲ ἕν; where the confusion between ὑπόστασις and οὐσία led, as in the controversy between the two Dionysii, of Rome and of Alexandria, to much debate between persons who were substantially agreed. [DIONYSIUS (6).] The Patripassian and Sabellian views spread into the most distant East before the middle of the 3rd century, as the adoption of somewhat similar views led to the discussion between Origen and Beryllus of Bostra [BERYLLUS]. In the amalgam of heresies taught by Paul of Samosata, Sabellian views seem to have had an important share.

We shall conclude with a brief statement of this heresy. Those who wish a more lengthened one may consult Dorner, who is, however, more than usually involved when dealing with this heresy. Much of his statement sets forth not indeed what the upholders thereof taught, but what he conceives they must have taught, which is very different. At the beginning of this article we stated that the Monarchian party were divided into two sections. One guarded the Monarchy by denying to Christ any real share in the Divine Nature. They were Ebionites, or pure humanitarians, in their view of Christ's person. The other guarded it by denying any personal distinctions in the Godhead, and thus identifying the Father and the Son. Still the difficulty stared them that Christ is called the Son of God, and that a son necessarily supposed a Father distinct from himself. Tertul. *Cont. Prax.* c. 10. They evaded this difficulty by making a distinction between the Logos and the Son of God. The Logos was itself eternally identical with God the Father. The Son of God did not exist till the Incarnation, when the Eternal Logos manifested its activity in the sphere of time, in and through the man Christ Jesus. "In the Old Testament," says Sabellius, "no mention is made of the Son of God, but only of the Logos." Athan. *Orat.* iv. s. 23. The Sonship is only a

mere temporary matter, however (cf. Gregor. Nyss. *Cont. Sabell.* in Mai's *Coll. Nov. Vett. Scriptt.* t. viii. pars ii. p. 4), and when the work of man's salvation is completed the Logos will be withdrawn from the humanity of Christ, into that personal union and identity with the Father which existed from eternity, while the humanity will be absorbed into the original Divine nature. All this was in fact summed up in the distinction which was drawn between the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and the λόγος προφορικός. Here it was that Sabellianism merged into Pantheism. The ultimate end of all things, according to Sabellius, was the restoration of the Divine Unity; that God, as the absolute Μονάς, should be all in all. If then the absorption of Christ's humanity into the absolute Μονάς was necessary for this purpose, much more the absorption of all inferior personal existences. Neander points out that this system presents many points of resemblance to the Alexandrian-Jewish theology. Epiphanius, indeed, expressly asserts (*Haer.* lxii. cap. 2) that Sabellius derived his system from the apocryphal gospel of the Egyptians, where it was related that Christ had taught his disciples, as a great mystery, the identity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. This gospel insisted upon the element of Sabellianism most akin to Pantheism, viz. that all contrarieties will be finally resolved into unity. Thus, according to it, Christ replied to the question of Salome when His kingdom should come, "When two shall be one, and the outer as the inner, and the male with the female; when there shall be no male and no female." Cf. Lipsius on GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, Vol. II. p. 713.

Neander, *H. E.* t. ii. p. 317–326, Bohn's ed. gives the clearest exposition of this heresy and its connexion with kindred systems. Baur's *Church Hist. of First Three Centuries*, by Menzies, t. ii. pp. 92–99, is rich in references to modern German dissertations on the subject. Harnack's article in Herzog's Encyclop. new edition, on Monarchianism, brings down these refs. to the latest date; other authorities are Dorner's *Doctrine of Person of Christ*, Div. I. t. ii.; Hilgenfeld's *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, pp. 608–626, Leipzig, 1884; Caspari's *Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, t. iii.; Döllinger's Hippolytus und Callistus; Gieseler in *Stud. u. Kritik*, 1853, p. 759. Dissertations on the subject from very different points of view may be seen in Newman's *Arians*, and Schleiermacher's collected works, t. ii. pp. 485–575. Newman's exposition is very good, but his history is defective, having been written before the discovery of Hippolytus' *Refutation*. The older church historians, Lardner, Mosheim, Tillemont, etc., may be consulted, and specially Ch. Wormii *Hist. Sabellianismi*, ed. Francof. 1696. The patristic authorities, Hippolytus, Tertullian, the Dionysii, Athanasius, Eusebius, Basil, etc., have been already quoted. Athanasius, Disc. 4, against the Arians, in Library of the Fathers, Oxf. 1869, apparently often quotes the very words of Sabellius. Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, t. i. p. 254–256, points out traces of the Sabellian controversy in the long recension of the Ignatian Epistles. The seventh canon of the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, declared Sabellian baptism invalid. It describes the sect as numerous in Galatia. [PATRIPASSIANS, MONARCHIANS, NOETUS, PRAXEAS.] [G. T. S.]

SABELLIUS gave the name to the sect of the Sabellians which lasted till the middle of the 5th cent. at least, as their baptism is declared invalid in an epistle from the Church of Constantinople to Martyrius of Antioch, in the latter half of 5th cent. (Van Espen's *Jus Ecclesiast.* t. iii. p. 181), a declaration which is repeated in the 95th canon of the quinisext synod, A.D. 692. Sabellius has been usually assigned to the middle of cent. iii. Mr. Clinton giving A.D. 256–270, as his active period. The discovery of the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus has proved this to be a mistake and thrown his period back to the close of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd century. The known facts of his history are but few. All 4th century writers agree that he was born in Africa. Timothy of CP., in his book on the reception of heretics, says there were two heretics of this name, one of Libya, the other from Pentapolis, but in this opinion he stands alone. There is, however, no contemporary authority fixing his birth in Africa. Basil is the earliest writer who asserts this. It rests simply on the fact that his views met with special favour in the Pentapolis about the middle of cent. iii. The scene of his activity, at any rate, was Rome. Doctrines of a similar character to those he afterward held were flourishing in Rome during the latter part of the 2nd century, Praxeas having introduced them from Asia Minor during the pontificate of Eleutherus, bishop of Rome A.D. 174–189 [ELEUTHERUS (1)], while Noetus and his brother brought the same views from Smyrna some ten years later.

We find Sabellius in full activity at Rome during the episcopate of pope Zephyrinus, A.D. 198–217. The great questions then at issue in Rome, were the doctrinal one, concerning the Monarchia, and the practical one, concerning strictness of discipline. The Monarchian party were heretical in doctrine, and favoured the liberal view about discipline. The Montanists were orthodox in doctrine and rigid in discipline. Sabellius, from the statement of Hippolytus, would seem to have been undecided in his views when he came to Rome, or when he first began to put forward his views at Rome, for the silence of Hippolytus about his birthplace would incline us to regard Sabellius as a native of Rome. In *Refut.* ix. 6, Hippolytus tells us Callistus perverted Sabellius to Monarchian views. Hippolytus took him in hand and argued with Sabellius, as also with Noetus and his followers, l. c. cap. iii. Hippolytus indeed, about the year 200, was the leading controversialist of the Roman Church. Sabellius was convinced for a time, but was again led astray by Callistus. In fact during the episcopate of Zephyrinus, Callistus, Sabellius and the pope seem to have been united in persistent opposition to Hippolytus. Soon after the accession of Callistus, A.D. 217, we find him launching an excommunication against Sabellius, wishing to gain, as Hippolytus puts it, a reputation for orthodoxy, and to screen himself from the attacks of his persistent foe. Sabellius thereupon disappears from the scene. He seems to have written some works, to judge from apparent quotations by Athanasius in his 4th treatise against Arianism. [G. T. S.]

SABIANS (SABEANS, SABEITES, ZABIANS, SSABIANS, SUBHAS, MANDAEANS, MENDEANS,

CHRISTIANS OF ST. JOHN). Uncertainty besets the form, etymology, origin, applicability, and real application of this ancient name. The Sabian peoples and religion have been described as the very "dust-heap of Orientalism."

The genuine Sabians are perfectly distinct from the *Sabaioi* of the Caspian Sea, and from "the *Sabeans*" of the Bible, who are probably identifiable with the Omerites or Hamayarites of S. Arabia. Nor are they to be identified with the Zabians or Ssabians of the Hauran, who can be historically shewn, during the 9th century, deliberately to have adopted their name in order to avoid the persecution of the Mohammedans. After the 9th century Mohammedan writers give to these Pseudo-Sabians, as well as to the Mandaeans, this name, and some of the peculiarities of the one sect are attributed to the other. Inextricable confusion prevailed on the subject until, in comparatively recent years, the sacred books of the Sabians proper have been with very varied ability edited by Tychsen, Matt. Norberg (*Codex Nasareus, Liber Adami appellatus, Syriace transcriptus, Latineque redditus*, 2 vols. 4°. 1815), and H. Petermann (*Thesaurus sive Liber Magnus, vulgo Liber Adami appellatus opus Mandaeorum summi ponderis*, 2 vols. 1867). The last-mentioned work is lithographed in the singular character of the Mandaeans, but not translated either into Syriac proper or Latin. The knowledge thus placed before European students has been supplemented by Petermann's personal researches given in his *Reise in Orient*, and his brief articles in Herzog Real-Cycl. arts. *Mandaer* and *Zabier* or *Ssabier*. To these publications may be added the brochure of M. Siouffi, vice-consul of France at Mosul, in his "*Etudes sur la Religion des Soubhas ou Sabéens, leurs dogmes, leurs mœurs*," &c. Petermann brought to his research scientific knowledge, and the priest who gave him information was far more competent to impart it than was the half-instructed youth from whom Siouffi derived his facts. So far as present customs prevail, the two informants do not seriously differ. D. Chwolson, Professor in the Imperial University at St. Petersburg, has also thrown much light upon the subject in his learned and laborious work, entitled *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, two vols., 1856. Four-fifths of this treatise are devoted to the *Hauranite* Sabians, or pseudo-Sabians, whom he carefully discriminates from the Mandaeans or Sabians proper. He has filled a volume with the Arabic documents upon which he bases his conclusions concerning the history, the dogmas, the worship, the philosophy of this eclectic sect and its offshoots. The name "Christians of St. John" is a title which was given to the Mandaeans in the 17th century by Portuguese travellers (Chwolson, i. 100). They do not designate themselves by this term, although there may have been some slight colour for the ascription of it to them, in the contents of some of their sacred books, in the high place assigned to *Yahia* (John the Baptist) in their tradition and worship, and in their frequent use of baptism for the removal of all impurities. M. Norberg prefixed to his edition of the *Liber Adami* a strange recital by Conti the Maronite (1650), to the effect that a Johannine sect had migrated to Mergab in the Lebanon from Galilee about 150 years previously to his time. This sect considered John the Baptist to be their founder. Their ministers wore turbans and garments of camel's hair. Their sacrament consisted of locusts and wild honey, which was administered to those present in their assembly, and also carried to the absent. Though the minister commenced his discourse with the sentence "In the beginning was the Word," they held the Messiah to be a mere prophet who succeeded John. Images and pictures they abhorred. Their days of assembly were Sunday and Thursday. Their annual feasts were four in number: (1) The birthday of John; (2) A commemoration of the institution of baptism; (3) A lamentation for John on the day which commemorates his decapitation; (4) A feast in honour of the destruction by John of a dragon (see *John the Baptist*, &c., by the present writer, p. 476). This narrative is not confirmed by any ancient source of information touching the practices of either the Hauranites or Mandaeans.

It is important to determine who were the *Sabians*, to whom Mohammed referred in the Koran. In *Surah* ii. 59, we read: "The believers, be they Jews, Christians, or *Sabians*,[a] if they believe in God and in the judgment day and do what is right, will find reward with the Lord; let neither fear nor dismay torment them." In *Surah* xxii. 17: "Verily on the day of the resurrection, God will discriminate between believers, Jews, *Sabians*, Christians, Magians, and Polytheists." The same sentence occurs v. 73. Clearly the Sabians, whosoever they may be, were believed by Mohammed to worship one God only. Chwolson shews that those to whom Mohammed referred could be no other than the Mandaeans of Southern Babylon, whom the Mohammedan writers carefully distinguish from the Hauranites. They are discriminated from the latter by Masudi, A.D. 958, who says they turn towards the North Pole in their worship. This peculiarity is justified by their sacred books and present habits. About A.D. 987 Mohammed b. Isaac, after speaking of the Hauranites, devotes a chapter to Dualists, and enumerates among them *El-Mogtasilah*, the sect that purifies itself by washing, but he calls them the *Sabians* of the marshy district between Arabian deserts and the Euphrates and Tigris.

Chwolson gives at length, vol. ii., the *Fihrist* of Moh. b. Isaac, En Nedim of the 10th century, who interprets the word *Sabiyun* from *tsaba*, "dip" or "plunge" or "dye," corresponding with the Syriac word *Saba*—"tinxit," "baptizavit." This is the etymology which Renan prefers (*Vie de Jésus*, c. vi. *Histoire des langues Sémitiques*, iii. 4. i.); also, with misgiving, Bp. Lightfoot (*Ep. to Galatians*, p. 312, *Ep. to Coloss.* p. 165). Later Mohammedan writers have referred its origin to the Arabic word *saba*, "to change one's religion," *i.e.* "to become an apostate." Petermann inclines to this last origin of the word, while Sale (*Koran, Introd.* p. 15) thought that it might refer to *Seba*, the host of heaven, or the leader of the stars, which Sabians were supposed to reverence.

Much additional interest has been thrown around the subject, from the strongly supported conviction that these Mandaeans, or Sabians proper, are either direct descendants, or col-

[a] Palmer spells the word *Sabaeans*, Qur'ân, vol. i. c. 8, and ii. 58. Rodwell, "*Sabeites*."

lateral offshoots of the heretical sect of the Hemero-baptists, or the Elchasaites of the 1st and 2nd centuries. [BOOK OF ELCHASAI.] The accounts given by Origen (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 38), Hippolytus (*Adv. Haer.* lib. ix. 8–12), Epiphanius (*Adv. Haer.* xix. 1), are far from harmonious. Hilgenfeld (*Novum Test. extra Canonem receptum*, fasc. ii. p. 153) thinks that the word may have been a proper name derived from the name of the village *Elchesi*, where Jerome reports that Nahum was born. Ritschl and Lighfotot accept the interpretation which Epiphanius offers of the word Ἠλξαΐ, viz. that it is equivalent to δύναμις κεκαλυμμένη, or "power veiled," while Origen and Hippolytus, followed by many modern scholars, assert that he was a man who lived during the reign of Trajan, preached Gnostic views of Christ and of the universe, repudiated asceticism and sacrifices, and recommended frequent baptism for remission of the foulest sin, and also deliverance from hydrophobia (Hipp. *l. c.* ix. 15). The association by Epiphanius of the name of Sampsean with that of the followers of Ἠλξαΐ, and the view of Hippolytus that Ἠλχασαΐ entrusted his revelations to *Sobiai* (qy. baptized ones or (Ritschl and Hilgenfeld) sworn members) have led Chwolson to identify the Sobiai, the Sampsaeans, and the Sabians, the Sobiyun of the Koran, and the Mandaeans of later times, with each other. It is true that Epiphanius is not altogether consistent with himself in treating of the *Sampsaeans* (*Adv. Haeres. Haer.* liii. 1, 2), whom he identifies with Ἡλιακοί, sun-worshippers, and yet refers to one Elchseus as their founder. He says they are neither Jews, Christians, nor Hellenes; they reject prophets and apostles, and display a divine reverence for water. In *Haer.* xxx. 3 and 17, the false prophet Elchsaios is made a link of connection between the Ebionites, the Sampsenoi, and Elchesaiei, and sundry Gnostic extravagances touching Christ are attributed to him. Amongst other views this, that Christ was incarnated first of all in Adam, and frequently since, thus adopting (as Hipp. *l. c.* says) the doctrines of the Pythagoraeans. The same peculiarity is found in the Clementine *Recognitions*, and also in Theodoret (*Haer.* ii. 7). Chwolson entertains no doubt that these church Fathers, under different names, are describing the early history of the *Sabians* of the Koran or Mandaeans of history. He even goes further and identifies Elchasai, their founder, with SCYTHIANUS, the reputed Buddhistic teacher, who was the teacher of MANI, the founder of MANICHAEANISM.

Everything points to the high antiquity of the group of sects of which the diminishing tribe of Mandaeans is the instructive relict.

They call themselves מַנְדָּיֵא, Mandāyē, contracted from Mandā dĕchāyē = "the word of life." In the presence of others, and as claiming the protection of the Koran, they call themselves "Sabians." Another title, *Natsoreans*,[b] is the name given to their most distinguished men. Though they have been inaccurately called "Christians of St. John," they are not Christians in any sense.

When Norberg first published his Syriac transliteration and Latin translation of the silk MS. in the Paris Library, grave discussion arose as to its value between Tychsen, De Sacy, and the editor, who proved that it was not a modern forgery, but contained the relics of an ancient faith.

The sacred literature in the more accurate texts of Petermann, consists of the following books: i. *Sidra Rabba*, "great book," or *Ginsa*, *i.e.* "treasure." It is the work of many centuries, places, and authors; is divided into two parts, one having reference to the living and the other to the dead; it contains prayers and rules. ii. *Sidre mesmatha*, or "book of souls,"—a liturgy. iii. *Q'olasta*, "liturgy for marriage ceremonial." iv. *Bavatha d'rakhma*, "prayers for special days." v. *D'rasha d'yakhya*, "narratives of John the Baptist." vi. *As'phar Malvasheya*, "astrological rules."

According to Ignatius-a-Jesu, there was another book called the *Diwan*, but living priests know nothing of it. Petermann's judgment is that this book consisted merely of illustrative talk concerning the Sidra Rabba.

The *Sidra rabba* contains three accounts of the origin of all things. The report which M. Siouffi offers, on the authority of the young priest, differs materially from that which Petermann's informant gave to him. The latter corresponds with other Gnostic systems, more particularly with the scheme of Valentinus. The source of all, the Aether of Great Light, the Lord of Glory, and the Great Jordan, form a kind of ultimate triad, sometimes called Mana Rabba, who, having called life (*Hajje qadmaje*) into existence, retired into profound concealment; communion with him is granted only to holiest Mandaeans, and to the souls of such only after death, in the form of one beatific vision. The "First life" does not correspond with the Demiurgus of the Gnostics, but rather with the Logos, for all the great honours of Mana Rabba are attributed to Him, he is enthroned in the aether, and countless angels minister around Him in eternal blessedness. From the "first life," emanate "the second life," *Hajje tinjânê*, and *Manda de hajje*, who correspond with the evil and good principle. To the latter is attributed all kinds of glowing honours and titles; he is the Redeemer and Saviour in the Mandaean system; he has revealed himself in three sons, called also his Brothers, Abel, Seth, and Enos. The Abel or Hibil-zino is by far the most sacred and important personage, and he is confounded and his qualities are interchanged with those of *Manda de hajje*. From Hajje tinjane have proceeded a host of spiritual beings, of whom *Abathur*, "Father of the Aether," is the chief. He is the "Concealed one," the "Judge of all." Abathur sits on the border of the world of light, and determines the destiny of all, who pass before him, and according to his decision move on into the light or back into darkness. He looked into the dark waters of the abyss, and there saw his own reflection, which he called *Pethahil*, and whom he entrusted with the creation of the world of men. But Mana Rabba would not allow man to suppose Pethahil to be his creator, and so authorized the three sons or brothers of

[b] Bar Hebraeus says they received this name from Nazriyah, a village near Kufa, where they first appeared in the close of the 9th century, but they frequently give themselves this name in the *Liber Adami* or *Sidra Rabba*, and in the so-called *Codex Nazareus*.

Manda de hajje to breathe into them the breath of life, and Hibel-zino becomes the ruler of the world, and Pethahil is sent elsewhere to await the final judgment. The four hells for disobedient spirits might have given some hint to Dante himself. Hibel-zino or Manda de hajje overcame the power and the malice of their rulers, and produced from their own forces the seven planets and the twelve signs of the zodiac and five sons. The heavens are built of solid crystal. The stars move in them round the pole star, the station of Abathur, towards which Mandaites turn to pray. Divergence from Christianity is great and fundamental, and it is easy to discern echoes that are antagonistic to it. Thus Jesu Messechah was a false prophet, who by sorcery walked on the waters and was transfigured, who called Himself God and Son of God, was proved to be a deceiver, and put to death by the Jews. *Jahia* (John the Baptist) was the only true prophet; to him they attribute the miracles of healing and resurrection. Mohammed is the last false prophet, after whom there can come no other. After four or five thousand years the world is to be swept by a terrific storm, and the human race once more to be created from a heaven-descended pair, whose posterity will remain for fifty thousand years in happiness and virtue. Then Leviathan is to throw all into confusion, and destroy all worlds save one of perfect light.

M. Siouffi's informant declares that the *D'ravchod Jahio* (which Petermann calls *D'rasha d'yakya*) is the most sacred of their books, and contains the narrative and the words of Jahia. The Mandaeans had fallen into an evil case from their neglect of circumcision. *Manda de hajje* caused Inochwei, the aged childless wife of Saoûa, to drink water, which made her pregnant with a child of promise. To avoid the threatened destruction of this child, he was caught away to paradise, and there instructed in all that would make him legislator of the people. He was brought back again to earth, and while traversing the river Euphrates was recognized by father and mother, who were baptized by him. He satisfied the incredulousness of the Jews by signs and wonders. They accepted his baptism, and amongst them Jesus Messiah came for baptism. Jahia hesitated on foolish grounds, but was subsequently encouraged to proceed by a message from *Abathur*, and most extraordinary phenomena accompanied the rite. Jahia on his first appearance adopted a celibate life, but since multitudes followed his example and threatened to bring the entire community to an end, Jahia married a wife. Some of the conversations between these two are very piquant and strange. The story of the death of Jahia is full of supernatural details, with no resemblance to the Synoptic narrative or that of Josephus. Manda de hajje overcame the reluctance of Abathur, and Jahia mounted at once on his death to a home in paradise. After the death of Jahia, the legends, weaving every kind of recital together, mingling up Pharaoh, Moses, Eleazar, Ezra, Mohammed, in one inextricable jumble, bring down their records to A.D. 1831, when the plague nearly destroyed them.

In the 17th century they numbered 20,000 families. They now do not exceed 1500 souls; inhabit villages south of Bagdad, between the Euphrates and the Tigris. They are gold-beaters, iron-workers, ship-builders, and are scarcely distinguishable from the Mohammedans among whom they live.

Their customs and the laws of their community are remarkable.

Siouffi and Petermann agree that the lowest order of their clergy is called *shganda* or deacon, though Siouffi says they must spend twelve years in committing the Sidras to memory. They are ordained to the office by baptism and imposition of hands. The ceremonial required to raise a *shganda* to the rank of *tarmida* or priest consists of intricate and prolonged purgations, with fasting from food and sleep for seven days and nights. The next stage is that of *gansibra*, whose function is episcopal, the consecration of other gansibras, and the conduct of nuptial ceremonies. One very curious custom is that the Gansibra, before he can be consecrated, must send a message by some dying Mandaean to *Abathur*, and often the country has to be searched for such an opportunity, or the service is delayed. They have also in theory, but not in fact, a supreme pontiff. The clothing of the priest is a white tunic, white trousers, girdle, and turban, with a gold or signet ring, and a white scarf connecting the right arm and turban. They go bare-foot in all religious services. Their churches are small huts, without altar or ornament, built near to the running water which is so necessary for their constant ablutions.

In addition to Sundays, they have four great festivals, ruled by the zodiacal signs. As their year consists of 360 days, five days are intercalated between Virgo and Libra and called *Pantsha*, on which occurs the great annual baptism of their whole community. Their sacrament is celebrated with an unleavened cake made by the priests in the church and with water. Their laws of purification for women after childbirth, and for both sexes after the normal operations of nature are most exacting. If a person quits the water before the rite of baptism is completed, the *Tarmida* has to remain in the river until some one of the same name can be brought to him who will go through the whole process. According to Siouffi, the baptismal formula is "Thou art baptized with the baptism of the three" (ALAHA (qy. Mana-Rabba), MANDO-SHAIY = Manda de Hajje, and JAHIA-YOUHONO), "may it keep thee from all evil and cause thee to rise to paradise." Baptism of infants is accompanied by frequent kissing of the dress and anointing. If a child dies under the complicated process, the *Tarmida* has to remain in the river until other priests have made an imaginary baby of dough and brought it to him. He then completes the ceremony, and the image is subsequently buried as if it were a real corpse. The rite of *Massakto* is of the most complicated character, and is supposed to ensure one who has submitted to it, from the otherwise terrible consequences of unexpected death. The marriage and mortuary rites are very elaborate and revolting to Western notions. Their ideas of purgatorial fires are very exacting and terrible. They entertain a curious phase of the Mohammedan belief, as to the part which Jesus will take in the final scenes of judgment. At that

dreaded time, they will all fall at His feet, but refuse to accept His religion. Whereupon they will all be killed, but their souls will go straight to paradise. Then the world without Mandaeans will be in sore case, and everything will go wrong, until compensation is made by their triumphant return to earth. Many of their other notions about Jesus correspond with the legends of the Koran, themselves derived from apocryphal and Gnostic sources.

The greater part of Chwolson's great work is occupied with a minute description of the Ssabians of the Hauran, who are proved to differ from the true Sabians in many ways. The expedition of Chalif el Mamûn, between 813 and 883 A.D., brought him into contact with this strange community. As they declared that they were neither Christians, Jews, nor Magians, they were thereupon advised by Mohammedan scholars to call themselves "Sabians," and thus come under the protection of the Koran and the Suras quoted above. Their religion was a strange amalgam of Roman, Greek, and Syrian deities, of Biblical and Buddhistic names, and of astrological speculation. According to Mohammedan writers, they had temples to the planetary bodies under their Roman names, in which they offered sacrifices, even human sacrifices, with most revolting ceremonies. They had also, according to Masûdi (Chwol. ii. 367), temples to the First Cause, to Reason, to the World-Order, and to Necessity.

The most interesting portion of this treatise is an account of a philosophical sect that dissented from the old community and which held a recondite Pantheistic theory, blending Buddhistic and Neoplatonic speculations with these curious ancestral ceremonials (Chwolson i. 717). The whole system, though it starts on signal lines of metaphysical mysticism, ingloriously terminates in gross superstition and magical rites. Their doctrines of the evil inherent in ὕλη, of the eternity of matter, of their cycles of change and renewal remind the reader of several forms of Gnosticism. Their burnt offerings to the planets connect them with idolatrous systems of both East and West; they resemble the Mandaeans in their frequent ablutions and in their habit during prayer of turning to the North Pole. They differ from them in discountenancing polygamy, in their nine orders of priesthood, and other particulars.

[H. R. R.]

SABINA (1), POPPAEA, empress, second wife of Nero. Just as in the case of certain members of the Flavian family it can be asserted with a very high degree of probability, but without absolute certainty, that they were Christians, so in the case of Poppaea, though it is almost certain that she was a Jewish proselyte, there still remains some doubt on the subject. The language of Josephus, *θεοσεβὴς γὰρ ἦν* (*Ant.* xx. 8, 11), almost implies that she was, and the fact that her body was embalmed and not burnt after the Roman custom (Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 6), has been used as an argument to shew that she had embraced a foreign religion. At any rate on at least two occasions (Jos. *supra*, and *Vita*, 3) she exerted her influence with Nero in favour of the Jews (see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 5 *note*). It has even been conjectured that it was due to her that the Christians and not the Jews were selected as the victims who were to suffer for the burning of Rome. A romantic theory has lately been put forward by M. Latour St. Ybars of a rivalry between the Jewish Poppaea and Acte the former mistress of Nero, who, on the strength of a passage in St. Chrysostom (*Hom. in Acta* xlvi. in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* lx. 325), is conjectured to have been a Christian. (Schiller, *Geschichte des Römischen Kaiserreichs unter Nero*, 436 *note*, and Aubé, *Histoire des Persécutions*, 421 *note*.) For the general history of Poppaea, see Merivale, ch. liii. [F. D.]

SABINA (2), Aug. 29, a widow, suffered at Rome with Seraphia, a virgin, who converted her under a prefect named Helpidius, and a magistrate named Berillus in the reign of Hadrian. Their acts are mingled up together. Seraphia seems to have suffered first, but is commemorated Sep. 3. Sabina was the widow of a man of high position named Valentinus. She was the daughter of a certain Herodes Metallarius. They were both buried in the tomb of Sabina, at the arch of Faustinus, "juxta aream Vindiciani, in oppido Vindinensi." Till. t. ii. 246, 597, rejects their acts, while Le Blant, *Actes des Mart.* pp. 83, 117, 143, 239, uses them as genuine illustrations of ancient Roman criminal procedure. They seem to have a historical germ, but to have been interpolated in later times. They will be found in their most ancient form in Boll. *Acta SS.* 29 Aug. vi. 500–504. [G. T. S.]

SABINA (3). See MACARIUS (20); Christian at Rome, Cyp. *Ep.* 22. [E. W. B.]

SABINIANA, an aged deaconess, probably of the church of Antioch, who, careless of her advanced years and infirmities, had started for Chrysostom's place of exile, reaching Cucusus the same day with himself, and apparently at an earlier hour, and had met with a kind reception from the members of the church there. Sabiniana expressed her readiness to follow Chrysostom to whatever place of banishment he might be sentenced to, even if, as had been currently reported, it was in Scythia, and her determination never to leave him (Chrys. *Ep.* 13). Tillemont is disposed to regard her as the same whom Palladius speaks of having seen at Antioch, about 410 A.D., and whom he praises as one of the most illustrious for piety he had ever known. He calls her the paternal aunt of Chrysostom. If there had been this relationship between them —supposing the two Sabinianas to be the same —it is hardly likely that Chrysostom would have spoken of her to Olympias simply as "my lady Sabiniana, the deaconess," *ἡ κυρία μου Σαβινιανὴ ἡ διάκονος*. (Pallad. *Hist. Laus. Vit. Patr.* append. p. 965; Tillemont, tom. xi. pp. 263, 519.) [E. V.]

SABINIANUS (1), martyr at Troyes under Aurelian (*Vid. D. C. A.* and Tillem. iv. 347). [C. H.]

SABINIANUS (2), a deacon of Rome in the end of the 4th or early in the 5th century, probably the latter. He was ordained by a bishop whom Jerome highly esteemed, probably therefore Anastasius (400–403), but had

to leave Rome on account of an intrigue with the wife of a barbarian. The bishop, not knowing the cause, gave him letters of recommendation, and he was received by Jerome and his friends at Bethlehem. He then endeavoured to corrupt a nun in the convent, and all had been arranged for their flight, when they were discovered by a letter placed by the guilty man in a crevice of the altar. Sabinianus fled, and afterwards wrote to entreat Jerome's pardon. Jerome, in his letter to him (14 Ed. Vall.), gives an account of all that has occurred, and, while forgiving all the injury to himself, shows his knowledge of evil deeds which he was still committing and exhorts him to repent.

[W. H. F.]

SABINIANUS (3), bishop of Perrha, appointed successor of Athanasius after his deposition by the council at Antioch, A.D. 445, and ordained by Stephen, metropolitan of Hierapolis and his suffragans (Labbe, iv. 719, 722). He was deposed by the "Latrocinium" in 449, and Athanasius re-established (Labbe, iv. 719, 754). Sabinianus appealed against this act of injustice, and claimed to be heard in his defence and reinstated in his see. Theodoret wrote to remonstrate with him strongly on this weakness. In the existing crisis when wickedness was triumphant only two courses were open to the lovers of truth. Either boldly to resist the dominant party and so expose themselves to persecution, or absolutely to refuse to hold any communion with the advocates of false doctrine. (Theod. *Ep.* 126.) Sabinianus attended the council of Chalcedon and signed the acts as bishop of Perrha, Athanasius also signing under the same title. (Labbe, iv. 602, 590.) The council decreed his temporary re-establishment, with the proviso that Athanasius should be heard within eight months by Maximin of Antioch, and if acquitted should be restored to his see. We hear however of no further proceedings (Labbe, iv. 718–754) (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 944.) [E. V.]

SABINIANUS (4), a priest of Narbonne, whose excessive zeal against a person charged with adultery upon insufficient testimony, and subsequent disobedience to his spiritual superiors, when called to account, form part of the subject of a letter of pope Leo to Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 1199). The letter is assigned to the year 448 (Ceillier, x. 200). [S. A. B.]

SABINIANUS (5), bishop of Jadera (Zara) in Dalmatia, had at first taken the side of MAXIMUS (18), bishop of Salona, but afterwards abandoned it in obedience to Gregory the Great (*Epp.* vii. 17, viii. 10, 24), who commends him for doing so, and also directs him to inquire into the case of FLORENTIUS (30), bishop of Epidaurus, who was said to have been uncanonically deposed and banished by NATALIS. [F. D.]

SABINIANUS (6), (SABINUS), bishop of Callipolis, to whom Gregory the Great wrote in A.D. 599, charging him to defend the inhabitants from unjust exactions, and sending him copies of the privileges of that church from the record office at Rome, and placing under his care the church estate at Callipolis. He succeeded JOANNES (95) in A.D. 596 (*Epp.* ix. 100, vi. 21). He had been a monk in Gregory's own monastery. (Joan. Diac. *Vita S. Greg.* iii. 7.)

[F. D.]

SABINIANUS (7), vir clarissimus. Gregory the Great, in A.D. 600, directed Fantinus, the defensor, to adjudicate in certain causes between him and Decius, the bishop of Lilybaeum. Sabinianus alleged that a composition had been made between the citizens and Theodorus, the late bishop, by which the church in return for a grant of certain property, undertook to entertain the strangers, who, according to custom, were chargeable to the citizens. Sabinianus claimed to be recouped the payments he had made as defensor during the bishop's absence, on this account. (*Epp.* x. 28.) [F. D.]

SABINIANUS (8), bishop of Rome, after Gregory the Great, who died 12 March, A.D. 604. He was elected five months and more after the vacancy had occurred, probably on the 13th of September in the same year, and held the see for about a year and a half only, dying 22 February, A.D. 606 (Pagi, *critic.*). He was a native of Volaterra in Tuscany, and the son of one Bonus. When Gregory I. died, Rome was relieved for a time from the aggressions of the Lombards, a truce having through him been concluded with them; but, with other parts of Italy, it was suffering grievously from famine (Paulus, *Diacon.* l. 4, c. 9). The deceased pope had relieved distress by liberal, and perhaps too indiscriminate, charity, doling out food daily, and corn without charge from the granaries of the see. After his death, the ungrateful populace is said to have attributed the prevailing scarcity to his prodigality, and to have been on the point of expressing their feeling against him by burning his library, had not his friend, the deacon Peter, interposed. [GREGORIUS (51).] Sabinianus is said by Sigebert (*Chron. ad ann.* 606), and by Onuphrius Panvinus to have encouraged the popular feeling against his predecessor, but to have himself run into the opposite extreme of penuriousness, "withholding his hand from the poor." Anastasius (*Vit. Sabiniani*) speaks of his having sold corn to the people, instead of giving it as Gregory had done. But the manuscripts vary as to the price at which he sold it; so that it is uncertain whether it was for one, or thirteen, or thirty solidi per modius. Sigebert (*ib.*) tells the story that he was thrice visited in vision by the deceased Gregory, who reproached him for his derogation of himself, and for his niggardliness, and that on a fourth occasion, with horrible imprecations, the saint struck him so hard on the head that his death ensued in consequence of the blow. His body after death, according to Anastasius, was buried in St. Peter's, but conveyed thither over the Milvian bridge, and thence outside the city. This may have been done in order to avoid attacks on the funeral procession by the hungry populace who had become incensed against him. Nothing more is told of the short career of this unhappy pope, except that Onuphrius attributes to him the introduction of the custom of ringing bells at the canonical hours, and at the celebration of the Eucharist. [J. B—Y.]

SABINUS (1), prefect of Egypt under the emperor Decius, mentioned by Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.*, vii. 11). His cruelties are described by Dionysius in vi. 41. [G. T. S.]

SABINUS (2), bishop of Emerita (Merida), or Legio-Asturica (Leon-Astorga). The question which see he was bishop of, is fully discussed, and the authorities given, under FELIX (99). He had succeeded BASILIDES and Felix MARTIALIS (2), libellatics in the Decian persecution, who had been deposed, Basilides having spontaneously declared himself unworthy. Cyprian enlarges on the regularity of the appointment of Sabinus; the bishops of the province had met in the city for which he was to be consecrated, and had chosen him in the presence of the people. When BASILIDES repented of his resignation, and in order to get himself restored went to Rome, and won the support of pope Stephen by misrepresenting the facts, Sabinus and Felix were sent with letters by the churches over which they presided, to Carthage to Cyprian, who assembled a council in the autumn of A.D. 254, which decided that Martinus and Basilides were canonically deposed and their successors canonically appointed. [CYPRIANUS (1), Vol. I. 747.] [F. D.]

SABINUS (3), a bishop, who wrote to Silvanus of Cirta, entreating him to be reconciled to Nundinarius before the ensuing Easter, A.D. 305, so as to prevent scandal arising from apparent disagreement. He wrote also to Fortis, urging him to use his influence for the same purpose, but by all means to keep the matter secret. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* iv. p. 173, ed. Oberthür; p. 169, ed. Dupin.) [FORTIS (2).] [H. W. P.]

SABINUS (4) I., bishop of Seville, was present at the council of Elvira, c. 306, and subscribes the canons (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Espan.* ii. 21, 27). He may have been the bishop who took up the body of St. JUSTA (3), from the well into which it had been thrown, and buried it (Ado, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 304), but the readings vary between Gabinus and Sabinus (*Esp. Sag.* x. 130). [F. D.]

SABINUS (5), bishop and martyr at Assisi in the reign of Diocletian. [EXUPERANTIUS (3)]. [C. H.]

SABINUS (6), bishop of Placentia, took part in the council of Aquileia, in A.D. 381, against the Arians Palladius and Secundianus, and in that of Milan, in A.D. 390, against Jovinian (Mansi, iii. 599, 664; Ambr., *Act. Aq.*, *Ep.* 42 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 916, 1124). He was the intimate friend of St. Ambrose, six of whose letters are addressed to him (*Epp.* 45–49, 58 in *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 1142, 1178). In one, he asks him to criticise the works he is sending with it; in another he informs him that Paulinus and his wife had sold their property and given it to the poor, and that he had retired to Nola. He is probably the same as the Sabinus, deacon of Milan (Mansi, iii. 460), the bearer, in A.D. 372, of the letter from pope Damasus and the council of Rome to the East, who brought back the letter of St. Basil to the bishops of Illyricum, Italy and Gaul (Basil. *Epp.* 89, 90 in *Patr. Gr.* xxxii. 171, 172). He is said to have been bishop forty-five years. He is commemorated on Jan. 17th. (*AA. SS.* Jan. ii. 163; Tillemont, *M. E.* x. 106.) [F. D.]

SABINUS (7), bishop of Constantia in Cyprus. He had been the provost of a monastery in that island and succeeded St. Epiphanius on his death in 403. There was another Sabinus in this see in 458. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1045, 1047; Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 801.) [E. V.]

SABINUS (8), bishop of Tucca in Numidia. He stated at the Carthaginian Conference in 411 that he had been a Donatist presbyter of the same place, had brought all his people into catholic communion, and had been appointed their bishop. (*Carth. Coll.* cogn. i. 130 in Hard. i. 1084; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 334; Tillem. xiii. 350.) [C. H.]

SABINUS (9), friend of Sulpicius Severus, mentioned by Paulinus of Nola. (Paul. *Ep.* 13; Tillem. xiv. 89.) [C. H.]

SABINUS (10), bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, and a leader of the party and sect of Macedonius. He was the author of a collection of the Acts of the councils of the church from the council of Nicea to his own time. This work was much used by Socrates in compiling his *Ecclesiastical History*. He speaks of it as being untrustworthy, because Sabinus was an unscrupulous partisan, and omitted, and even wilfully altered, facts and statements adverse to his views and interests (cf. Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* i. 8, ii. 15). In these passages Socrates shews how Sabinus tries to disparage those who met at the council of Nicea, in the face of the evidence of Eusebius to the contrary, and makes no mention whatever of Macedonius, lest he should have to describe his evil deeds. Baronius speaks in strong language of Sabinus's unscrupulous handling of history (cf. Baronius, ad ann. 325, xxxix., ad ann. 344, iii. etc.), calling him "homo mendacissimus," and suggesting that Sozomen gives a garbled account of the election of Athanasius, "ex officina Sabini." Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 411) fixes the date at which he flourished as about A.D. 425. [G. W. D.]

SABINUS (11) II., bishop of Seville, was expelled from his see in A.D. 441, and EPIPHANIUS (3) wrongfully consecrated in his place (Idatius, *Chron.*). He returned to his own church from Gaul in A.D. 461 after an absence of twenty years (Idatius, *Chron. Parvum; Esp. Sag.* iv. 426, ix. 137). [F. D.]

SABINUS (12), ST., bishop of Canusium, was the chief of the legates sent by pope Agapetus to Justinian in A.D. 535, and in the next year attended the council of Constantinople under Mennas, on whose right hand he sat with the other legates, and subscribed the decrees (Mansi, viii. 877, 1141). He was a friend of St. Benedict, who prophesied to him the coming destruction of Rome. Gregory the Great relates how Totila made trial of his prophetic powers, and how his archdeacon tried to poison him, and was miraculously punished. He lived to a great age, and in his later years was totally blind (*Dial.* ii. 15, iii. 5, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvi. 162, lxxvii. 225). There appears to have been

an earlier bishop of the same see and name, a contemporary of pope Gelasius, who died in A.D. 496. Sabinus is commemorated on February 9th (*AA. SS.* Feb. ii. 310). [F. D.]

SABINUS (13), defensor of Sardinia, directed with JOANNES (578) by Gregory the Great in A.D. 593 to cause JANUARIUS (25) and EPIPHANIUS (44) to appear at Rome for trial. (*Epp.* iii. 36.) [F. D.]

SABINUS (14) (SAVINUS), sub-deacon, addressed and mentioned in letters of Gregory the Great from 591–603. The first charges him to place the nunnery of St. Euprepia in possession of the garden of the deceased priest, Felicianus, in Rome. He separated from the church on the question of the Three Chapters, but his scruples were appeased by Gregory's arguments. He afterwards was sent to Bruttium, where he inquired into the case of the priest Sisinnius, of Rhegium, who was charged with idolatry and sodomy, and also with refusing to repay to the children of the deceased priest, Victorianus, a loan he had borrowed. He had also to investigate the complaint of Stopaulus and Marcellus, the freedmen of Comitiolus, who alleged that their master's daughter and representative, Maria, wife of the cleric Pardus, refused to pay the legacy of one-sixth of his property bequeathed to his freedman, and, to gain time, was raising questions as to the legality of their manumission. Finally, Sabinus procured timber from the forests of Bruttii for repairs of the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome. (*Epp.* ii. 4, iii. 10, ix. 47, 60, x. 4, 5, xii. 21, 22, 23, 37, xiii. 24, 25.) [F. D.]

SACCOPHORI, a subdivision of the Manichean sect, which cultivated the solitary life. They are denounced, under pain of capital punishment, in a law of Theodosius, dated A.D. 382, addressed to Florus, praetorian prefect of the East. This law is the first document which contains the word inquisition, as applied to official persecutors. (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. 5, leg. 9.) [G. T. S.]

SACERDON, heretic in the list of Sophronius (Mansi, *Concil.* xi. 499), doubtless transcriber's error for CERDON. This interchange is also found in the text of Hippolytus (*Ref.* vii. (10). [G. S.]

SACERDOS (1), a youthful presbyter of Caesarea, brother of Thecla, for whom, as for his sister, Gregory Nazianzen felt no common regard, calling him his son, his young hope, the comfort of his old age, the sharer of his sufferings, who in his youth manifested the ripeness of old age (Greg. Naz. *Epp.* 93, 212). Having been appointed superior of the hospital for the poor, founded by Basil at Caesarea (*Ep.* 233), one of the younger members of the community, Eudocius (EUDOCIUS), who had formerly been his friend, jealous of his promotion, quarrelled with Sacerdos, and brought charges against him before Helladius, Basil's successor in the episcopate, which led to his being removed from his office. (*Epp.* 216, 217, 235.) Gregory wrote him several consolatory letters (*Epp.* 213, 214, 215), and at the same time rebuked Eudocius for his unkindness to one who still desired to be his friend, and who had spoken of his behaviour with brotherly forbearance (*Epp.* 235, 236). He also pleaded his cause with Helladius, calling on him not readily to believe charges against one who had endured such great trials for the truth; nor, even if he had given him cause of offence to deprive him of his office, but at least to continue him in some part of it; and as to the rest not to distress him and the older members of the community by any hasty innovations. Helladius's reply, courteous in terms, but reiterating the charges against Sacerdos, caused Gregory great pain, he being unwilling to believe evil of his young friend, while grieved that ungrounded calumnies should cause alienation between those who had once been so closely united. (*Ep.* 217.) We are ignorant of the issue of the matter. Sacerdos, however, retained Gregory's confidence, who sent letters by him to friends at Constantinople (*Epp.* 91, 92), not long after which he was removed by death (*Ep.* 202). [E. V.]

SACERDOS (2), ST., 28th bishop of Lyons, presided at the 5th Council of Orleans in 549, and may have been present at the 2nd of Paris in 551 or 552. Shortly after the latter council he fell ill at Paris, and was visited by Childebert, in whose favour he stood high, and of whom he made the dying request, that his nephew Nicetius might succeed him in the episcopate. The king assented in the words, "Fiat voluntas Dei." He ranks as a saint, his day being Sept. 12 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 36; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. iv. 31 seqq.; *Gall. Christ.* iv. 32). [S. A. B.]

SACERDOS (3) (popularly SARDOS, SERDOT, or SADROC), ST., 26th bishop of Limoges, between Aggericus and Ausindus, according to his biographers, was born at a village called Calabre, now Calviac, between Cahors and Bordeaux, his father being Laban, a man of distinction in the latter city, and his mother, St. Mundana, the martyr. He is said to have been received from the font by Ecdicius, the son of the emperor Avitus, and brother-in-law of Sidonius Apollinaris, but upon very conjectural grounds (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. ii. 12). Ordained a deacon by St. Capuanus, bishop of Cahors, he became in time priest and monk in a monastery situated at his birth-place. As abbat he was reputed to have performed many miracles, and his fame spread so widely that he was chosen bishop of Limoges, upon the death of Aggericus. After an episcopate of about ten years, feeling the approach of death, he set out for his monastery, but died on the way. His body was carried thither, but in the time of Charles the Great was translated to the monastery of Sarlat, in the Dordogne. The church in which it lay was in the 14th century made a cathedral dedicated to Sacerdos, himself (Boll. *ibid.* p. 12, 17). He is commemorated at Limoges, May 5, and two towns derived their names from him, one in Aquitaine and the other in the diocese of Agen. Though a popular saint in his district, there is very little trustworthy information concerning him, and even his approximate date has been the subject of controversy, some placing him in the 5th and 6th centuries (Boll. *ibid.* p. 13), others as late as the 7th and 8th (*Gallia Christiana*, ii. 505). The authorities for his life are very late, consisting of

a biography by Hugo Floriacensis in the 11th century, and another by Bernardus Guidonis in the 14th. The former may be found in Boll. *ibid.* 14–22, and Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxiii. 975 seqq. The latter was published by Labbé, *Nova Bibl.* ii. 661–5. Neither is of much value, and the catalogues of the bishops of Limoges are confused and of little assistance. [S. A. B.]

SACLAS. For this name in the Ophite system see HEBDOMAS, Vol. II. p. 850. From the Ophites the name was borrowed by the Manicheans. According to Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* iv. 9) Saclas was accounted by the Manicheans the prince of matter, and to him was ascribed the creation of man. The Manichean myth about Saclas is related somewhat more fully by Augustine (*Haer.* 46). [G. S.]

SADOSH (SADOST, SADOTH, SAADUST, SCHADOST, SCIAADOST), tenth catholicus of Seleucia on the Tigris, succeeded his uncle, Simeon Barsaboë, and in the following year, probably A.D. 342, suffered martyrdom at Seleucia with 128 companions. His feast is Feb. 20. (Assem. *B. O.* i. 188, iii. 399, 613; Greg. Barheb. *Chron.* ii. 38; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1108.) [J. G.]

SADWEN (1), abbat of the abbey of St. Docunni, in South Wales (*Lib. Land.* by Rees, 388–459). As witness to Gwidnerth's grant of Llangadwaladr [GWAEDNERTH] to God and St. Cadoc, he is "Saturn princeps altaris Docgwinni." (Rees, *Cambr. Brit. SS.* 93, 391.) [J. G.]

SADWEN (2), (SADYRNIN, SATURNINUS), surnamed FARCHOG, Welsh saint of the 6th century. He was son of Bicanys of Armorica, was married to St. Canna [CANNA], and related to many of the Welsh saints. Sadwen was born in Armorica, accompanied St. Cadfan to Britain in his old age, and founded churches in Anglesey and Wales. His feast is Nov. 29. (*Myv. Arch.* ii. 52; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 123, 213, 222.) [J. G.]

SAETHRYTH, queen, attesting a charter of Ethelbald king of Mercia in 734. (Kemble, *C. D.* 78.) [C. H.]

SAEWARD, king of the East Saxons. See SEXRAED. Saeward was the father of Sigebert the Little, and also of Sebbi, who succeeded Sigebert the Good. [S.]

SAFFARACUS, 18th bishop of Paris, present at the 5th council of Orleans in 549, and soon afterwards was deposed for some crime at the second council of Paris, the date of which is variously given in 551, 552, and 555 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 36; Mansi, ix. 739; *Gall. Christ.* vii. 17). [S. A. B.]

SAFFARIUS, 10th bishop of Perigueux, was present at the synod of Poitiers, A.D. 590. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ix. c. 41; Labbe, *Conc.* v. 1596; *Gall. Chr.* ii. 1454.) [J. G.]

SAFRIDA, mother of ST. FRIDESWIDA.

SAGARIS, Oct. 6, bishop and martyr at Laodicea, mentioned by Polycrates in his letter to Victor of Rome (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24). Melito, in his work on the Passover, mentions his martyrdom under Servilius (?) or Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Asia (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 26). As pointed out in t. iii. p. 895, this probably fixes his martyrdom between A.D. 164 and A.D. 166. [MELITO.] [G. S.]

SAGITTARIUS, 7th bishop of Gap, was a brother of Salonius, 10th bishop of Embrun. The two were notorious for their crimes in the time of Gregory of Tours, whose account is instructive as a picture of one aspect of the church of the 6th century. They were educated by St. Nicetius of Lyons, and ordained to the diaconate. Made bishops, the one of Gap and the other of Embrun, they threw off the mask and gave themselves up to usurpations, murders, adulteries, and other excesses. At the head of a troop of armed retainers they fell upon Victor, bishop of Saint-Paul-Trois-Châteaux, while celebrating his birthday, slew his servants, maltreated himself, and carried off his plate. King Guntram summoned the fourth, or, as it is generally called, the second council of Lyons in 566, to sit in judgment on the two. The bishops presided over by St. Nicetius, sentenced them to deprivation, but they induced the king to allow them to appeal to the pope, probably the first instance of the kind in France. At Rome they succeeded in persuading Paul that the sentence was unjust, and he sent them back with letters to the king, commanding their reinstalment. Their conduct now became more outrageous than before. When Mummolus engaged the Lombard invaders near Embrun (circ. A.D. 572) the two brothers fought in his ranks in full armour, and slew many of the foe. At length the clamours of their own flocks, whom they savagely beat and oppressed, induced Guntram to summon them to his palace. Because they were not straightway admitted to the presence, Sagittarius fell into a passion, and vilified the king and his race. Guntram's anger led him to forfeit their property and immure them in separate monasteries, but with his customary weakness he soon had superstitious scruples and let them out again. At first they made a show of repentance and a new life, but soon relapsed into shameless and continued debauchery. But in 579 the council of Châlon-sur-Saône once more at Guntram's bidding heard the charges against them, which now included that of treason. They were again deprived of their office and imprisoned in a monastery, but escaped and wandered from place to place. Sagittarius afterwards joined the pretender Gundovald, who landed at Marseilles in 582, and was promised by him the bishopric of Toulouse. When the cause became desperate, he prepared to save himself by betraying his leader, but it was then too late, and after witnessing the death of Mummolus he was himself slain while attempting to escape (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 43, v. 21, 28; vii. 28, 34, 38, 39; Aimoinus, *Hist. Franc.* iii. 28; *Gall. Christ.* i. 454–5). [S. A. B.]

SAHADUNAS, second bishop of Mahuza, a city of the Garmaei, abjured Nestorianism while he retained his see, and was bitterly opposed by Jesujabus, bishop of Adiabene, both personally and in a series of letters given by Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* iii. 116 sq.). Sahadunas is included among the Syriac Nestorian writers (*ib.* iii. 453); he flourished about the beginning of the 7th cen-

tury, and is said to have been sent on an embassy from Siroas king of Persia to Heraclius the Greek emperor. (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1320.) [J. G.]

SAHAG. [ISAACUS (7).]

SALABERGA, Sep. 22, widow and abbess. She was born in Northern Gaul about A.D. 665. After her husband's death, to whom she had been married by order of king Dagobert, she built a monastery for perpetual praise. Her fame was celebrated in the middle ages. Her story is told at great length by the Bollandists. (*AA. SS.* Sep. vi. 516–530.) [G. T. S.]

SALAMANES (1), (Σαλαμάνης). [PHYSCO.]

SALAMANES (2), a solitary of Capersana, a village on the right bank of the Euphrates, who shut himself up in a cell on the opposite bank, having neither door nor window. Once a year he dug himself out and provided himself with food for the next twelve months and returned to his cell, having exchanged a word with no one. The bishop of the diocese being desirous to confer the gift of orders on so distinguished an ascetic, had the wall of the cell broken down, and laid his hands upon him, Salamanes manifesting neither consent nor dissent. With equal passiveness he allowed himself to be transferred to a cell on the opposite side of the river by the inhabitants of the village, and to be taken beck again by his former neighbours. (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. xix.) [E. V.]

SALAPHTHA, of Gaza. [PORPHYRIUS (6).]

SALATIEL, one of the martyrs of Raythu with PAULUS (96). [C. H.]

SALERIUS, notary and chartularius of the Roman church, is mentioned three times in connection with Sicilian business by Gregory the Great. (*Epp.* ix. 55, xi. 49, xiii. 34.) [F. D.]

SALGAMIUS, one of the four deacons condemned by Primian. [MAXIMIANUS (2.) PRIMIANUS.] [H. W. P.]

SALIBA-ZACHA (1), 39th catholicus of Seleucia on the Tigris, succeeded Ananjesus A.D. 714. He was a native of Carchan near Tirhana, and seems first to have been the 3rd Nestorian bishop of Anbara (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1124, 1172), then 7th bishop of Hazza and Arbela (*ib.* ii. 1231). He died at Seleucia A.D. 728. (Assem. *B. O.* iii. 616; Greg. Barheb. *Chron.* iii. 150.) [J. G.]

SALIBA-ZACHA (2), 3rd Nestorian bishop of Tirhana in Assyria, A.D. 767; he is best known in connexion with the licence given to the Nestorians to build a church at Tagrit. (Greg. Barheb. *Chron.* iii. 156; Assem. *B. O.* ii. 112; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1169.) [J. G.]

SALLUSTIUS (1), pretorian prefect under Julian, whose persecuting orders he was obliged to execute, much against his will, although he was a pagan. The case of Theodorus, who exhibited remarkable constancy under torture, at length led Sallustius to remonstrate with the emperor, to whom he pointed out how such proceedings discredited their party and conferred honour on the Christians. (Rufinus, *H. E.* lib. x.; Theod. *H. E.* iii. 7 al. 11; Soc. iii. 19; Soz. v. 20.) [C. H.]

SALLUSTIUS (2), praefect of Rome, A.D. 386 (*Cod. Theod.* xiv. i. ii. 3, xviii.), perhaps the Sallust addressed in three letters of SYMMACHUS (v. 55–57) and mentioned in three others (iii. 30, 31, vi. 35). It was to him that Valentinian wrote, thanking him for the information he had given about the site of the basilica of St. Paul, and directing him, with the approval of the senate and people, to divert the road to Ostia, so as to enlarge the site, and to have plans prepared for the extension of the basilica. (Baronius, v. 607.) [F. D.]

SALLUSTIUS (3), a presbyter of Constantinople, attached to the party of Chrysostom, who with Theophilus, his brother-presbyter, caused great dissatisfaction to their exiled bishop by withdrawing, the one through indolence and the other through cowardice, from the public assemblies of their brethren, neither uniting with them regularly in worship, nor instructing them, as behoved them, by preaching. Sallustius had only preached five times between Chrysostom's expulsion in June and November, and Theophilus not once. Chrysostom on receiving the painful intelligence wrote first to a friend, Theodore by name, who had great influence over Sallustius, reproaching him for not having written to inform him of their neglect of their ministerial duties, nor endeavour himself to correct it, and stating that he had written to Theophilus sharply rebuking him, but knowing Theodore's affection for Sallustius he preferred leaving him in his hands, begging him to stir up his friend and not allow him to go to sleep at his post (Chrys. *Ep.* 210). Neither this letter nor that to Theophilus (*Ep.* 212) having apparently had the desired effect, Chrysostom wrote to Sallustius himself, telling him with what grief he had heard the account of his own and his companion's base neglect of their duty as presbyters, which had made his banishment more desolate. If the charge was false, he begs that Sallustius will lose no time in contradicting it, and thus relieve him of his grief. But should it be true he entreats them to rouse one another from their torpor, lest they should bring down the judgment of God on their heads, if when their brethren are being persecuted, banished, and driven from their homes, they do not even contribute their presence and instruction to the tempest-tossed church (*Ep.* 203). We may hope that these severe remonstrances had their due effect, for both Sallustius and Theophilus were among those who were driven from Constantinople in the persecution of Atticus, the former being banished to Crete, and the latter to Paphlagonia (Pallad. p. 196). The Sallustius of *Ep.* 219, on whom Chrysostom lavishes many laudatory epithets, who as a γραμματηφόρος was able to convey letters to him from Constantinople, was probably a different person. [E. V.]

SALLUSTIUS (4), governor of the Euphratensian province, to whom Theodoret wrote a complimentary letter on his receiving the appointment for a second time, praising the integrity of his former administration which had caused the people of the province to hail his return with delight, and apologizing for having been compelled by the approach of Easter to leave Hierapolis without offering him

his congratulations in person. At his request he sent him a deacon who was skilled in hydraulics. (Theod. *Ep.* 37.) [E. V.]

SALLUSTIUS (5), patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 486–494 (Clinton, *F. R.*, Theophan. *Chron.* p. 124). He succeeded Martyrius in A.D. 486. Cyrillus Scythopolitanus frequently mentions Sallustius in his life of St. Sabas in terms of eulogy. As a bishop he exhibited wisdom and freedom from partiality, with perfect incorruptibility, never accepting evidence without thoroughly sifting it. St. Sabas was ordained presbyter by Sallustius, who also appointed him abbat of his Laura, to the mortification of some of the brethren, who scorned Sabas on account of his holy simplicity and rustic manners. He also consecrated the church of the Laura known as Theoctista, A.D. 491 (*Vit. S. Sab.* c. 19). Two or three years afterwards, on his deathbed, Sallustius also appointed Sabas superior of all the solitaries of his diocese (at the same time that he made Theodosius superior of the coenobites), with the view of checking the worldly and avaricious spirit which was beginning to invade the monasteries of Palestine, and to stay the spreading schismatical tendency. In spite of Cyril's eulogium Sallustius's orthodoxy admits of doubt. Eutychius says candidly that he was a Jacobite, *i.e.* an Eutychian (Eutych. ii. 108). It is certain that he signed the Henoticon, and communicated with Athanasius, the successor of Peter Mongus (Liberat. *Breviar.* c. 18; Labbe, v. 271), but more in the interests of peace, and to avoid schism, than from decided sympathy with his heretical views. He died July 23, A.D. 494, and was succeeded by Elias (*Vit. S. Sab.* c. 31; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 174; Baron. *Annal.* vi. pp. 428, 468; Cyr. Scythop. *Vit. S. Sab.* passim; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xvi. 377). [E. V.]

SALLUSTIUS (6), bishop of Seville, addressed and granted vicariate jurisdiction by pope HORMISDAS, q.v. [Vol. III. 161.] [F. D.]

SALOME. The New Testament notices of Salome will be found collected in the article on her name in the *Dictionary of the Bible*. With regard to the use of her name in apocryphal writings may be added here that in the protevangelium, or Gospel of St. James, she is made to attest the perpetual virginity of our Lord's mother, her incredulous refusal to believe the report of the midwife who attended at His birth being punished by miracle until on her repentance she obtains healing by touching the child. She appears as an interlocutor in some fragments of the "Gospel according to the Egyptians," preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 13). See GOSPELS APOCRYPHAL, Vol. II. p. 713. She appears as a speaker in *Pistis Sophia*, p. 102, and her name was so used by other heretical sects as to become known to Celsus (Orig. *adv. Cels.* v. 62, see HARPOCRATIANI). According to Epiphanius Salome was one of two daughters of Joseph by a former marriage. The other he calls Mary (*Haer.* lxxviii. 6), but Anna (*Ancor.* 62). [G. S.]

SALOMON (1), (SOLOMON), solitary near Antinopolis in Egypt, visited by Palladius, who much extols him and speaks of his grace of patience in particular. He had then passed fifty years in a cavern, and had learnt the whole Bible. Heraclides also visited him. (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 96; Heracl. *Paradis.* 45; Tillem. xi. 519.) [C. H.]

SALOMON (2) (SALMON), abbat of the monastery at Marseilles over which Cassian had once presided (*Gall. Chr.* i.); addressed in a metrical epistle, c. 450, by the poet Victor (*Pat. Lat.* lxi. 935; Ceill. viii. 420, 421, x. 443). [VICTOR (39).] [C. H.]

SALONIUS (1), bishop of Genoa, according to some, of Vienne, according to others, about the middle of the 5th century. He was the son of Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, and the pupil of Salvianus, under whom he was educated at Lerins. Salvianus dedicated to him his two works, *De Avaritia* and *De Providentia*. He is supposed to have died before A.D. 475, because in the acts of the Council of Arles, held in that year, a certain Theophlastus is described as bishop of Genoa. He wrote a work variously styled *Expositio Mystica in Parabolas Salomonis et Ecclesiasten*, or *In Parabolas Salomonis Dialogi ii.*, or *In Parabolas et Ecclesiasten Salomonis Dialogi.* in the form of a conversation between himself and his brother Veranus. This exposition was adopted almost verbally by Honorius of Autun, in the 12th century, and published under his name at Cologne, in 1554. Cornelius à Lapide, in his *Comment. in Eccles.* p. 6, pointed out this fact. We have also a letter written by him to pope Leo the Great, thanking him for a copy of his epistle to Flavianus, of Constantinople, and requesting him to annotate a copy he had made of it. (Migne's *Pat. Lat.* tt. liii. 967; liv. 887; Ceill. xiv. 300); [EUCHERIUS (1) t. ii. p. 255.] [G. T. S.]

SALONIUS (2), 10th bishop of Embrun, was a brother of Sagittarius, 7th bishop of Gap. The two were notorious for their crimes. Salonius's history is the same as that of his brother until their escape from the monastery in which they were imprisoned after the sentence of deprivation passed on them by the council of Châlon-sur-Saône in 579. Salonius then disappears from history, and his end is unknown [SAGITTARIUS]; (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 43; v. 21, 28; vii. 28; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1061–2). [S. A. B.]

SALVIANUS (1), bishop of Gazaufala (Hartel; v. l. cazauphala, gazauphalia. The true form is in inscr. 4800, Mommsen, vol. viii., gadiaufala. Procop. Γαζοφυλα, ap. Momms.) in Numidia Procons. He is called "martyr" in later MSS. Has seventy-sixth suffrage in Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. [E. W. B.]

SALVIANUS (2), a bishop of Spain in the last half of the 4th century. He and another Spanish bishop Instantius were the first followers of PRISCILLIAN. At the synod of Caesar Augusta (Saragossa) in 381, attended by the bishops of Spain and Aquitaine, where the Priscillianist doctrines were first condemned, sentence of excommunication in their absence was passed against Salvianus and the other leaders of the sect. After the rescript of the emperor Gratian banishing heretics, Salvianus accompanied Priscillian and Instantius from Spain to Italy. The

journey was undertaken with the view of clearing themselves and their party at the papal court. At Rome pope Damasus refused them audience. During their stay in the city Salvianus died (Sulp. Sev. ii. 46–48). [M. B. C.]

SALVIANUS (3), priest of Marseilles, and a writer whose works illustrate most vividly the state of Gaul in cent. v. The one external authority for the events of his life is Gennadius, *de Scriptor. Eccles.* cap. 67, where we find a list of his writings. All the rest almost of our information is gained from his own works. He was born about the closing years of the 4th century. He must have been a priest eminent for piety from the year 429 at least, when St. Hilary of Arles, in a sermon on St. Honoratus, describes him as "the most blessed man Salvianus, the presbyter." We conclude from his own expressions (*De Gub. Dei*, vi. 72) that he was born in Gaul, probably at Trèves, the manners and customs of which place he knew intimately and reproves sharply. He resided at Cologne, at least some of his relations did, as the first epistle of his which now remains to us is one addressed to a community of monks soliciting admission for a young man, son of a widow, his own relation, who had been captured at Cologne. His people occupied a respectable position in that city. His words about the youth are, "Quondam inter suos non parvi nominis, familia non obscurus, domo non despicabilis et de quo aliquid fortasse amplius dicerem, nisi propinquus meus esset. Hoc enim fit ut minus dicam, ne de me ipso dicere videar de illo plura dicendo." When a young man he married Palladia, daughter of Hypatius and Quieta, by whom he had one daughter, Auspiciola. After her birth Salvianus and his wife agreed to adopt the monastic life, which greatly incensed Hypatius who was originally a Pagan. He had embraced Christianity, but could not understand the ascetic tendency which was then seizing all ranks. He retired therefore to a distant region, and refused to hold any communication with Salvianus and his wife for seven years. We possess in *Epist.* iv. a very earnest appeal made by Salvianus and his wife, together with their daughter Auspiciola, pleading for the renewal of the love and friendship of Hypatius. We are not told what success attended their appeal, but from this time all disappear from history save Salvianus himself, who still survived in extreme old age when Gennadius wrote. He was then held in the highest honour, being expressly termed, "Episcoporum Magister," and regarded as the very type of a monk and a scholar. His title "Master of bishops" appears justified by the style of *Epist.* ii. and viii. addressed to Eucherius, whom he sharply reproves for want of courtesy to himself, of *Epist.* iii. addressed to Agrycius, and of *Epist.* ix. to Salonius, which are marked by the tone of one who was regarded by all as their literary and spiritual director. Gennadius tells us (*l. c.*) that he had read the following works composed by Salvianus, three books *On Virginity* addressed to Marcellus, a presbyter; four books against Avarice; five books *de Praesenti Judicio*, now commonly called *De Gubernatione Dei*, addressed to Salonius the bishop; an exposition of the close of Ecclesiastes or Ecclesiasticus, addressed to Claudianus bishop of Vienne; a book of Epistles; a poem on the first chapter of Genesis; and numerous homilies. Of these various writings there now exist only the following: *De Gubernatione Dei*, in eight books, not in five as Gennadius says; nine Epistles and the work in four books, variously called *Timotheus*, *Ad Ecclesiam*, or *Adversus Avaritiam*. All the other works have perished, unless as Peter Allix thinks, his poem on Genesis is identical with that on Genesis i., found among the metrical fragments of Tertullian. The writings of Salvianus are important from a social, political and ecclesiastical point of view. In the *De Gubernat. Dei*, lib. iv.–viii., he gives a lively picture of the social changes which were going on within the empire owing to the iniquitous fiscal system in vogue. Thus lib. v. capp. 4–9 show clearly the cause of brigandage, the origin of the serf system, and the evils of vast estates. He gives significant hints as to the social and commercial state of the country. Thus in iv. 14, he refers to the crowds of Syrian merchants who inhabited all their cities, a fact which the discovery of Syrian, Assyrian, and other Oriental inscriptions in France has amply confirmed. Cf. Le Blant's *Ins. Chrét. de la Gaule*, Diss. nos. 225, 557, and 613. He helps us again to understand the interruption of intercourse between Roman and English Christianity, which took place to a great extent in 5th and 6th centuries. The empire was gradually surrounded by a ring fence of hostile states, all barbarous, and several of them heretical, which served as a retreat from the power, and a barrier to the religion of Rome. At any rate for a century and a half the new kingdoms of the Franks and Burgundians afforded ample employment for her missionary zeal without troubling herself with the regions beyond. The treatise against Avarice is simply an extravagant laudation of the ascetic life and the practice of almsgiving, which he pushes so far in the first book as seriously to discuss whether a man should leave any property at all to his sons. Ceillier (x. 359) devotes a lengthened notice to Salvianus, with a full analysis of his writings and their bibliography down to the publication of Migne's *Patrol. Lat.*

The latest modern edition of his works has been published in the *Corpus Ecclesiast. Scriptorum* of the Vienna Academy, t. viii. Vindob. 1883, edited by Fr. Pauly, for which the best Mss. have been collated. He has elaborately set forth his views on the formation of Salvian's text in the *Sitzungsber. der phil.-hist. Classe der Kaiserl. Akad. in Wien*, xcviii. Hft. i. p. 3 ff. [G. T. S.]

SALVINA (SILVINA), daughter of the Moorish chief Gildo, count of Africa, and wife of Nebridius, nephew on the mother's side of Flacilla, the first wife of the emperor Theodosius the Great. The Christian virtues which, according to Jerome and Chrysostom, distinguished the ladies of Gildo's family, were in strong contrast with brutal and savage vices which rendered his name detestable. His wife is designated as "a holy woman" by Jerome, from whom we also learn that Cyria, Gildo's sister, had devoted herself to a life of perpetual virginity (Hieron. *Ep.* 9). While still a girl, Salvina was transferred by Theodosius to his own court, as a pledge of the loyalty of her father and of the province of Africa of which he was governor.

She was brought up with the young members of the imperial family, and was married some years before her father's miserable death, somewhere about A.D. 390, to the young Nebridius, the son of the empress's sister, who had been educated with his cousins, the future emperors, Arcadius and Honorius. Her union was of short duration, Nebridius dying soon after A.D. 390. He left her with two children, a son, named after his father Nebridius, and a daughter (Hieron. *ibid.*). Salvina devoted her widowhood to God's service, and, as her husband had been, became the patroness and protectress of Oriental churches and ecclesiastics at the court of Arcadius. Her fame having spread to Palestine, Jerome, though a stranger to her personally, addressed to her a letter—the arrogant tone of which might (we may well think) have offended, if the coarseness had not shocked her—calling upon her to maintain her state of widowhood unimpaired, and that she might the better avoid the temptations to break her vow, exhorting her, though living in a palace—"aula regalis"—to adopt a rule of strict abstinence; foregoing meat and wine and baths, and devoting her time to prayer and the reading of the Scriptures and holy books. The education of her son and daughter should be her first care, together with the management of her large and opulent household. At the time Jerome wrote—which he did chiefly through the importunity of "his son Avitus"—the young widow and her children formed one household with her mother, Gildo's widow (his death had taken place A.D. 398) and her paternal aunt at Constantinople (Hieron. *Ep.* 9; *De servandâ virginitate*, *Ep.* 11 *ad Geront.* ad fin.). Salvina's ardent piety speedily attached her to Chrysostom. She became one of his deaconesses, equalling in her devotion Olympias and Pentadia, and bound to him by the strongest of ties. She remained with him to the last, and, together with the above-named and Procula, took a final farewell of him in the baptistery of the cathedral, the night of his final expulsion. (Pallad. p. 90.) [E. V.]

SALVIONUS (GALBIONUS), a layman to whom Chrysostom wrote stating that he had heard of his fervent affection for him from many who had come to Cucusus, and though he felt no doubt of it, he begged that he would prove it by the frequency of his letters. (Chrys. *Ep.* 209.) [E. V.]

SALVIUS (1), martyr at Carthage in the fourth century, and commemorated in the Calendar of Carthage. (*Vid. D. C. A.* and Tillem. v. 555.) [C. H.]

SALVIUS (2), Donatist bishop of Ausapha, or Ausafa, a place of unknown site, present at the council of Cabarsassum, A.D. 393, and condemned at that of Bagai, A.D. 394. (Aug. *En. Ps.* 36. 20; *c. Cresc.* iii. 59, iv. 5; *c. Gaud.* ii. 7.) [MAXIMIANUS (2).] [H. W. P.]

SALVIUS (3), Donatist bishop of Membresa, Membrissa, or Membressa (*Medjez el Bab*), a town mentioned by Procopius as distant 350 stadia from Carthage, near the river Bagradas (Procop. *Vand.* ii. 15); placed between Musti and Sicilibba, 45 miles from Carthage, by Antoninus, *Itin.* 45. 3. Salvius was one of the twelve ordainers of Maximianus. [MAXIMIANUS (2).] He was not present at the council of Cabarsassum; and another bishop, Miggin, signed its resolutions in his stead. For this he was condemned by the council of Bagai (Aug. *En. Ps.* 36. 20; *c. Cresc.* iii. 59, iv. 5; *c. Gaud.* ii. 7). He is mentioned as one of those who practised re-baptism (Aug. *Parm.* iii. 22). Refusing to return to the party of Primian, he was displaced, and Restitutus appointed in his stead; but when he attempted to take possession of the house and land belonging to the see, Salvius resisted him, believing that his opponents could not take advantage of the laws against heretics without implicating themselves in its operation (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 57, 58, 60, 82; *Ep.* 108. 14; *En. Ps.* 57. 18; *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 5, 22, 25, 26). The action appears to have been brought during the proconsulate of Herodes, A.D. 394, but not to have been decided until that of Seranus, A.D. 398. [HERODES (2); RESTITUTUS (3); SERANUS.] When the judgment was published, the people of Membresa, by whom Salvius, now an old man, was greatly beloved, appear to have supported him in opposition to the edict, but the people of Abitina, a neighbouring town, took upon themselves, without any official sanction, to execute it, and having attacked Salvius maltreated him cruelly and ignominiously. They dragged him in a mock triumphal procession, with dead dogs tied to his neck, and compelled him in this condition to join in their disgusting antics, an act of brutal mockery, the truth of which Augustine said could not be denied, and which, comparing it to that of Mezentius (Virg. *Aen.* viii. 485), he said was as bad as death by burning, and ought to justify the Maximianists in regarding him as a martyr (Aug. *Parm.* iii. 29; *c. Cresc.* iv. 59, 60). Whether this attack caused the death of Salvius we know not, nor do we hear of him again in subsequent history, but his case is often quoted by Augustine when he retorts on the Donatists their charge against the Catholics of persecution. [H. W. P.]

SALVIUS (4) (SILVIUS), ST., 5th bishop of Martigny (Octodurus), whence the see was transferred to Sion, flourished in the middle of the fifth century. There are indications that he was an author of some note. St. Eucherius of Lyons addressed to him his history of St. Maurice and his companions, the supposed martyrs of Agaunum, situated in Salvius' diocese (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* l. 827). In return Salvius dedicated his *Laterculus* to Eucherius in terms which imply that he had written other works (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. i. *Praefat.* p. 44). The author of the life of St. Hilary of Arles speaks of a Silvius, who may well be identical with this bishop, as among the learned doctors of the time who had made themselves celebrated in Gaul by their writings (*Vita S. Hilarii*, cap. xi., *Patr. Lat.* l. 1232). But nothing of his works has survived beyond the above mentioned *Laterculus*, which however is of considerable interest. It is a sort of calendar, sacred and profane. According to the preface it is not an original work, but founded on and elucidating that of others, and was undertaken in the year 448. The same preface promises an enumeration of the names given to the month by different

nations, the princes and tyrants who had reigned, the Provinces of the Roman Empire, the known quadrupeds, birds and fishes, directions for finding the new moon and Easter day, and other information. But the work itself falls short of this somewhat, which has induced the belief that we have only a part of it. The preface and a part of the calendar were first published by Bollandus in the *Acta SS.* Jan. i. *praefat.* 43–4, and the full calendar by his successors Jun. vii. 178 seqq. It is also to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 671 seqq. For comments on it see the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 294–6 and Ceillier, viii. 452; and, for the whole subject of these early calendars, Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, i. 48 ff. [S. A. B.]

SALVIUS (5) (SAUVE), ST., bishop of Alby, towards the close of the 6th century, an intimate friend of Gregory of Tours, who gives us the story of his early life from his own lips. He had been an advocate, and had led an active and worldly life though unstained by the passions of youth. After his conversion he entered a monastery, to embrace a new life of poverty, austerity, and worship. In time the monks made him abbat, but craving for still higher sanctity, he withdrew to a solitary cell, where, after a fever, he fell into a sort of trance, and was laid out for dead. While unconscious he was conducted by two angels to heaven, and shewn the glory of it, but not permitted to remain, as work still awaited him on earth. The account of this Dantesque vision, which Gregory calls God to witness, he heard from the bishop's own lips, is interesting (*Hist. Franc.* vii. 1). It should, however, be noted that the authenticity of this chapter has been called in question. (See Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. iii. 575–6.) As bishop he indignantly scouted the heretical and somewhat crude views which king Chilperic unfolded to him on the subject of the Trinity, and wished to force upon the church (*ibid.* v. 45). He was at the council of Braine in 580, and while bidding farewell to Gregory in the vestibule of the house they had occupied there, he pointed to the king's palace, and asked his companion if he saw aught above it. Gregory could see nothing but the upper story just built at Chilperic's command. Then Salvius, drawing a deep sigh, uttered these words: "Video ego evaginatum irae divinae gladium super domum hanc dependentem," and after twenty days the two sons of the king were no more (*ibid.* v. 51). In his diocese he won the people's love by many good deeds, for but few of which the historian has space. When Mummolus carried off some of his flock as prisoners, he followed and ransomed them at his own cost; and when Alby was almost depopulated by a plague that ravaged southern France, he refused to desert the city (*ibid.* vii. 1). He was, Gregory says, magnae sanctitatis, minimaeque cupiditatis, aurum nunquam habere volens (*ibid.*), and there are few contemporary French bishops of whom he says as much. He died about 584, and was succeeded by Desideratus (vii. 22). He is commemorated September 10, and though only mentioned by Rabanus among the ancient hagiologists, the Bollandists think the cult was already established in the time of Gregory, who survived him. See the *Acta SS.* for the history of his relics, and two churches dedicated to him, one being at Nevers (Sept. iii. 574). [S. A. B.]

SALVIUS (6), ninth bishop of Amiens, succeeded Honoratus c. A.D. 588 [HONORATUS (17)], and died A.D. 612. A life, not written by a contemporary, but probably embodying an old tradition in the eighth century, is given by the Boll. (*Acta SS.* Jan. i. 703–6). He was consecrated at the suggestion of Theudericus (Thierry III.), king of the Franks, and long after his martyrdom, c. A.D. 612, his remains were found by Charlemagne. His feast is 11 Jan. (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 50, 195; Vincent Belv. *Spec. Hist.* xvii. 90; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 982.) [J. G.]

SALVIUS (7) I., 8th in the list of the bishops of Valence. In St. Ouen's Life of St. Eligius, mention is made of a Salvius, doctissimus episcopus, who at a council of bishops held at Orleans (circ. A.D. 638) overthrew in controversy a certain heretic from beyond seas, who had done much harm to the faith (Audoenus, *Vita S. Eligii*, i. 35, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 507). Conjecture has assigned this Salvius to Valence (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 294). [S. A. B.]

SALVIUS (8) II., 13th in the list of the bishops of Valence, a contemporary of Charles the Great. Mention is made in the *Chronicon Elnonense* and by Sigebert of a bishop Salvius who came from Aquitaine to Valenciennes, a royal fiscus, and there was martyred. But it is pure conjecture to assign him to this see. (*Gall. Christ.* xvi. 296.) [S. A. B.]

SAMAEL (SAMANNA). The chief of the seven demons in the Ophite system, was the Serpent, having the two names Michael and Samael (Iren. i. 30, p. 111). The latter name in Theodoret's report (*Haer. Fab.* i. 14) takes the form Samanna. The name Michael is attested also by Origen (*Adv. Cels.* vi. 30). [G. S.]

SAMHTHANN (SAMTANN, SAMTHANNA, SAMTHANUS, SAMTHAND), virgin, abbess of Clonbroney, co. Longford, died A.D. 739 (*Ann. Tig.*). Her life, quoted by Ware *Ir. Writ.* i. c. 13), is now lost: a prophecy by her is referred to in *Ann. Tig.* A.D. 738. O'Reilly, *Ir. Writ.* p. li.) [J. G.]

SAMLED, Welsh saint of the 7th century, patron of Llansamlet, co. Glamorgan. (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 309.) [J. G.]

SAMMONAS (AMMONAS), bishop of Neapolis (Sichem) in Palestine A.D. 529. He was murdered in one of the frequent revolts of the Samaritans. (Cotel. *Mon.* iii. 339; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 649.) [G. T. S.]

SAMONA. [HABIBUS (2), SARBELIUS.]

SAMPSAEI (Σαμψαῖοι), heretics, also called Elkesaites (Epiph. *Haer.* 33 sive 53). [ELKESAI.] [C. H.]

SAMSON (1) (SAMPSON), Welsh saint, bishop of Dôl. The legend of this bishop is evidently obscured by the admixture of several traditions, and by considerations which were found con-

venient in the ecclesiastical controversies of the middle ages. The materials for his life are of their kind very abundant. Leading authorities are *Vita S. Samsonis Episcopi Dolensis in Armorica*, auctore anonymo, printed first in Mabillon, *Acta SS. O. S. B.* i. 154, ed. Ven. (165, ed. Par.), and then in the Bollandists' *Acta SS.* 28 Jul. vi. 573, with learned Commentarius Praevius and appendix, discussing the comparative values of the British and Gallican authorities (pp. 568–593); another of similar import, but calling him "archiepiscopus et confessor" in *Lib. Land.* by Rees, with English translation, pp. 8–25, 287–305; another in Du Bosc, *Bibl. Flor.* 464, and Surius, *Acta SS.* iii. 338; another in Capgrave, *Nov. Leg. Angl.* f. 276; and another by Balderius of Dole, never printed, is also mentioned. (See for the bibliography and his acts generally, Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. 141–4, pt. ii. p. 381; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 158–9, append. E.; *Hist. Lit. de la France*, iii. 265, 546.)

Taking the life in *Lib. Land.* as a type of the British tradition as distinguished from the Gallican, Samson was son of Amwn Ddu, prince of Armorica in the 5th century. He was born in Glamorganshire, educated by St. Illtyd at Llantwit Major, ordained deacon and priest by St. Dubricius, and became for three and a half years abbat of St. Peirio or Piro's monastery on an island near Llantwit; some say at Llantwit. Afterwards he went to live in a desert near the Severn, was consecrated by St. Dubricius and others to the episcopate, though, according to the common Celtic custom, without reference to a specific see, and in course of time proceeded to Armorica, where he became the champion and deliverer of the captive prince Judual, and died at Dôl (*Lib. Land.* 305). Thus far, and excluding the miraculous elements, the tradition is generally consistent and complete, though some of the Welsh traditions bring him back to die at Llantwit in Wales. But to this are added several fictions which probably belong to the 12th century, and are traceable to Geoffrey of Monmouth and to Girald. Cambr. Geoffrey's is that Samson was archbishop of York, and when he had to flee before the Saxons, he carried the pall with him to Dôl; that of Giraldus is that he was 25th archbishop at Menevia, after St. David, and similarly carried the pall with him to Dôl, when he left Wales on account of the yellow plague; in either case he thus became archbishop of Dôl. But obviously there was a purpose to be served by these additions. The church of Dôl was ecclesiastically subject to Tours, and against this the bishop and clergy of Dôl were struggling for freedom. At the same time the Welsh church, as represented by Giraldus and Bp. Bernard of St. David's, was resisting the power of Henry II. and the encroachments of Canterbury, so that they brought this forward as a convenient plea for exemption from the English metropolitan. But with the argument inherently weak, and the English king in opposition, the appeal even to Rome failed (Pryce, *Anc. Br. Ch.* c. 4). There seems, however, to be no doubt that a Samson bishop of Dôl was present, and signed the canons at the council of Paris in A.D. 557 (Mansi, ix. 752), but the Gallican authorities give him an entirely Gallican tradition as to birth, life, and labours. As he was not present at the second council of Tours in A.D. 567, he is supposed to have died in the interval, so that the dates of his episcopate given by Gams (*Ser. Ep.* 546) are A.D. 557, 565 (567), but Ussher places his death at 599. When Giraldus names him as the 25th archbishop of Menevia after the founder, he must place him about the 10th century, which is evidently a fabrication for controversial purposes, but a Samson at all, at either York or Menevia, rests upon only the slenderest authority (Stubbs, *Reg.* 153, 155; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 186, 200). Samson's feast is July 28. In his memoir, *De Sansone Demeta*, A.D. 567, Pitseus (*Angl. Script.* p. 99) ascribes to him *De patientia in adversis*, ep. i., with Bale and Leland. (See also Rees, *Welsh SS.* 218, 228–9, 253 sq.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 442, c. 13; Moran, *Ir. SS.* c. ii.) The monumental inscribed stones to SS. Illtyd and Samson found in the churchyard of Llantwit Major cannot be of the early date at one time imagined, as there can be no doubt that the Samson there mentioned as placing the cross for his own soul and for the souls of Juthael, the king, and Arthmael, must have lived in the 9th century, and the lettering would agree with that date. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* i. 626–8; Rees, *Welsh SS.* 181, 255.) [J. G.]

SAMSON (2) (SAMPSON), Scotic priest in Germany, complained of archbishop Boniface of Mayence, and censured as "vacuus a spiritu sancto, et alienus a gratia Christi atque a consortio sacerdotali abjiciendus," by pope Zacharias (*Ep.* No. 11) and as erring from the truth in affirming that, without the outward form of baptism, we can become Christians by the imposition of the bishop's hands. (The whole letter is given in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lxxxix. 943 sq., and the part about Samson and Virgilius by Ussher, *Wks.* iv. 473, *Ep.* 17.) Bale (*Script. Brit.* par. post. 200) gives a long account of Samson and his companions, and of their contentions with St. Boniface, but much seems of no value. Dempster (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 579) and Tanner (*Bibl.* 650) take from Bale, but say he wrote *Super controversia cum Winfrido misso* (or *Winifrido Bonifacio*). He flourished about A.D. 750 (Fleury, *H. E.* xlii. 57; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 32). [J. G.]

SAMSUCIUS, bishop of Turris, or Turris Caesaris, a town of Numidia, forty miles south-east from Cirta (*Burgh Twill*, Shaw, p. 43), mentioned by St. Augustine as prepared to debate the question of Donatism with Proculeianus, Donatist bishop of Hippo Regius (Aug. *Ep.* 34. 6). He also consulted Samsucius on the question of the property of Honoratus [HONORATUS (24)] (Aug. *Ep.* 83. 4), and joined him and Alypius in a letter to Severus about the case of Timotheus (*Ep.* 63). [TIMOTHEUS (8).] [H. W. P.]

SAMPSYCHUS, of Gaza. [PORPHYRIUS (6).]

SAMUEL (1) Feb. 16, martyr, with four other Egyptians, under Firmilian at Caesarea, in the Diocletian persecution. They suffered with Pamphilus. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* cap. xi.) [G. T. S.]

SAMUEL (2), a Persian martyr, put to death with his brother, Bar-Hadbesciaba, by Sapor, for supporting the forty martyrs, "ex facultatibus suis" (Asseman. *Bibl. Or.* i. 192). [E. V.]

SAMUEL (3), established by Pachomius as oeconomus in the monastery he founded at Panis. (*Vit. Pachom.* in Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. 315, ed. 1866; Tillem. vii. 222.) [C. H.]

SAMUEL (4), 1st bishop of Tus in Chaldea, about A.D. 430. He was a favourite with Beheranus or Vararenes, king of Persia, and kept his people in peace. (Assem. *B. O.* iii. 214, 397; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1337.) [J. G.]

SAMUEL (5), Syrian patriarch of Armenia, A.D. 432. Another Samuel of Ardzge was patriarch in 492. (Saint-Martin, *Mém. sur l'Arménie*, t. i. p. 437, ed. Paris, 1818.) [G. T. S.]

SAMUEL (6), a presbyter, of Edessa, the chief of the accusers of his bishop, Ibas, at Antioch (A.D. 448), Tyre and Beryhoea (A.D. 449), in revenge for having been inhibited from preaching by him for unsoundness of doctrine (Labbe, iv. 654) [IBAS, Vol. III. p. 193]. Gennadius states that he was the reputed author of many works in Syriac, directed against the enemies of the Church, but especially against the Nestorians, Eutychians, and other recent heretics, and that when Gennadius wrote he was still alive at Constantinople, A.D. 493. (Gennad. *de Virr. Illust.* c. 82; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 451; Clinton, *Fast. Rom.* i. 669; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 259; Hefele, *Counc.* iii. 178.) [E. V.]

SAMUEL (7), abbat of the monastery of St. Isaac at Gabula, addressed by James, bishop of Batna, in a letter wherein he attacks the council of Chalcedon and avows Eutychean sentiments (Ceill. x. 641; Asseman. *Bib. Orient.* i. 294; cf. however JACOBUS (4), t. iii. p. 328 of this dictionary). [G. T. S.]

SAMUEL (8), 5th Jacobite bishop of Amida, was intruded into the see by Chosroes II. A.D. 616, but was rejected in the patriarchate, as he had been appointed by the Maphrian and not by the patriarch. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* i. 266; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1413.) [J. G.]

SAMUS, bishop. [SYMPIUS.]

SANCTAN (SANTAN), son of Samuel Ceinnisel (or Chendisel), was bishop of Cill-dales, or Kill St. Ann, near Tallaght, co. Dublin. (On the identification of place and change of name, see Joyce's *Ir. Names of Places*, 2nd ser. p. 22.) His feast is May 9. (*M. Doneg.*: *Book of Obits C. C. Dublin*, lx.) [J. G.]

SANCTINUS, first bishop of Meaux, but his life is of very doubtful authenticity (Boll. *AA. SS.* 11 Oct. v. 585; *Gall. Christ.* viii. 1597). The sees of Meaux and Verdun each claim a Sanctinus as its first bishop in the fourth century, and it is disputed whether these two are the same (Vincent. Belvac. *Spec. Hist.* xi. 22: Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 466, 721, 722; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ix. 518–9). [J. G.]

SANCTISSIMUS, a presbyter probably deputed by Damasus to convey to Basil and the other prelates of the Eastern Church in 373 the assurance of the fraternal regard and sympathy of the Western Church with troubles under which they were then labouring. Basil sent him on his way with letters of introduction to the leading members of his communion to Meletius (*Ep.* 120 [58]), Theodotus (*Ep.* 221 [195]), Vitus of Charrae (*Ep.* 225 [314]), Pelagius of Laodicea (*Ep.* 254 [311]), Abraham of Batnae (*Ep.* 132 [315]); to the presbyters of Antioch (*Ep.* 253 [199]); together with a circular letter, which they were requested to sign. Sanctissimus appears to have returned to the West with Dorotheus in 374, and to have visited the East a second time in 375 or 376, and to have followed much the same course, visiting the chief orthodox bishops, conveying letters and messages of sympathy from the Western Church, and obtaining their signatures to circular letters for him to carry back with him (*Ep.* 256 [200]; 239 [200]). (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* ix. 259.) [E. V.]

SANCTULUS, a simple and illiterate priest of Nursia, near Spoleto, who visited Gregory the Great at Rome every year. Gregory tells various stories about him, and especially how some Lombards gave a deacon they had taken prisoner in charge to him, on condition that if he let him escape his life should be forfeited. Sanctulus freed him and ordered him to fly; the Lombards accordingly resolved to behead him; he knelt to receive the stroke, but the raised arm of the executioner was miraculously arrested, and its use was restored to him only at the intercession of Sanctulus. The astonished Lombards offered him all the cattle they had taken, but he refused, and obtained from them instead the release of all their prisoners. Gregory makes the reflection, "comparemus cum hac nostra indocta scientia illius doctam ignorantiam." (Gregorii *Dial.* lib. iii. 37, in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 305.) It was Sanctulus who narrated to Gregory the story referred to under EUTYCHIUS (31). [F. D.]

SANCTUS (1), deacon of Vienne, martyred at Lyons, A.D. 177. (Euseb. v. 1.) [C. H.]

SANCTUS (2), addressed along with Amandus in two letters by Paulinus of Nola. Sanctus and Paulinus had been friends before the conversion of the latter. Paulinus had written to Sanctus, and had received only a short answer, followed by a long silence broken at last by a letter, with which Paulinus was overjoyed. He deprecates, however, the praises, of which he declares himself unworthy. The letter contains a curious explanation of the verse, "I am become like a pelican in the wilderness," &c., in which Paulinus uses information about the pelican received from a friend who had been a great traveller (probably Rufinus). From the expressions of Paulinus it appears that Sanctus had also been converted. In the second letter Paulinus thanks Sanctus for some hymns he had sent him, and explains the parable of the ten virgins. (Paulini *Epp.* 40, 41, in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 367, 377.) [F. D.]

SANXO, bishop. [SAMPSON.]

SANSALA, a Gothic presbyter and confessor, mentioned in the acts (§ 4) of the Gothic martyr St. Sabas. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 12 Ap. ii. 89, ed. 1866; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, p. 81.) [C. H.]

SAPAUDUS (1) (SABAUDUS), twenty-second archbishop of Arles, between St. Aurelianus and Licerius, a son of the patrician Placidus, and descendant of the emperor Avitus, was an intimate friend and correspondent of Pope Pelagius I., who, with the gift of the *pallium*, appointed him his vicar in Gaul (A.D. 557), and stoutly maintained the privileges of the see against the attempted infringements both of King Childebert and the neighbouring bishops. In the struggle between Sigebert and Guntram for the possession of Arles, Sapaudus secured the success of the latter by a daring ruse (A.D. 571). He presided at the fifth council of Arles in 554, was present at the second of Paris in 555 or 551, according to some, the fourth of Paris in 573, the second of Valence in 584, and by deputy at the second of Mâcon in 585. In the following year he died. (Pelagius, *Epist.* 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 401–7; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 30, viii. 39; *Gall. Christ.* i. 539; Trichaud, *Hist. de l'Église d'Arles*, ii. 106–122.)

Magnan has a story that by his preaching he converted the Allobroges, whose country thenceforward was called after him Sabaudia, or Savoy (*Vies des SS. de l'Église de Marseille*, p. 84).

[S. A. B.]

SAPAUDUS (2), professor of rhetoric at Vienne, had a famous school, and belonged to a family of rhetoricians. He was contemporary with Mamertus Claudius (*Ep.* ii.) and Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* v., no. 10) and received letters from both, complimenting him on his eloquence and encouraging him in study. He lived towards the end of the sixth century (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. liii. 783, and t. lviii. 541; *Hist. Lit. de la France*, ii. 450–1, 498; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 355, 389, 554). [J. G.]

SAPIDA, a virgin, who presented to St. Augustine a garment which she had made for her brother, probably named Timotheus, a deacon of the church of Carthage, but which his death prevented him from receiving. Augustine accepted it with pleasure, and tells her in a letter that he had begun to wear it. Expressing his sympathy with her in her great sorrow, he exhorts her to maintain her virgin life, as being thereby brought nearer to her deceased brother; for whose loss he endeavours to console her by the thoughts, that her treasure is now the safer for being laid up in store, that in the resurrection she will be reunited to him, and that the garment which he is now wearing is an emblem of the never-fading one in which her brother will hereafter be clothed (Aug. *Ep.* 263).

[H. W. P.]

SAPIDIANUS, vicar of Africa, to whom was addressed, Feb. 25, 400, a law of Honorius, ordaining that a rescript which the Donatists had obtained from the emperor Julian in 362, containing a disreputable request of theirs, should be set up in the most public places. (*Cod. Theod.* vii. 155, ed. Godefr.; Tillem. xiii. 525.) [C. H.]

SAPOR (1) II., king of Persia A.D. 310–381. The secular history of this monarch will be found in the Dictionary of *Greek and Roman Biography* under the title Sassanidae, and in the authorities there quoted, to which may be added Gibbon, cap. xviii., Le Beau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, De Broglie, *L'Eglise de l'Empire*, t. iii. p. 180; Saint-Martin's History of Armenia in *Journal Asiatique*, March 1830, p. 178; Clinton's *Fasti*, and Rawlinson's *Seventh Oriental Monarchy*, p. 143–253. He is noted in ecclesiastical history for the violent persecution raised by him against the Persian Christians, which has furnished many narratives to Asseman's *Eastern Martyrs*. Theodoret (i. 25) inserts a letter written by Constantine the Great to Sapor, in which he commends the Christians of his dominions to the care of the king. It is evident that his hostile intentions were already manifest, but were restrained through fear of Constantine. As soon as that emperor was dead the persecution burst forth and raged for many years with more or less violence. War was thereupon declared by Rome. The Persians attacked Nisibis, which endured three distinct sieges at their hands. Its deliverance is attributed by Theodoret (*H. E.* ii. 30) to the piety and skill of James, bishop of that city, of which he tells some wondrous tales. [JACOBUS (4).] Sapor is also celebrated as the sovereign by whom Julian's Persian expedition was defeated. Cf. JULIANUS (103), Vol. III. p. 513 of this dictionary. [G. T. S.]

SAPOR (2), a bishop and martyr in Persia, under the king Sapor II., about A.D. 340. Assem. *AA. MM.* i. 226; Ceill. iii. 341.) [G. T. S.]

SAPOR (3), 3rd Nestorian bishop of Bethgarma in Chaldea, died A.D. 342 in the persecution under Sapor II. (Assem. *B. O.* i. 189; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1237.) [J. G.]

SAPOR (4), a Roman general, to whom the emperor Gratian confided the task of expelling the Arians from the churches of the East, and restoring them to those who were in communion with Damasus, bishop of Rome. (Theodoret. *H. E.* v. 2, 3, cf. the edict. "De Catholica Fide" in *Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi.) He drove Apollinaris of Laodicea out of the church. [APOLLINARIS, Vol. I. p. 134.] [G. T. S.]

SAPRICIUS, priest of Antioch, A.D. 260. He refused to be reconciled to his former friend Nicephorus, and became an apostate through his lack of charity. The story is told under NICEPHORUS, Feb. 9. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* p. 243.) [G. T. S.]

SARA (Σάρρα), female solitary, entitled ἀμμᾶς, i.e. mater, the feminine of abbas, near Scetis. She was thirteen years constantly assaulted by an unclean demon, and for sixty resided near the river without looking at it. (Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* v. 7, § 19; Cotel. *Mon. Gr. Eccl.* i. 691; Tillem. x. 473.) [C. H.]

SARAGOSSA, MARTYRS OF, April 16. Eighteen persons are celebrated under this name by Prudentius, Hymn. 4. They suffered under the president Dacianus. Their names are Optatus, Lupercus, Successus, Martialis, Urbanus, Julia, Quinctilianus, Publius, Fronto, Felix, Caecilianus, Evotius or Eventius, Primitivus, Apodemius, and four Saturnini. [DACIANUS (1).] [G. T. S.]

SARAN (2), surnamed UI CRITAIN, died A.D. 662 (*Ann Tig.*). He is the Saranus who is classed with the "Caeteris doctoribus seu abbatibus Scotis," in the paschal letter from the pope elect to the Irish church, A.D. 640 (Bede, *E. H.* ii. c. 19; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 17 n.). [CRONAN (11).] He is identified by O'Donovan (*Four Mast.* i. 572 n[d]) with the patron of Tisaran, bar. Garrycastle, King's Co., and Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 581, and *Men. Scot.* Jan. 23, Mar. 10) ascribes to him *Epistolae ad Hilarium, Super Controversias de Paschatis celebratione*, and places his relics at Tungland. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 190, 194; Boll. *Acta SS.* 10 Mart. ii. 3 praet., 30 Jul. vii. 139, praet., both upon Dempster.) [J. G.]

SARAPAMMON (Σαραπάμμων), one of the Egyptian catholic bishops banished by the Arian party. (Athan. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 79.) [C. H.]

SARBELIUS (1) (SHARBIL.) [See EDESSA, MARTYRS OF. Vol. I.] To what has been stated in the article just referred to must here be added that Syriac acts of Sarbelius, and other Edessan martyrs, were included by Cureton in his *Antiqua Monumenta Syriaca*, 1864, and that a Latin translation of these acts, together with abundant illustrative matter, has since been published by Moesinger, Innspruck, 1874. According to these acts, Sarbelius was the chief priest of the idol worship of Edessa. Trajan, in the 15th year of his reign (which is also described as the third year of Abgarus, the 7th king, and the 416th of the era of Alexander the Great) issued a command to the rulers of the provinces of his empire that sacrifices and libations should be renewed and increased in every city, and that those who refused to take part should be punished with cruel tortures. On the announcement of this command, Barsimaeus, the bishop of the Christians, accompanied by a priest and deacon, waited on Sarbelius, and warned him of the responsibility he incurred by leading so many into the error of worshipping gods made with hands. They briefly tell him of the doctrine concerning our Lord's Incarnation and death, taught by Paluth, the disciple of Addai, the apostle, and believed in by the earlier king Abgarus. Sarbelius is at once converted; is admitted to baptism that night, and makes his appearance next day clad in the Christian baptismal robes. A great multitude, including some chief men of the city, join him in his conversion. The acts then relate how the governor Licinius brings Sarbelius before him and commands him to sacrifice. Licinius makes it a point of honour to overcome the constancy of the martyr, and as each form of torture is tried without success, orders a new and more severe one. The series of tortures described actually runs to the number of eighteen. Finally, he is put to death with new tortures, being partially sawn asunder and then beheaded. His sister Barbea is united with him in martyrdom. There are separate acts of Barsimaeus, evidently by the same hand. They relate how Barsimaeus, after the martyrdom of Sarbelius, is brought before the tribunal, and how the magistrate commences a like series of tortures in order to shake his constancy. But when the torments have not proceeded beyond the second or third stage, a letter, ordering the cessation of the persecution, arrives from Trajan, who has by this time become convinced of the excellence of Christian morality, and of the general agreement of their laws concerning conduct with the laws of the empire.

These Edessan acts acquired very considerable celebrity. Moesinger publishes an Armenian translation, and the name of Sarbelius is commemorated in the Greek Menaea under the dates Jan. 29 and Oct. 15, and in the Latin martyrologies under the same dates. There is also a Thathuel commemorated on Sept. 4, whose story is identical with that of Sarbelius, so that it may be assumed that the same person is intended. Moesinger labours hard to maintain that the extant acts were written by a contemporary of Sarbelius, and that they are historically trustworthy; but his arguments are too weak to deserve serious refutation. It is not worth while to discuss the details of the story, or to enquire how the state of things described answers to the date A.D. 105 or 106, which the acts assign to the martyrdom. Two marks of fiction show themselves on the face of the story. One is the extravagant amount of tortures alleged to have been inflicted, the narrator having been so eager to accumulate proofs of the constancy of his hero, that he did not stop to consider what a Roman magistrate was likely to order, or what the human frame was capable of enduring. The other is, the familiarity of Sarbelius with the New Testament, which would have been noteworthy in a Christian of long standing in the year 105, but is incredible in the case of a newly-made convert. He is made not only to quote the Gospels several times, but also the book of Psalms and the Epistle to the Romans. We may ascribe the acts to the latter part of the fourth century. They are probably later than Eusebius, who shows no sign of acquaintance with the story. On the other hand, the acts are largely employed in a sermon, printed by Moesinger, by James of Sarug, who died A.D. 522. [JACOBUS (13)].

To this may be added that there is a strong family likeness between the acts of Sarbelius and those of Habibus, and of Samona and Guria, which are also given in Cureton's work. Since the latter martyrs are alleged to have suffered in the Diocletian persecution, the former acts which have the air of coming from the same workshop are at least no earlier. [G. S.]

SARMATIO. In the Epistle of St. Ambrose (lxiii.) to the church of Vercellae, Sarmatio and Barbatianus are denounced as apostate monks, who had fled from their monastery and repudiated the principles of monasticism. They affirmed that there was no merit in fasting or virginity. They had gone to Vercellae, and St. Ambrose warns the Church against their doctrines. [J. Ll. D.]

SATANIANI. [EUPHEMITAE, Vol. II. p. 292.] The name Sataniani is copied by Augustine (*Haer.* 57) from Epiphanius, but without giving any explanation of it. Praedestinatus based his work on Augustine's tract on heresies, and this title gives an amusing illustration of his style of workmanship. He found in Augustine

(*Haer.* 57) the name Sataniani without any explanation of the tenets of the sect, and (*Haer.* 67) the tenets of a sect described without any name. So he combines his information, calls the latter sect Satanniani, and since their tenets as described throw no light on the name, he invents an imaginary Satannius as the founder of the sect. [G. S.]

SATTIUS, African bishop, twentieth in Tit. Conc. Carth. ii. *de pace*, Cyp. *Ep.* 57; sixteenth in Tit. Conc. Carth. iv. *de Basil.* Cyp. *Ep.* 67; thirty-second in Conc. Carth. v. *de Bap.* i. Cyp. *Ep.* 70; bishop of Sicilibba (Procons. Prov.); thirty-ninth suffrage in Conc. vii. *de Bapt.* iii., where the Codex Reginensis reads Sicilibra as Anton. Itin. Other forms in Morcelli are Sicilippa, Sciliba, Sibida. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (1). (Σατορνῖνος, Iren. i. 22; Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 7; *Constt. Apol.* vi. 8. So also Ps.-Tert. 3; Philaster 31; August. *Haer.* 3. but Σατορνεῖλος or Σατορνῖλος, Hippol. *Ref.* vii. 28; Epiph. *Haer.* 23; Theodoret, *Haer. Fab.* i. 3.) In that section of the work of Irenaeus which commences I. 22, he gives a list of heretics, to all appearances derived from the work of Justin Martyr. The first two on this list are the Samaritan heretics, Simon and Menander; and the next, as having derived their doctrines from these, are Saturninus and Basilides; who taught, the former in the Syrian Antioch, the latter in Egypt. Irenaeus proceeds to tell that Saturninus like Menander, ascribes the ultimate origin of things to a Father unknown to all; and taught that this Father made Angels, Archangels, Powers, Authorities; but that the world and the things therein were made by a certain company of seven angels, in whom no doubt we are to recognise the rulers of the seven planetary spheres. He taught that man was the work of the same angels. They had seen a brilliant image (εἰκών) descend from the supreme power, and had striven to detain it, but in vain; for it immediately shot back again. So they encouraged each other; "Let us make man after the image and after the likeness" (κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν, Gen. i. 25). They made the man but they were too feeble to give him power to stand erect, and he lay on the ground wriggling like a worm (ὡς σκώληκος σκαρίζοντος) until the upper power taking compassion on him because he had been made "in its likeness," sent a spark of life which raised the man and made him live. Saturninus taught that after man's death this spark runs back to its kindred, while the rest of man is resolved into the elements whence he was made.

The same myth as to the creation of man is reported by Irenaeus (I. xxx. 5) to have been included in the system commonly known as Ophite; and that there is a relation of literary dependence between the two stories is clear from the common use of the word σκαρίζω. But according to the Ophite story it is not the Supreme Power, but Ialdabaoth the chief of the creative company who bestows the breath of life; and these angels say, as in Genesis, "Let us make man after *our* image." We may count Saturninus as the originator of the myth, for the Ophite version has marks of less simplicity and originality. Some of the earliest editors of Irenaeus supplied the "our" in his account of Saturninus, equally against MS. authority and the requirements of the context; and Theodoret or his transcribers have made the same mistake. But the absence of ἡμετέραν is attested not only by Epiphanius, who (*Haer.* 23) severely criticises this departure from the Scripture text, but by an earlier authority. In an extract given by Hippolytus (vi. 14) from the μεγάλη ἀπόφασις, which purported to be the work of Simon Magus, the words of Genesis are quoted with the same omission, but an entirely different use is made of them. Man is said to have been created not single but two-fold, κατ' εἰκόνα, and καθ' ὁμοίωσιν. This coincidence is one of the points that ought to be discussed in forming an opinion as to the date of the work quoted by Hippolytus.

Saturninus further taught that the God of the Jews was one of the seven creator angels. He and his company were in constant warfare with Satan and a company of evil angels. So, likewise, there were two distinct species of men, the one good, the other bad, the latter ever aided by the demons in their conflicts with the others. Then the Supreme Father sent a Saviour to destroy the power of the God of the Jews and the other Archons; and to save those who had the spark of life in them; that is to say, the good. This Saviour had no human birth or human body, and was only a man in appearance.

This portion of the teaching ascribed to Saturninus presents the aspect of an inconsistent mixture of different systems. In the case of a conflict between good and evil angels, we should expect that the Supreme, if he interfered, would interfere on the side of the good; yet here the object of the mission of the Saviour is represented as the destruction, not so much of the power of Satan, as of that of the God of the Jews. In the Gnostic systems generally, the origin of evil is traced to the creation of matter, and so the work of redemption is constantly represented as the destruction of the power of the Being or beings who had created the material world. But such systems could very well dispense with the doctrine of evil angels. We may conjecture that Saturninus, whose use of the Old Testament is evidenced by his quotation of Gen. i., derived from the Jewish Scriptures the doctrine of Satan and his angels, and superadded to it a theory suggested by the principle that matter is essentially evil. This principle explains also his docetic teaching concerning the Saviour.

The same principle also explains his Encratism, a rule of life which Saturninus seems to have been the first to introduce among those who called themselves Christians. Some Gnostic teachers justified sexual immorality as but a courageous violation of arbitrary precepts imposed by the God of the Jews. Saturninus on the contrary taught that marriage and generation came from Satan; and many of his followers abstained besides from animal food of all kinds, attracting admiring followers by this severity of life.

It only remains to mention that Saturninus ascribed the Jewish prophecies, some to the creator angels and some to Satan. This is one of several points of coincidence between the reports given by Irenaeus of the teaching of Saturninus and of the Ophites whom he describes (I. xxx.) These do not ascribe any of the prophecies to Satan, but Irenaeus (§ 11) gives the

scheme according to which they distributed the prophecies among the several angels. Saturninus does not appear to have left any writings. His sect is named by Justin Martyr (*Trypho* 35), and by Hegesippus (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 22.)] No later haeresiologist appears to know anything about him beyond what he learned from Irenaeus; and Irenaeus himself in all probability gives but second-hand information derived from Justin Martyr. [G. S.]

SATURNINUS (2) (SERNIN), ST., martyr, first bishop and patron of Toulouse. According to his *Acta*, which were published by Surius (Nov. 29), and again by Ruinart after careful revision, in his *Acta Sincera* (p. 128–133), Saturninus came to Toulouse in the consulship of Decius and Gratius (A.D. 251), apparently from Rome (cf. Venant. Fort. *Misc.* ii. 12, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 101). Here his preaching so exasperated the people that they put him to a shocking death by binding him to a bull, which they infuriated by goads. Some years later St. Hilary (third bishop of Toulouse) built a little chapel over his remains for worshippers, but left the coffin undisturbed. Next Silvius (bishop circ. A.D. 364) constructed a beautiful church for its reception, but his death left the task of removing the body to his successor Exuperius. So say the *Acta*, which are highly praised by critics (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 161; Ceillier, ii. 111), and which Ruinart believed were written fifty years after the martyrdom, conjecturing somewhat boldly that the narrative of the translation of the body was a later addition (p. 128). But there were two other traditions current in early times and in the middle ages, one that Saturninus was sent into France by St. Clement at the end of the first century, the other that his mission was from the apostles themselves. The former view is to be found in Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Mart.* i. 48), though it is inconsistent with the *Hist. Franc.* i. 28, where he adopts the version of the *Acta*, in Rabanus Maurus (*Martyrologium*, Nov. 29) and many writers of the middle ages. Nor is the latter tradition lacking in antiquity, being as old as Venantius Fortunatus, if the *Passio S. Dionysii* is rightly ascribed to him (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 579), and appearing in many other ancient sources (see Ceillier, ii. 111 n.) The recent editor of Ceillier believes the author of the *Acta* was mistaken as to the date, and that the mission in fact should be referred back to apostolic times (*ibid.*)

Saturninus's feast is Nov. 29, though events in connection with the history of his relics are marked on other days. His cult was widely extended, churches being dedicated to him in many places in France, and even in some of the provinces of Spain. Sidonius Apollinaris celebrates his martyrdom in Sapphic stanzas (*Epist.* ix. 16). Venantius Fortunatus has some verses on the same event, the wonder-working virtues of his tomb (*Misc.* ii. 11, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 99), and the beautiful church built towards the close of the sixth century by Launibodes on the spot where he was bound to the bull, and which came to be known as du Taur or du Taureau (ii. 12, col. 100). From Gregory of Tours we gather that portions of his relics were at the monastery of Pauliac (*De Glor. Mart.* i. 48), at Iciac or Issac in the Auvergne (*ibid.* i. 66), and at one time in Burgundy, where they were rescued from a burning church by a man of Tours and consigned to the altar of the church at Neuvy in Touraine (*De Glor. Mart.* i. 31), and finally in Gregory's own oratory at Tours (*De Glor. Conf.* xx.). An unfounded tradition claimed the possession of the body for St. Denys at Paris whither it was said to have been carried in 637, but in fact, according to Adrien Baillet, it was discovered in the martyr's own church at Toulouse in the year 1258 after being lost to view for some centuries (*Vies des Saints*, Nov. 29). There was an early tradition that, before his death, he uttered a prayer that Toulouse might never have a bishop of its own citizens for ever, which Gregory says up to his time had been fulfilled (*Hist. Franc.* i. 28). [S. A. B.]

SATURNINUS (3, 4, 5), African bishops. Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 2, *de pace*, A.D. 252, *Ep.* 57. [E. B. W.]

SATURNINUS (6, 7), African bishops. Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 4, *de Basilide*, A.D. 254, *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (8, 9, 10), African bishops; of the thirty-two sending the synodal epistle of Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. 5, *de Bapt. Haer.* i., A.D. 255 (Cyp. *Ep.* 70). [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (11, 12), Numidian bishops; of the eighteen receiving the Ep. Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. 5, *de Bap.* 1, Cyp. *Ep.* 70. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (13), Carthaginian confessor, tortured with the *unqulae* in April A.D. 250 before the proconsul. Then banished, or fled to Rome with all his family, Cyp. *Epp.* 21, 22. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (14), bishop of Avitinae (vv. ll. abitinis, avitinisi, vitinis), 64th in *Sentt. Epp.* Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. His see a colony in Prov. Proc. (not to be confounded with either Avitta, *Momms.* Insc. viii. pp. 100, 148), afterwards famous for its martyrs and its *traditor* bishop Fundanus; in the persecution of Diocletian for its confessor bishop Gaudiosus under Genseric; and for its author bishop Augustalis against the Monothelites (Morcelli). [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (15) (? same as 13), Cyp. *Ep.* 27, a Carthaginian confessor, quoted as an example of one who would give no *libelli*, though imprisoned after torture. Received with AURELIUS exhortatory letters from the confessors MOYSES, &c., at Rome. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (16) *Sentt. Epp.* 51 in Conc. Carth. sub. Cyp. vii., bishop of Victoriana, of which we seem to have no inscriptions, but which is stated in 2nd Council of Constantinople to be in Byzacene Province, and so is not that mentioned by Augustine as in Mauret. Caesar (Morcelli). [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (17), bishop (and confessor) of Tucca or Thugga Terebinthina in Prov. Byzac. *Mommsen*, viii. p. 77; of Tucca in Numidia, *Morcelli*, but apparently by a transposition of HONORATUS, in which case Tucca in Prov. Proc. should have been assigned to this Saturninus. There was another Tucca in Sitifensis. *Sentt. Epp.* in Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. no. 52. [E. W. B.]

SATURNINUS (18) (SATURIANUS) CLAUDIUS, curator of Aptunga or Autumnae, at the enquiry into the case of Felix, bishop of that place, A.D. 314. (Opt. i. 26; Aug. *Ep.* 88. 4; *c. Cresc.* iii. 81; *Mon. Vet. Don.* pp. 162, 206, ed. Oberthür; pp. 163, 185, ed. Dupin.) [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (19), a grave-digger (fossor), a witness at the inquiry, under Zenophilus, A.D. 320, into the conduct of Silvanus, bishop of Cirta, at the time of the persecution, A.D. 303. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 170, ed. Oberthür; p. 170, ed. Dupin; Aug. vol. ix. app. pp. 794–797.) [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (20), a deacon, examined at the inquiry under Zenophilus, A.D. 320. (*Mon. Vet. Don.* pp. 178, 179. ed. Oberthür; p. 170, ed. Dupin; Aug. vol. ix. app. p. 798.) [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (21), eighth bishop of Arles, between Valentinus and Artemius, was a pillar of Arianism in the west. In the winter of 353 he presided at the council of Arles, which, in the presence of Constantius, condemned Athanasius, and sentenced Paulinus of Treves to deprivation and exile. About this time, however, a more powerful champion of orthodoxy than Paulinus appeared on the scene in the person of Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, and in the west the battle was henceforth between him on the one side, and Saturninus, with Ursacius and Valens, supported by the emperor on the other. In 356 Saturninus presided at the council of Béziers, which decreed the exile of Hilary; and it seems probable, from allusions in Hilary's writings, that he was also at the council of Rimini, in 359, and was one of the legates despatched thence to the emperor at Constantinople (Hilarius, *ad Const. Aug.* ii. 3, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* x. 565). This appears to have been the culminating point of the archbishop's fortune. Hilary, not long after, returned to Gaul, and Saturninus, still unbending in his opposition, was deprived of his see, and even excommunicated, as is thought, at the first council of Paris in 362. According to Sulpicius Severus, he was more than a heretic, being "vir sane pessimus et ingenio malo pravoque; verum etiam praeter haeresis infamiam, multis atque infandis criminibus convictus;" and again "homo impotens et factiosus" (Sulp. Sever. *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 45, 40, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 155, 152). But it must, of course, be remembered that we have only the accounts of his religious adversaries. In addition to the sources abovementioned, see the references scattered through the writings of Hilary in *Patr. Lat.* ix. x.; *Gall. Christ.* i. 523–4; Mansi, iii. 231, 251, 293, 359. [S. A. B.]

SATURNINUS (22), Encratite bishop about A.D. 374. His episcopal rank was recognised on his conversion to the church, together with another bishop named Zoïs, though Basil, who mentions his case in his canonical letter to Amphilochius, lays down in general that such persons were to be rebaptized. [AMPHILOCHIUS.] (Basil. *Epist.* 188; Ceill. iv. 458.) [G. T. S.]

SATURNINUS (23). An imperial general, consul in A.D. 383, a friend of Gregory Nazianzen, who wrote to him in 382 to excuse himself from attending the synod convened by Theodosius for that year (*Ep.* 132). EUDOXIUS (9). [E. V.]

SATURNINUS (24), husband of Castriccia, a leading member of the female cabal against Chrysostom at Constantinople headed by the empress Eudoxia. He was consul in 383. On the revolt of Gainas, the Gothic commander, the terms demanded by the haughty barbarian for laying down his arms were the heads of Saturninus and Aurelian, praefect of the East. The weak Arcadius yielded to the demand, and Saturninus and his companions were given up to Gainas. Through the earnest intercessions of Chrysostom their lives were spared, though not till the sword had been actually brought down upon their necks, and blood had been drawn by it. The captives were kept in Gainas's hands as hostages until his overthrow, when they returned to Constantinople (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 6; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 4; Zosim. v. 18, p. 759; Chrysost. *Homil. cum Saturn. et Aurel.*, &c., vol. iii. pp. 405 ff.) [AURELIAN.] [E. V.]

SATURNINUS (25), bishop of Uzalis, fl. 388, mentioned by St. Augustine as having daily visited the advocate Innocentius at the time of his remarkable cure at Carthage, c. 392. (*Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 366; Tillem. xii. 582, xiii. 124, 166.) [C. H.]

SATURNINUS (26), a Donatist bishop present at the council of Cabarsussum, A.D. 393 (Aug. *En. Ps.* 36, 20.) [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (27), a bishop in Palestine, A.D. 400, one of those to whom the synodical letter of Theophilus in condemnation of Origen is addressed (Jerome, *Ep.* 92, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

SATURNINUS, the name of three presbyters mentioned in Augustine's letters; (28) the first (*Ep.* 142) lapsed with Eufrates into Donatism, but returned to the church;

(29) Another, bore a letter from Optatus, bishop of Mileum, to Augustine (*Ep.* 202 bis);

(30) The third was present at the proceedings relating to the appointment of ERACLIUS (1) (*Ep.* 213). [H. W. P.]

SATURNINUS (31), bishop of Marcianople, in succession to Dorotheus the Nestorian (Le Quien, *O. C.* i.; Farlati, *Illyr. Sac.* viii.). He was present at the council of Constantinople in A.D. 448, and at the Latrocinium in 449 (Hard. ii. 134, 167). Dorotheus successfully opposed his entrance on the see for a time till expelled by the civil power. (Tillem. xiv. 492, 498, xv. 496, 534.) [G. T. S.]

SATURNINUS (32), deposed priest, was forbidden by Gregory the Great ever to resume the performance of his priestly functions, but was allowed to continue his supervision over the monks in the islands of Gorgona and Capraria. Gregory the Great hearing subsequently that he had presumed to celebrate mass, directed that if it was true he should be excommunicated till his death. (*Epp.* v. 3, 4, 7.) [F. D.]

SATURUS (1), martyr with Perpetua, March 7. He wrote a vision contained in the *Passio Perpetuae*, cap. xi–xiii. His vision describes paradise, and embodies notices of some interesting liturgical practices, as of the Trisagion, the use of papa as a title of bishops, &c. [G. T. S.]

SATURUS (2), a Carthaginian confessor at Rome [MACARIUS (20)] about April or May A.D. 250; *after* Easter, *Ep.* 22. The context implies that he was connected with the clerus; if so, possibly the same Saturus whom about July of the same year Cyprian had with him in his retreat and ordained lector that he might with Optatus (whom he made subdeacon for the same purpose) be a proper envoy to the clergy of Rome, to whom he took *Ep.* 27 on the Lapsed, and *Ep.* 28, to Moyses and nine confessors. In *Ep.* 29 Cyprian, apologising to his own clergy for this private ordination, speaks of him as having been already *proximus clero*, having been more than once appointed to read on Easter-day *communi consilio*. He probably brought back the reply of the Roman clergy, *Ep.* 30, i.e. Novatian's, and that of Moyses (*Ep.* 31). He was then sent on to Carthage to convey copies of these four letters to the clergy there, and provide for their publication. (*Ep.* 32–35.) [E. W. B.]

SATURUS (3). Saturus, Cyprian's acolyte, who conveyed Cornelius' Epistle (59) to Cyprian, A.D. 252. Fell (who avoids identifications) considers him to be the same as (1). But (1) was already at least a lector. [E. W. B.]

SATURUS (4), steward of Hunneric king of the Vandals, and a staunch catholic. Persisting in his refusal to embrace the Arian religion, notwithstanding every kind of threat and the entreaties of his own wife, he was at length dismissed and reduced to poverty, but never overcome. (Victor, Vit. *Persec. Vand.* i. 16; Till. xvi. 536.) [C. H.]

SATYRUS (URANUS), the much loved brother of St. Ambrose, who dwells upon his virtues in his discourse, *De Excessu Satyri* [AMBROSIUS, p. 93]. [J. Ll. D.]

SAUVE, ST. [SALVIUS (4).]

SAVE, legendary eldest daughter of Adam, and wife of Cain, so named in the Book of Jubilees, quoted by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 39, 5). [G. S.]

SAVINELLA, Columba, and Agnella, three African ladies of high rank, of whose almsgiving and good works Gregory the Great had heard. He exhorts them to persevere in their well-doing, and sends them a key containing fragments from the chains of St. Peter. (*Epp.* xii. 7.) [F. D.]

SAVINIANUS, the first bishop of Sens and martyr (*Gall. Chr.* xii. 2); fabled by some Gallic writers to have been one of the seventy, and sent by St. Peter to preach in Gaul; though other writers make him the missionary of the Roman see, placing him in the middle of the third century. Odorannus, a monk of St. Peter Vivus, c. 1028, wrote the history of his translation with that of Potentianus and their martyred companions, printed by Migne (*Pat. Lat.* cxlii. 777). His history is very doubtful. (Tillem. iv. 482, 727; Ceill. xiii. 113.) [C. H.]

SAXULF (SEXULF, SAEXULF), the first abbat of Medeshamstede and the seventh bishop of the Mercian church. Saxulf, according to Bede (*H. E.* iv. 6) was the builder and abbat of the monastery of Medeshamstede in the region of the Gyrvii or fenmen. On this statement the Peterborough historians erected a fabric of legend, traditional history and probable inference, which will not bear critical investigation, although some portions of it need not be entirely rejected. As the Gyrvian country was subject to Mercia, although occasionally under the East Anglian rulers, it is lawful to suppose that Peada and Wulfhere may in succession have patronised the foundation of Medeshamstede, which would be probably dated somewhere between 655 and 664. The Peterborough writers add, from tradition or invention, that Saxulf was a great thane of the neighbourhood, who with the four Northumbrian missionaries laboured for the conversion of Mercia during the short reign of Peada. [PEADA.] (Hugo Candidus, ed. Sparke, p. 23.) They further introduced into the great Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under the year 655 an account of the foundation different from, if not inconsistent with, that of Bede; making Peada and Oswy joint founders, and adding that it was by them committed to the monk Saxulf, who was God's friend, noble and rich. In the account of the reign of Wulfhere the Peterborough Chronicle describes the rich endowment bestowed by that king, on the advice of his brothers, Ethelred and Merwala, and his sisters Kyneburga and Kyneswitha; the sisters and Ethelred were present at the consecration which was performed by archbishop Deusdedit with the assistance of the bishops of London, Rochester, bishop Jeruman of Mercia and Tuda of Lindisfarne. The dedication was to St. Peter, and Wulfhere by word of mouth and by charter gave estates of land. The charter was dated in 664, and was confirmed by pope Vitalian. Under the year 675 is recorded a further endowment by Ethelred, and confirmation by pope Agatho. There is no doubt that the whole of these details are fabricated; but there is nothing impossible in the story assigned to the years 655 and 657 (*Chr. S.; M. H. B.* pp. 312–320). The charters, however, on which the story is actually based are forgeries (see Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 984, 990). Probably the forgery was perpetrated in the age of Edgar, when the reviving monastic interest was keenly intent on recovering every estate and privilege that had been lost during the Danish troubles.

In the year 675, or thereabouts, Theodore, having deposed the Mercian bishop Winfrith (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 6), appointed Saxulf to succeed him. The Chronicle mentions, as his successor at Medeshamstede, an abbat named Cuthbald, who must be identical with the person of that name who was abbat at Oundle, when Wilfrid died there, in 709 (Bede, *H. E.* v. 19). It is, however, quite possible that Saxulf retained the government of Medeshamstede in his own hands; for the Black book of Peterborough (MS. Soc. Ant. 60) contains the mention of a gift of king Ethelred to Medeshamstede conferred by placing on the gospels book a sod taken from the land given, and a similar benefaction of Friduric or Friodored, a Mercian Ealdorman, conveyed in the same way; both gifts being made in the presence of Saxulf. All this material is, however ancient, very questionable.

The history of Saxulf's episcopate is less apocryphal. At the time of his appointment the great Mercian diocese was undivided; the

deposition of Winfrith being possibly caused by his unwillingness to divide it, an unwillingness which was felt in Wessex also. The due organisation of the diocesan system was one of Theodore's great acts of policy, and accordingly in the council of Hertford, in 673, a proposition to increase the number of bishops, as the number of the faithful increased, was promulgated. It was waived in that assembly (*Councils*, Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 120), but in 679, with the assistance of Wulfhere and the Mercian Witan, Theodore broke up the great diocese into five; Worcester, Lichfield, Leicester, Sidnacester and Dorchester being the sees (Flor. Wig. App. *M. H. B.* 622); and Hereford being added probably the next year. Of these the see of Lichfield seems to have been given to Saxulf, and that of Leicester to Cuthwin; although the account of Florence is different, the ancient lists of bishops prove this to have been the case. Cuthwin, however, lived but a short time, and his see, whether at Lichfield or at Leicester, ultimately fell into the hands of Saxulf. Saxulf lived until about 691. On his death Wilfrid of York, who was in exile, undertook the government of a part of his diocese, Headda taking the other; the ancient lists make Wilfrid bishop at Leicester, and Headda at Lichfield (*M. H. B.* pp. 622, 623). Headda subsequently united the two. The statement of the Chronicle that Saxulf died in 705, is disproved both by the statement of Eddius (c. 44), that he was dead in 692, and by the attestation of Headda appended to Mercian charters. [HEDDA.] Of the acts of Saxulf as bishop little is known. It was, however, by him that Putta, the refugee bishop of Rochester, was settled among the people of Herefordshire (*H. E.* iv. 12). Besides Medeshamstede, Saxulf is said to have founded a monastery called Ancarig, afterwards Thorney (*Mon. Angl.* ii. 571, 59; Hearne, Appendix to Sprott, pp. 171, 172; Hugo Candidus, ed. Sparke, p. 6); also by the assistance of Wulfhere, and therefore before he became bishop. This is legendary.

It may be questioned whether any of the charters to which Saxulf's name is appended are genuine. The Malmesbury charters of 681 (K. *C. D.* 22, 23) and the Peterborough grants above referred to are certainly spurious; it is possible that the charter of Osric, Nov. 6, 676, may be genuine (*ib.* No. 12). See Will. Malmesb. G. P. ed. Hamilton, pp. 135, 235, 307, 352; *Mon. Angl.* i. 384; Hugo Candidus, ed. Sparke, pp. 1–23. [S.]

SCALITA (SCIALITA), Nestorian bishop of Rhesina in Mesopotamia, in the time of Georgius the catholicus, about the beginning of the 9th century or earlier. (Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1329.) Among the Syriac manuscripts brought from Amida to Rome and placed in the Vatican (described by Assemani, *B. O.* i. 581, 583, ii. 486) there are the following (in codices i., viii., x.) ascribed to Scalita, *Hymnus de Beata Maria*, *Homilia II. de S. Mariâ et de Feriâ Tertiâ Ninivitarum seu Rogationum ad primam Sessionem.* [J. G.]

SCAPULA, a proconsul of Africa to whom Tertullian addressed a remonstrance on account of his persecution of the Christians; a remonstrance which Tertullian declares was prompted by no shrinking from martyrdom on the part of the Christians, but solely by love for their enemies, and a desire to save them from the guilt of shedding innocent blood. He recounts the temporal calamities which had overtaken former persecutors of the Christians; he denounces the injustice of punishing men pure in life and always loyal to the emperor; men whose innocence the magistrates fully acknowledge by the unwillingness they evidently show to proceed to extremities, and the exertions they used to induce the accused persons to withdraw their confession. Finally, he represents the alarming scale on which persecution ought in consistency to be carried out. If, as had been done in another province, the Christians of Carthage were to go in a body and present themselves before the proconsul's tribunal, the magistrate would find before him thousands of every age, sex and rank, including many leading persons, and probably relations and intimates of his own friends; and he might well shrink from severities which would decimate the city. The tract addressed to Scapula is later than the emperor Severus, of whom it speaks in the past tense, "Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini [Caracallae] Christianorum memor fuit." "Clarissimas feminas et clarissimos viros Severus, sciens hujus sectae esse, non modo non laesit, verum et testimonio exornavit, et populo furenti in nos palam restitit." Tertullian is plainly appealing, by way of precedent, to the tolerance of a dead emperor, and not accusing the proconsul of opposing the wishes of a living one. But though some have thought that the tract was also later than Caracalla, Tertullian's boast that the Christians had not taken part with any of the rivals of Severus,—Cassius, Albinus, or Niger—would not be natural after the dynasty of Severus had been overthrown.

We may with great probability identify with the subject of this article, Scapula Tertullus, who was one of the ordinary consuls of the year 195. The usual interval between consulship and proconsulship was between 15 and 20 years. We thus arrive by another road at the result already obtained, viz. that the proconsulship is to be placed not very long after the death of Severus, which took place Feb. 9, 211. It has been attempted to fix the date with more precision by means of an eclipse of the sun which Tertullian has been thought to refer to in the words, "Sol ille in conventu Uticensi extincto paene lumine adeo portentum fuit ut non potuerit ex ordinario deliquio hoc pati positus in suo hypsomate et domicilio. Habetis astrologos." Ruinart (*Acta Sincera*, p. 119) gives a calculation made by a brother Benedictine fixing for the date of this eclipse April 11, 210. But there are several points in what Ruinart gives as the computed circumstances of this eclipse which suggest a doubt whether the calculation was made by a sufficiently skilled person; and in point of fact Professor Adams has examined the matter sufficiently to be able to say that if any eclipse took place at the date named it must have been a very small one; and that, large or small, it could not have been visible in North Africa. An eclipse which took place in 207 has been suggested, but that, though visible at Utica, was not of sufficient magnitude to answer the description of Tertullian. It may therefore be simplest to assent to Tertullian's own belief, that

the phenomenon which he describes was not an eclipse at all. His reasons for thinking so may not be convincing, nor indeed quite intelligible; but as he refers the proconsul to his own "astrologers," it is likely he knew that the scientific opinion of his day was that there had been no eclipse. There had been sudden darkness at midday, while the annual African assembly was in full session; but whether that darkness had been caused by dust cloud or storm cloud, or otherwise, we have no means of determining. [G. S.]

SCARILA, a man whose queries concerning the Incarnation and the creation of venomous animals caused Fulgentius of Ruspe to write his work *De Incarnatione Filii Dei et de Vilium Animalium Auctore* (cf. t. II., 581; FULGENTIUS (3)). [G. T. S.]

SCHALUL, deacon of Edessa, said to have been instrumental in the conversion of SARBELIUS. [G. S.]

SCHEMATICI, a name for the Monophysites in Joan. Damasc. *Haer.* 83. Some MSS. read Schismatici (see note in Migne, *Patr. Graec.* xciv. 742). [G. T. S.]

SCHOLASTICA, Saint, sister of S. Benedict. All that is known about her is derived from the Dialogues of Gregory the Great (ii. 33, 34, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvi. 193). According to him, she was dedicated to God from her childhood, and was accustomed to visit her brother once a year, who came to meet her with some of his disciples not far from his monastery, and afterwards return to her cell. She is commemorated on February 10th (*AA. SS.* Feb. ii. 392). [F. D.]

SCHOLASTICUS (1), principal eunuch of Theodosius the emperor. Cyril is said to have bribed him lavishly, and thus secured his influence against the Nestorian and Antiochene schools of thought. (Hefele, *Councils*, t. iii. pp. 81, 112, Clark's trans.; Mansi, t. v. p. 777.) [G. T. S.]

SCHOLASTICUS (2), a governor of Campania, to whom Gregory the Great wrote concerning the election of a bishop of Naples. The people at first chose Florentius, subdeacon of Rome. He declined the office. The pope then ordered Scholasticus to assemble the people of Naples for another election. If they failed in finding a local man they were to send three deputies to Rome to choose one there, an example of popular election of bishops so late as A.D. 592. [FLORENTIUS (44).] (Greg. Mag. *Epist.* iii. 15.) [F. D.]

SCHOLASTICUS (3), defensor, addressed in two letters of Gregory the Great. (*Epp.* viii. 32, xi. 20.) [F. D.]

SCILLITAN MARTYRS. Under Felix (212) we have given an abstract of the acts of these martyrs. When that notice was written we practically knew no more about them than Ruinart did two centuries ago, upon whose statements that abstract was founded. Since that time much additional light has been thrown upon their history. The case stood thus. According to Ruinart's theory, which we adopted, the Scillitan Martyrs suffered under Sept. Severus between 198 and 202, about the time when Perpetua and Felicitas were martyred. They suffered under the proconsul Saturninus, who, it was assumed, had been consul about the year 190, and was therefore proconsul in Africa about ten years later, according to the usual rules of promotion in the imperial civil service. Several apparently conclusive proofs confirmed this view. In the MS. used by Baronius the proconsul speaks not only of several emperors as ruling together, but also names Severus and his son Antoninus Caracalla. Now as Caracalla received the title of Augustus only in 198, we had a limit fixed on one side, and on the other side we could not go much beyond the year 200 when Tertullian composed his *Apologeticus*, in which he mentions several bloody executions of the faithful, and we certainly cannot go below the date of his letter to Scapula where he expressly says, c. 3, that "Vigellius Saturninus who first drew the sword upon us lost his eyes." Suspicion however arose some years ago in the mind of M. Léon Renier, an eminent French archaeologist, that the true date of these Acts was much earlier. He noticed that the first line of the existing codices gave the names of the consuls for the year of the martyrdom very variously. The MS. of Baronius gave it as "Existente Claudio Consule;" a fragment published by Mabillon, *Vet. Analect.* t. 4, p. 155. as "Praesidente bis Claudiano Consule." Other codices substituted for *praesidente* or *existente praestante* or *praesente*. He therefore suggested in a letter to Borghesi, that the word *bis* ought to follow a proper name indicating a second consulship, and that the word *consule* ought to be replaced by *consulibus*. Finding moreover in the Fasti the names Praesens II. and Condianus as consuls for 180, he proposed that the first line of our acts should be read, "Praesente bis et Condiano Consulibus." Borghesi, in his reply (*Oeuvres Complètes*, t. viii. p. 615), points out that this hypothesis would necessitate a further change. The words *Dominis nostris imperatoribus Severo et Antonino* must be altered into *imperatoribus Antonino et Commodo*, and further that according to it, in the middle of July 180, that is, five months after the death of Marcus Aurelius, when Commodus had been reigning alone for that period, the African proconsul knew nothing of this fact and supposed the Empire had still two emperors, which is scarcely credible. This was Borghesi's crowning objection, to which Renier could make no reply. Matters were in this state when in 1881 Usener, a Bonn professor, published a hitherto unknown text of these Acts from a MS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* of Paris. This MS. dates from the end of the 9th century. It is of great value, because it furnishes the precise date of the episode in question, and quite bears out the hypothesis tentatively put forward by Renier. It explicitly names the two consuls, and these consuls are the very two suggested by Renier, Praesus II. and Condianus. The date in this MS. is the one fixed in all the Martyrologies; XVI. Kal. Aug. or July 17th. This document furthermore clears up the special difficulty urged by Borghesi. There is no mention of Severus or of Caracalla. It speaks of one emperor quite consistently with the facts of the case, since

Commodus on July 17th 180, was sole emperor. The proconsul of Africa is Saturninus. He continues the policy of the previous reign which is not yet modified by the domestic influences which led Commodus to favour the Christians. In 177 persecution had raged at Lyons. It was now the turn of Africa. The first African martyr, Namphamo, henceforth celebrated as the "archimartyr" of Africa, with his companions, Mygdon, Lucitas, and Samae, had suffered perhaps but a few days before. [NAMPHAMO.] (*Mart. Rom.* July 4; August. *Ep. ad Maxim.* Madaur. *opera*, ed. Bened. *Epp.* 16 and 17; Aubé, *Les Chrétiens dans l'Empire Romain*, p. 199; Renier, *Inscript. d'Algérie*, Num. 1030, 1761, &c.) The question now arises, What is the value and character of the Greek text discovered by Usener. Baronius regarded the Latin Acts as veritable transcripts from the proconsular registry purchased by the zeal of the Christians. Ruinart regards them as either transcripts from the official records or notes taken by Christians present in court; upon which two sources of the genuine Acts of the Martyrs Le Blant enlarges and furnishes many interesting illustrations in his supplement to Ruinart, *Les Actes des Martyrs*, p. 6–21, Paris, 1882. Aubé regards the various Latin texts of the Scillitan Acts as emanating from Christian pens, and as probably only translations of Acts written originally in Greek. Usener, on the other hand, looks upon the Greek text discovered by him as merely a translation from a Latin original, as he cannot conceive how the trial in the proconsular court at Carthage could have been conducted in Greek, or how a Greek document could have been composed in such a Latinised city as Carthage; an opinion in which Hilgenfeld concurs (*Zeitsch.* 1881, p. 382). Aubé, viewing the Greek text of Usener as an original document, the source and fountain of all the Latin texts, which are only translations of them, replies to Usener's arguments at great length, pointing out that Greek was largely spoken at Carthage in the latter half of the 2nd century, and urging many critical considerations from a comparison of the Latin and Greek texts which seem to support his view. The reader anxious to investigate this question further must be referred to the treatises of Aubé and Usener as indicated below. To the biblical critic these Acts in both shapes are interesting, as indicating the position held by St. Paul's Epistles in the year 180 in the North African church. The proconsul asked the martyr Speratus what books they kept laid up in their bookcases? To which he replied, Our books, or, as the Latin Version puts it, the four Gospels of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in addition the Epistles of Paul the holy man. The list of names in the Greek version of Usener does not materially differ from that given in the Latin Acts. We may in conclusion mention that the name of the proconsul Vigellius Saturninus, mentioned in our Acts and again by Tertullian in his treatise *Ad Scapulam*, was discovered in 1861 on a monument near Iglitza in Eastern Bulgaria. Renier, in a paper on the inscriptions of Troes published in the *Revue Archéol.* for 1864, t. x. p. 396 (cf. Mommsen, *C. I. L.* iii. n. 6183), quotes this inscription raised in his honour when imperial legate of Moesia Inferior, a post which he may have occupied a year or two after his consulship. According to the then usual rules of promotion he must have been Consul Suffectus about A.D. 170. His full name was Publius Vigellius Raius Plarius Saturninus Atilius Braduanus Aucidius Tertullus. Renier points out that he was connected with the family of Atilius Bradua which furnished Consules Ordinarii in 108 and 160, and with the Gens Plaria, to which belonged the wife of Man. Acilius Glabrio, consul in 152: cf. Mommsen, *Ins. Reg. Neapol.* Num. 1068; Orelli, num. 2228. Agobard asserts that the relics of Speratus, with those of Cyprian, were translated by Charlemagne's orders from Carthage to Lyons (Migne's *Pat. Lat.* civ. 349). The title of the treatise to which this article owes so much is: Aubé, *Etude sur un nouveau texte des Actes des Martyrs Scillitains*, Paris, 1881; cf. Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, t. i. p. 507. [G. T. S.]

SEACHLAN (SEACHNALL), bishop of Armagh and Dunshaughlin. [SECUNDINUS (10).]

SEALBHACH, son of Cualta, abbat of Cork, died A.D. 772. (*Four Mast.* i. 371, A.D. 767.) [J. G.]

SEBARJESUS (1), 9th Nestorian bishop of Bethgarma, in Chaldea, about the end of the 6th century; by his intercession he saved his people from the plague, and he instituted an observance called "The Fast of the Ninevites." (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 427; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1239.) [J. G.]

SEBARJESUS (2), 48th catholicus of Seleucia on the Tigris, was a native of Nuhadra, and made bishop of Harran, or Charran, by Joannes metropolitan of Nisibis; then archbishop of Damascus by the patriarch Timotheus A.D. 778, and catholicus A.D. 832. He died at Dara A.D. 836, famous as promoter and visitor of schools in his dioceses. (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 435; iii. 441, 505; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1130, 1289, 1317.) [J. G.]

SEBASTE, FORTY MARTYRS OF. [FORTY MARTYRS.]

SEBASTIANUS (1), duke of Thebaid, whither Diocletian sent him in the second year of the great persecution to carry out his edicts. (Aug. Ant. Georgii *SS. Col. et Panis. Miracula*, praef. p. 41.) [G. T. S.]

SEBASTIANUS (2), Jan. 20, military martyr at Rome under Diocletian. He was of Milan, where he commanded the first cohort. He confessed Christ, and was shot (apparently) to death with arrows in the camp. His fame was celebrated in the time of St. Ambrose, *Enarr. in Psal.* 118 Num. 44; Ado (*Martyrolog.*) gives a lengthened notice of him, which tells us that when shot with arrows he was left for dead. A pious woman, Irene, came to seek his body, and found him still alive. She healed him, but he was again arrested and beaten to death with clubs in the Hippodrome. A matron, Lucina, buried him in the Catacombs "juxta vestigia Apostolorum." He is the favourite saint of Italian women. He is regarded as the protector against the plague. His symbol is the arrow. In art he is represented as young, beautiful, without drapery, bound to a tree and pierced by arrows. [G. T. S.]

SEBASTIANUS (3), a presbyter to whom Chrysostom wrote a complimentary letter from Cucusus. (Chrys. *Ep.* 214.) [E. V.]

SEBASTIANUS (4), a hermit in Aquitaine, addressed by Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* xxvi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lxi. col. 304–6), and much commended for his piety (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 69). [J. G.]

SEBASTIANUS (5), the head of a monastic house (in some MSS. styled an abbat, in the "indiculus" of Possidius a monk) to whom Augustine wrote a letter, Alypius adding a postscript, in reply to one expressing pain at the misconduct of others. (Aug. *Ep.* 248.) [H. W. P.]

SEBASTIANUS (6), son-in-law of count Boniface the Great, opponent of Genseric and the Vandals. He was put to death by Genseric on refusing to embrace Arianism. [GENSERIC, Vol. II. 635.] (Victor. Vit. *De Wandal. Persecut.*; Ceill. x. 450.) [G. T. S.]

SEBASTIANUS (7), disciple of St. Benedict and author of a life of a certain St. Jerome (Petrus Diac. *De Viris Illust.* cap. iii.; Ceill. xi. 634). [G. T. S.]

SEBASTIANUS (8), deacon of the Roman church. [RUSTICUS (14).]

SEBASTIANUS (9), bishop, addressed in two letters by Gregory the Great in 591 and 595 (i. 28, v. 42). The name of his see is doubtful, as the readings in both letters vary between Sirmiensi and Rhisiniensi. Rhizinium was on the coast of Dalmatia near Cattaro. The first letter relates to the case of ANASTASIUS SINAITA (1), the deposed patriarch of Antioch; in the second Gregory describes his cares and troubles, and commends Sebastianus for declining to be translated to one of the suffragan sees of Anastasius, which the latter after his restoration had asked him to accept. [F. D.]

SEBASTIANUS (10), bishop of unnamed see near Ariminum, to whom in May, A.D. 597, Gregory the Great wrote about the election of a new bishop of Ariminum, in place of Castorius, resigned. (*Epp.* vii. 21.) [F. D.]

SEBBI (SEBBA, SAEBBI) king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Saeward and brother of Sigebert the little, and succeeded to the sovereignty of the East Saxons conjointly with his nephew Sighere about the year 665. During the relapse of his people into paganism in the great plague Sebbi remained faithful to Christianity, and, throughout what little is known of the history of his reign, maintained a high character for devotion. The first years of his long reign, if not the whole of it, were spent under the over-lordship of the kings of Mercia; and Wina the bishop, to whom Wulfhere had sold the see of London, was not likely to sympathise much with a religious prince. Erkenwald, however, who was appointed by Theodore to succeed Wina, and who seems to have re-established Christianity in London, found firm support from Sebbi, and had his co-operation in the foundation of the monastery of Barking: one charter of which, subscribed by Sebbi and his sons, is granted by Oedilred his kinsman (Kemble, *C. D.* 35). Sebbi survived his friend Erkenwald, and possibly also his nephew Sighere. After a reign of thirty years, accordingly, about the year 695, he expressed a strong wish, which his wife had previously prevented him from fulfilling, to resign his throne and become a monk. He was, as Bede repeats the saying of the time, fitter to be a bishop than a king (*H. E.* iv. 11). He applied for the monastic habit to Waldhere, the bishop of London, and obtained it from him, making over to him at the same time all his treasure for distribution among the poor. Freed from earthly cares he prepared for death, and, fearing in his dying hour to say or do anything unworthy of a Christian king, obtained from Waldhere a promise that none but himself and two of his servants should be present at the last. Soon after, he had, as the historian tells us, a vision of consolation: three men in bright apparel approached his bed; one sat down, the other two standing, and told him that his soul should quit the body without pain, and amid a bright shining light, and on the third day following. On the third day at the ninth hour Sebbi died. A miracle attended his entombment: for the stone coffin which was found too short for him became supernaturally lengthened to receive him. He was buried in the church of the doctor of the Gentiles; his tomb was shown in old St. Paul's until its destruction in 1666 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 11); it was in the north aisle opposite the choir under an arch depicted in Dugdale's *History of the Cathedral*, ed. Ellis, pp. 32, 64); the inscription hung over it dated Sebbi's conversion in 677, and followed Bede in giving him a reign of thirty years. Sebbi had two sons, Sigheard and Swefred, who succeeded him. His name is attached with those of his sons to two charters of Barking Abbey (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 35, 38) the former of which, that of Oedilred to abbess Ethelburga, he confirms. He also appears as confirming a forged Peterborough charter (*ib.* No. 40). [S.]

SEBERT (SABERCT, SAEBERHT, SABA, SAEBRIHT, SEBERT, SIBERT), the first Christian king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sledda, ninth from Woden, and king of the East Saxons, by Ricula, or Rigula, daughter of Eormenric, and sister of Ethelbert king of Kent. No date can be assigned for his accession, or for the acquisition by Ethelbert of supreme power in Essex and in London. Sebert however seems to have been almost entirely dependent on his mighty uncle, and to have accepted Christianity very soon after the conversion of Ethelbert. London, the chief city of the East Saxon territory, must have been entirely under Ethelbert's influence, and he, instead of Sebert, was the founder of the church of St. Paul, to which, shortly before his death, Augustine consecrated Mellitus as bishop. Mellitus, however, had been previously engaged in the evangelisation of the East Saxons, and his history is closely entwined with that of Sebert. Sebert's sons must have been born and grown up before his conversion, for they continued heathen at the time of his death. That event occurred, so far as we can gather from Bede (*H. E.* ii. 3, 5), soon after that of Ethelbert, about the year 616. Sebert appears in history as a pious but insignificant

prince; in legend, however, he is more important, being the traditional founder of Westminster. This legend, which is not more ancient than the eleventh century, but which is incorporated in the famous Westminster charters ascribed to Edgar, but probably fabricated after the Norman Conquest, first takes form in the work of Sulcardus [MELLITUS], who does not seem quite certain whether the Sebert who joined in the foundation was the king, or a citizen of London. The story may be read at large in the Monasticon (i. 265 sq.), and deserves no credit. The ascription, however, of the foundation to the first Christian king and bishop was so natural as to be readily accepted. William of Malmesbury records it as a fact (*G. P.* ii. § 73), and it was subject to little or no criticism by his followers. At Westminster was shewn the tomb of Sebert, and when, in 1308, this sepulchre was opened to allow of the translation of the king's bones, the right hand and arm up to the elbow were found clothed with flesh, and uncorrupted (*Annales Paulini*, p. 140; *Chronicul. S. Pauli*, ed. Simpson, p. 225).

Sebert, according to Bede (*H. E.* ii. 5) had three sons, of whom two appear in the pedigree as Sexred and Saeward; the third, on very insufficient authority, is named Sigebert (Bromton, ed. Twysden, c. 743). [S.]

SEBESIUS, a young friend of Jerome, who had been unfaithful to him, but was brought to see and own his fault by the Orator Magnus at Rome. (Jerome, *Ep.* 70, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

SEBUAEI (Σεβουαῖοι), described by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xi.), as the second heresy of the Samaritans. They celebrated, as he states, the Feast of Pentecost in the autumn, and the Feast of Tabernacles at the time of the Jewish Passover. (Cf. Scaliger in *Isag. Canon*, p. 218, and in *Elencho Trihaeresii*, cap. i.; Serarius, *de Sectis Judaicis*, lib. i. cap. 4; and also Petavius, *Commentary on Epiphanius*, l. c.) [G. T. S.]

SECUNDA, July 30, virgin and martyr, when twelve years old at Tuburbium in North Africa with Maxima and Domitilla, her companions. St. Augustine treats of them in *Ser.* 345, calling them Martyres Tuburbitanae, under which title some have thought Perpetua and her companions were celebrated. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 82.) [G. T. S.]

SECUNDIANUS (or v. l. SECUNDINUS), eightieth bishop in *Sentt. Epp.* Conc. Carth. vii. *de Bap. Haer.* iii.; called "martyr" in some MSS. Bishop of Thambi ("a Thambis" vv. ll. thanbis, thambeis) or Tambeae in Prov. Byz. (Notit). Names of three other bishops are preserved up till the fifth century, when its martyrs under Hunneric were famous. (See Morcelli.) [E. W. B.]

SECUNDINUS (1), twenty-first bishop in Conc. Carth. vii. *de pace*, Cyp. *Ep.* 57. [E. W. B.]

SECUNDINUS (2), suffr. ii. in Conc. Carth. vii. *de Bap. Haer.* iii., bishop "a Cedias" (vv. ll. accedias, acidius, chezas; so gadiaufala becomes gazaufala). The place is Cedia, now "Argoub el Mekhtalia, cercle de Aïn-Beïda" (Mommsen), and is in Prov. Numid., as Morcelli conjectured. [E. W. B.]

SECUNDINUS (3), twenty-fourth bishop in suffr. Conc. Carth. vii. *de Bap. Haer.* iii.; bishop of Carpis (Colonia Julia Carpis) in Prov. Proc. (1) and (3) seem likely to be identical. Carpis is feminine in inscr. 994, Mommsen, vol. viii. The MSS. of Cyp. have "a Carpos" with vv. ll. carpus, carpis; carpi, Plin.; Carpos, It. Mar. Now el Merissa with a port and large ruins (Momms.). [E. W. B.]

SECUNDINUS (4), a Numidian bishop, perhaps of the age of St. Cyprian, whose martyrdom is mentioned in the Acts of St. Jacobus and Marianus [JACOBUS (51)]. (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 226, cap. iii.) He may have been the Secundinus who signed the letter concerning the lapsed to the Roman church. (Cypriani *Epist.* 57.) [G. T. S.]

SECUNDINUS (5), an Arian bishop, deposed by St. Ambrose and a synod assembled at Aquileia in the summer of A.D. 381. He was excommunicated in company with another Illyrian bishop, Palladius, and Attalus a priest. The acts of this synod, composed probably by Ambrose, are printed in Mansi, iii. 599; cf. Hefele's *Councils*, Clark's Trans. t. ii. p. 375. [G. T. S.]

SECUNDINUS (6) (SECUNDUS), Donatist bishop of Jacundiana, Jacundiana, or Jucundia, a small town in Numidia (Ant. *Itin.* 71. 5) present at the council of Cabarsussum, A.D. 393; and also at the conference, A.D. 411, at which he declared that he had no Catholic rival in his see (Aug. *En. Ps.* 36. 20; *Carth. Coll.* i. 180). [H. W. P.]

SECUNDINUS (7). [LEPORIUS (1).]

SECUNDINUS (8), parish priest of Germanicia, a place in Numidia, with whom fault was found by some of the Donatists of the place, supported it would seem by a layman residing there, named Pancarius. Augustine wrote to Pancarius expressing his willingness to hear the charges against Secundinus, if brought by Catholics, but declining to do so if they proceeded from heretics (Aug. *Ep.* 251). [H. W. P.]

SECUNDINUS (9), a Manichean, but a listener rather than a member of the sect, who wrote a letter to St. Augustine, blaming him for leaving Manicheism, insinuating that he had done so from motives of fear and of gain, and stating some of its doctrines. He reproaches him for following Jewish rites unworthy of his attention, and urges him to return to the faith which he had quitted (*Sec. ad Aug.* vol. viii. p. 571, ed. Migne). To this letter Augustine replied in a letter which he thought to be the best of his works against Manicheism, denying the motives imputed to him, refuting the doctrines advanced by Secundinus, especially respecting the divinity of our Lord, which Secundinus had denied, or at least depreciated. As to the two opposing principles which, according to him, contended for the soul of man, he recommends him to read his work on Free-Will, which he will find in the possession of Paulinus of Nola, and which shews the nature of temptation by the devil. He defends himself for maintaining Jewish writings and prophecies, deprecates the

heathen fables, and shews that perfection cannot be attained without the help of God (Aug. *Retract.* ii. 10). [H. W. P.]

SECUNDINUS (10) (SEACHLAN, SEACHNALL, SECHNAL, SHAGLINUS), nephew of St. Patrick and bishop of Armagh. His legend is wholly Patrician. He was son of Restitutus Ua Baird and probably Liemania, but other sisters of St. Patrick are named as his mother. He is said to have been sent into Ireland to assist St. Patrick in the year 439 (*Ann. Tig.*), and appears to have been then a bishop. He became closely attached as disciple to St. Patrick, and his chief foundation was at Dunshaughlin, co. Meath: he was also bishop at Armagh. He died A.D. 448 (*Ann. Tig.*) aged seventy-five years, and his feast is Nov. 27. (Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 259 sq.: Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 383–384, 437–438.)

He is best known as author of the *Hymnus S. Secundini in laudem S. Patricii*, an alphabetical hymn in the rudest metre. If he was not the author, it was evidently written so as to pass for the work of a contemporary of St. Patrick. It gives in every respect to St. Patrick the character of a faithful apostle of Christ, "cujus ingentis laboris percepturus praemium, cum apostolis regnabit sanctus super Israel." It was first published by Colgan (*Tr. Th.* 211–212, with *Praefatio veteris anonymi*; it has also been given by Ware, *Opusc. S. Patr.* app., 1656; Muratori, *Antiphon. Bench.*, 1713; Villanueva, *Opusc. S. Patr.* app., 1835; Gallandius, *Bibl. Patr.* x.; Todd, *Book of Hymns* i. and Cusack, *S. Patr.*). Todd prints both the preface given by Colgan, and a much fuller one from the *Leabhar Breac.* It was much prized among the ancient Irish, and used as an armour. (Todd, *S. Patr.* 312; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. 294 sq.; Tanner, *Bibl.* 659; *Book of Obits C. C. Dublin*, lxxxv.–vi.; O'Conor, *Proleg.* ii. 71, 80.) [J. G.]

SECUNDINUS (11), a poet, and contemporary of Sidonius Apollinaris, who addresses to him one of his letters (*Ep.* v. 8). Secundinus had apparently stood high in his esteem as a writer of hexameter verse, on minor subjects, such as royal hunting parties and marriages. He had afterwards attempted satire, and sent to Sidonius a composition in hendecasyllabic metre, which Sidonius highly commends, urging him to continue this kind of composition for which there exists ample material. From another letter of Sidonius (*Ep.* ii. 10) it appears that some of his hexameters were inscribed upon the wall of the basilica built at Lyons by Patiens (bishop from about 451 to 491), and he may fairly be supposed to have been one of the considerable number of minor poets who flourished at Lyons in the middle and end of the 5th century. [H. A. W.]

SECUNDINUS (12), bishop of Taormina. Seven letters are addressed by Gregory the Great to him, either alone or conjointly with other bishops (*Epist.* lib. iii. ind. xi. 59; lib. vi. ind. xiv. 36; lib. viii. ind. i. 31; lib. x. ind. iii. 32, 33, 57; lib. xiii. ind. vi. 18, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 657, 826, 934, 1089, 1111, 1275). Of these the most important are the first, directing him to remove a baptistery from a monastery; the third directing him to prevent laymen exercising rights over a monastery; and the fourth relating to the wife of one Leo, who had left her husband on the suspicion of his adultery, and assumed the dress of a nun. On his being proved innocent she had returned to him, and Secundinus had therefore refused to admit her to communion. Gregory disapproves of his action, and directs him to admit her. Secundinus is mentioned as bishop of Taormina in lib. i. ind. ix. 72, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 598, and was therefore consecrated not later than A.D. 591. He subscribes the decrees of the synod held at Rome in July, A.D. 595. (*Appendix ad S. Greg. Epist.* 5, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1338.) [F. D.]

SECUNDINUS (13), abbat of the monastery of St. Martin in Campania. Gregory the Great, after mentioning that many grave charges had been brought against him, says that his own confession, that he had broken his vow of chastity before he became abbat, was sufficient without going further, and directs Peter, the subdeacon, to remove him from his office (*Epp.* iii. 23) in 593. [F. D.]

SECUNDINUS (14), bishop in Greece, whom Gregory the Great in 595 commissioned to investigate the charges against Anastasius, bishop of Corinth, who was ultimately deposed. Gregory praises his behaviour in the matter, and in another letter mentions he had heard through Secundinus of the misconduct of another bishop, Andrew. (*Epp.* v. 52, 57.) [F. D.]

SECUNDINUS (15), a recluse, to whom a long and important letter of Gregory the Great is addressed in 599 (lib. ix. ind. ii. 52, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 982). The text unfortunately is in a bad state, and there is a long interpolation about the treatment of clerics degraded for immorality, which is quite inconsistent with the rules laid down by Gregory in other letters. The pope, after touching on the hermit life of his correspondent, with the temptations to which it was specially liable, discusses the question of the Three Chapters, pointing out that by their condemnation no slight was done to the council of Chalcedon. Then follows the interpolation referred to, after which Gregory replies to a question of Secundinus about the souls of children who die unbaptized before committing actual sin. The letter concludes with some observations on the cult of images (partly quoted in *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, i. 817). Gregory sends with the letter some aloes and other perfumes, to be burnt before the relics of the martyrs, two volumes of his homilies, and two pictures of the Saviour and the Virgin Mary and the apostles Peter and Paul. He is apparently a different person from the Secundus or Secundinus mentioned in lib. vi. ind. xiv. 31, and lib. xiv. ind. vii. 12 (*Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 821, 1314). [F. D.]

SECUNDUS (1), Gnostic of the second century, a disciple of Valentinus, and apparently one of the earliest of that teacher's successors. At least, he is the first of that school of whom Irenaeus gives an account (I. xi. 2). He reports two things as peculiar in the teaching of Secundus; (1) that he divided the primary Ogdoad into two Tetrads, a right-hand and a left-hand one, the one being called light, the other darkness;

(2) that he did not allow the Sophia out of whose passions, according to the Valentinian theory, the material world took its origin to have been one of the 30 primary Aeons. On the theory of an upper and lower Sophia, see SOPHIA, p. 712. [VALENTINUS.] Philaster (*Haer.* 40) is singular in ascribing to Secundus a docetic theory about our Lord's Body; but on comparison with the corresponding sections (11, 12) in Pseudo-Tertullian, there appears reason to think that Philaster transferred to Secundus a portion of what was said about the Valentinians in the immediately preceding section of the older treatise of Hippolytus, which was the common authority of Ps.-Tert. and Philaster. The short notice in Irenaeus seems to be the ultimate source of all authentic information about Secundus; and Augustine appears to have had no more authority for ascribing to the Secundiani special immorality (*Haer.* 12) than 'Praedestinatus' for his story, that they were refuted by Diodorus, bishop of Crete. [G. S.]

SECUNDUS (2), African bishop in Syn. Carth. sub Cyd. iv. *de Basilide*, Cyp. *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

SECUNDUS (3), Arian bishop of Ptolemais in Egypt, one of the original Arian party at Nice. He, with another Egyptian bishop, Theonas, and Arius, alone opposed the imperial command to sign the creed and anathemas of Nice, and suffered exile accordingly. After the death of Constantine he established an Arian church in Egypt by consecrating Pistus as bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 339 (Athanasii *Apol. c. Arian.* 19, 24; Hefele's *Councils*, t. ii. p. 45, Clark's trans.; Gwatkin's *Studies in Arianism*, p. 111). [G. T. S.]

SECUNDUS (4), bishop of Tigisis or Tigisi, a fortified town of Numidia, possessing a valuable spring of water, in the neighbourhood of Lambese and Thamagada, but whose site is not certainly known (Procopius, *Vandal.* ii. 13). The principal facts of the history in which Secundus was concerned will be found in the *General History of Donatism*, Vol. I. pp. 881, 882, but the following particulars may be added. The persecution under Diocletian appears to have reached its height in February 304, and on May 19 of the same year Paulus, bishop of Cirta, committed the act of tradition, which in some measure gave rise to the proceedings in which Secundus became conspicuous. Paulus died not long after this, and some eleven or twelve bishops met at Cirta on March 5, but according to Optatus May 8, A.D. 305, under the presidency of Secundus, as primate of Numidia, to appoint a successor. Although persecution had virtually ceased, the churches were not yet restored, and the assembly met in the house of Urbanus, called by Optatus, Carisus, but by Augustine, Donatus, and there they ordained Silvanus. These facts, related by Optatus, came out in the investigation before Zenophilus, A.D. 320. In a letter to Generosus, A.D. 400, and in his account of this enquiry, contained in his treatise against Cresconius, A.D. 406, Augustine places the date of the outbreak of the persecution in the eighth consulship of Diocletian and the seventh of Maximian, *i.e.* in A.D. 303. But in his breviate of the Carthaginian Conference, A.D. 411, when the whole question was revived, and previous to which he appears to have examined the dates more carefully, he places the outbreak in the ninth consulship of the former emperor and the eighth of the latter, *i.e.* A.D. 304, and shows that the meeting at Cirta must have taken place thirteen months later, viz. on March 5, 305 (Opt. i. 14; Aug. *c. Cresc.* iii. 29–33; *Serm.* 46. 39; *Ep.* 53. 4; *Brevic. Coll.* 32; vid. Clinton, *Fast. Rom.*). But though the day named by Optatus is probably erroneous, the fact mentioned by him as to the condition of the churches is important, as assisting Augustine to disprove the assertion of the Donatists, that the meeting could not have taken place because it was unsafe at that time for so many as ten or twelve bishops to meet together (*Brevic. Coll.* 32, 33; *Post. Coll.* 18; *c. Gaud.* i. 47; *De Unico Bapt.* 31). Optatus also says that amid the uproar of mutual incrimination Purpurius of Limata taxed Secundus with tradition, because, instead of leaving his post of duty before the inquisition, he remained until he was dismissed in safety, which would not have been the case unless he had purchased his safety by act of surrender. On this a murmur arose in the assembly, and Secundus in alarm accepted a method of escape suggested by his nephew, Secundus the younger, that such questions as this of personal conduct ought to be left to the judgment of the Almighty, a judicious evasion which was received with acclamation by all present (Opt. i. 14; Aug. *Ep.* 43. 6).

At some time before this letters had passed between Mensurius and Secundus, containing on the part of the former strictures on the conduct of some pseudo-martyrs of the time, but acknowledging, as was afterwards urged by the Donatists, his own culpable evasion in respect of the sacred books at the time of the inquiry. On the other side Secundus sought to exculpate himself and justify the conduct of some, who avoided a surrender of their books, by the instance of Rahab, one which applied, as Augustine pointed out, rather to Mensurius than to them, and compared his own conduct to that of Eleazar, described in the book of Maccabees (2 Mac. vi. 18–31; Aug. *Brevic. Coll.* iii. 25; *c. Gaud.* i. 47). But whatever judgment might be formed as to the conduct of Mensurius and Secundus, it was plain, as Augustine remarked, that their intercourse was not interrupted during the lifetime of the former (*c. Petil.* iii. 29; *Brevic. Coll.* 25, 26; *De Unic. Bapt.* 29). But when, on his death, A.D. 311, Caecilian was appointed to succeed him, Secundus was sent for in haste to preside at a meeting of malcontents, seventy in number, to be held at Carthage for the purpose of opposing him; and their factious opposition, illustrated by the brutal insolence of Purpurius of Limata, resulted in the schismatic appointment of Majorinus (Opt. i. 19; Aug. *Parm.* i. 5). From this time no further mention is made of Secundus until the time when the case was brought up afresh at the conference. Besides the original authorities already quoted, the reader will find the history related by Baronius, vol. ii. 303, who maintains the earlier date; by Tillemont, vol. vi. pp. 5–14; by Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. 194–207; and by Ribbek, *Aug. und Don.* pp. 52–57, 69. [H. W. P.]

SECUNDUS (5), the father of CHRYSOSTOM.

SECUNDUS (6) and **(7)**, of Trent, described by Paulus Diaconus as servus Christi, had much influence with queen Theodelinda and her husband Agilulf, to whose son Adaloald he was godfather. He wrote a short history of the Lombards, which was the principal source of the earlier part of the work of Paulus Diaconus. He died in March, A.D. 612. A fragment of his history is given in a note to the preface to Paulus Diaconus in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 25, from which it appears that in June, A.D. 580, he had been fifteen years a monk. He must therefore have lived to an advanced age (Paulus Diac. iii. 29, iv. 27, 40 in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 108, 125, 133). He probably is the same as the abbat Secundus mentioned by Gregory the Great in a letter to queen Theodelinda (lib. xiv. ind. vii. 12, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1314). He had written, probably about the Three Chapters, to Gregory, whose health prevented him from replying. The Secundus, "servus Dei of Ravenna," addressed by Gregory (lib. vi. ind. xiv. 30), is probably a different person, though he was connected with king Agilulf, and was employed by Gregory in 596 to negotiate peace with him. [F. D.]

SEDATUS (1), second in the list of the bishops of Nismes, was present at the council of Agde in 506. He was a friend and correspondent of St. Ruricius. Four of the latter's epistles to him, one of them in verse, are extant (Ruricius, *Epp.* ii. 17, 18, 33, 34; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 99–100, 109–111). Three written by Sedatus survive. They are not included in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, but are to be found in Canisius (*Thesaurus Monument.* i. 360–361, 367, Antwerp. 1725.) For a description of these letters, see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 56–8; Ceillier, x. 608–9. The authors of the *Gallia Christiana* (vi. 428) ascribe to him the authorship of some homilies, which were more probably the production of Sedatus of Béziers. [S. A. B.]

SEDATUS (2), African bishop, on the committee *de Virgg. Subintroductis*, Cyp. *Ep.* 4; Sat. in Syn. Carth. 4 *de Bas. et Mart. Ep.* 67; in Syn. *de Bat.* i. *Ep.* 70; probably the same as Sedatus, bishop of Tuburbo, whether Majus or Minus Mommsen cannot distinguish; Morcelli prefers Majus. Both were in Prov. Procons. and both had bishops. Tuburbo Majus was a colony *Julia Aurelia Commoda* (Tuburbin coloniam, Plin.), and is identifiable with *Kasbat.* Augustine (post *Coll. ad Don.* 22, 38) speaks of the obscurity of the see. Mommsen, Conc. Carth. sub Cyp. vii. *de Bap.* 3, *Sentt.* 18. [E. W. B.]

SEDATUS (3), 5th bishop of Béziers, was at the 3rd council of Toledo in 589, and that of Narbonne in the same year. His diocese was at this period under Gothic domination (*Gall. Christ.* vi. 297). A homily on the Epiphany to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 765–74, is attributed to him, as well as two sermons printed in the *appendix* to the works of St. Augustine (cxxix. cxxx. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xxxix. 2001–5). For criticisms on these works see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 262–3; Ceillier, xi. 324. [S. A. B.]

SEDNA (SEDONIUS), bishop of Ossory, is noticed by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 572), and identified with the dumb cowherd on Slieve Bloom, who received his speech by the blessing of St. Columba of Terryglass, in the 6th century. He is probably the person to whom is ascribed the *Prophecy of Sedna*, a poem of twenty stanzas or eighty lines, which is in the form of a dialogue between himself and St. Finchu of Brigown. (O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 422; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 91.) [J. G.]

SEDULIUS (1),[a] a poet of the 5th century, of whose life very few details are known. The only trustworthy information is to be found in his two letters to Macedonius. From them we learn that he devoted his early life, perhaps as a teacher of rhetoric, to heathen literature. Late in life, like Prudentius, he either became converted to Christianity, or, if he had been a Christian before, began to take a serious view of his duties, probably under the influence of Macedonius. Thenceforward he devoted his talents to the service of Christ, living as a priest, apparently in some religious community (cf. i. 7–9), at any rate in close intercourse with a small body of religious friends (Pref.). He gives us a charming account of this group: Macedonius, the father and life of the whole; Ursinus, the reverent priest who has spent his life in the service of the King of Heaven; Laurence, the wise and gentle, who has spent all his money on the poor; Gallicanus, another priest, not learned, but a model of goodness and loyalty to church rule; Ursicinus, combining the wisdom of age with the brightness of youth; the deaconess Syncletica, of noble birth and nobler life, a worthy temple of God, purified by fasting, prayer, and charity, learned and liberal; and lastly Perpetua, the young pure matron, perpetual in fame and purity, no less than in name. Living in this society, he too longed to devote his talent to God, and to strengthen his own spiritual life by exhorting others. He too yearned to attract the heathen by telling them of the wonders of the Gospel, and so wrote the *Carmen Paschale* to invite them to share the Gospel feast. This was dedicated to Macedonius, and afterwards, at his request, whether to make it more widely useful, or whether to secure greater accuracy, was translated into prose (*Opus Paschale*). The works shew a character of much humility (cf. i. ad fin.), of tenderness of heart (v. 96), of warm gratitude (*Carm. Pasch.* Pref.), and of keen susceptibility to criticism (*Opus Pasch.* Pref.).

These are the only certain facts. Even his date is uncertain. He refers to St. Jerome as a well-known student, and his work is praised by a decree of pope Gelasius of A.D. 495 or 496. Further, Syncletica may have been a sister of Eustathius, who lived at the beginning of the 5th century. So that the date of Sedulius must be about A.D. 450. A great deal of information is given about him in later writers, but much of it arises from a confusion with Sedulius the Scotchman. The best authenticated account makes him a native of Rome, who studied philosophy in Italy; then became an *antistes* (i.e. probably a presbyter) and wrote his book in Achaia. The internal evidence as to these details is very slight; the names of his friends

[a] Sometimes called Caelius or Circilius, but there is very slight authority for any praenomen.

are almost entirely Latin; he is in the presence of educated idolaters and takes special pains to argue against sun-worship; but these indications are very vague. Perhaps a careful examination of his interpretation of the Gospels might connect him with some particular school of teaching. His works became popular very soon. They were edited by an editor of Virgil, T. Rufius Asterius (consul A.D. 494)—perhaps in consequence of the importance attached to them by the pope's decree. They are mentioned with praise by Venantius Fortunatus (viii. 1) and Theodulf of Arles; were commented on, perhaps by Remi of Auxerre, in the 9th century, and were frequently quoted and imitated by the writers of the middle ages. Areval quotes sixteen MSS. dating from the 7th to the 16th century; since then more than forty editions have been printed, and special prominence has been given to him by German writers in the last few years.

Works: *Carmen Paschale*.—In this poem Sedulius does not treat of the whole Gospel story, as Juvencus had done, but simply of the miracles of the Lord. He longs to shew the heathen that Christianity has wonders greater than heathenism, and so invites them to read this poem and share the great paschal gifts of Christ. It may be entitled "A poem in honour of Christ our Passover" (cf. i. 20, 56).

It is preceded by a dedicatory letter to Macedonius, written in rather involved but terse epigrammatic prose. In it he explains (1) that he writes through anxiety to consecrate to God the ability which he had before used on heathen literature, to avoid wrapping his talent in a napkin, and to strengthen himself by exhorting others: (2) that he writes in verse because there is so little Christian poetry, and yet many are attracted to the truth by poetry more than by prose: (3) that he dedicates the poem to Macedonius because he is the life and soul of all their society. He then describes the purpose of the book and its title.

This is followed by a short elegiac invitation to the reader to come to the simple paschal feast which he has prepared.

The poem itself begins with a book which is really introductory to the main subject. In it he calls on the heathen to listen to this true and wondrous theme (1–44), and prays God, whose miracles shew His power, to guide him in his poem (45–86). Then follows a succession of miraculous events from the Old Testament (87–205), which are recapitulated shortly (205–225). The poet then points out the folly of the worship of idols, arguing specially against sun-worship (226–265), and the delight of describing the work of the true God, whose nature is perfect and not to be mutilated as by Arius and Sabellius (266–317). The book ends with a prayer for a place in the heavenly city, even the place of the lowest of the citizens (318–342).

A short prologue, with a prayer to Christ and an account of the four Evangelists, leads to the main subject.

In Book II., after describing the incarnation as God's new act of mercy to undo the work of the Fall (1–34), he describes with clever antithesis the marvel of the pure conception, the birth of the Creator from a virgin mother (35–69), the appearance of the True Shepherd to the shepherds (70–72), the effort of the Jewish king to destroy the King of kings (73–133), the Boy master among the masters of the law (134–138), the Righteous Man baptized (139–174), the Lord tempted by the Devil (175–219), the call of fishers to be fishers of men, of the simple things of the world to confound the wise (220–236): the book ending with a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer (237–300).

Books III.–V. follow the main outline of the miraculous story down to the Ascension.

The poem is thus almost confined to the miracles: the Lord's Prayer is the only other subject dwelt upon at any length. In the earlier part he pieces together in chronological order the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Throughout the ministry to the final entry into Jerusalem he follows the order of St. Matthew, with a few insertions from St. John and St. Luke; then he adds a succession of miracles from St. Mark and St. Luke, without attention to their chronology (iv. 59–221), and the chief incidents of St. John's Gospel, and from the entry into Jerusalem to the end, he mainly follows that Gospel.

The treatment is far freer than that of Juvencus, but with much less poetical ornament than that of Nonnus; the tone being more that of a rhetorical preacher than of a poet or historian. The story is illustrated now and then by a few similes; but as a rule the details of the scenes are given slightly, and are followed by frequent comment. At times these comments are dogmatical (e.g. on the Nature of the Trinity, i. 16–20, 281 sqq., ii. 171, the Fatherhood of God, ii. 234, the Priesthood of Christ, iv. 207, &c.). At other times they point out the typical meaning of Holy Scripture, whether of the Old Testament (cf. i. 102–109, 127, 142, 152, iii. 202, iv. 170) or of the New; e.g. the number of the Evangelists and of the Apostles (Prolog. to lib. ii. iii. 172), the number and nature of the gifts of the Magi (ii. 95), the dove (ii. 170), and all the details of the Passion (v. 101, 169, 190, 243, 257, 275, 402). More often still they consist of moral warnings or of explanations of our Lord's Teaching (cf. ii. 106, iii. 321, iv. 16, 163, &c.).

The style is on the whole rhetorical but pleasant, with considerable terseness and power of antithesis; and fairly correct in prosody. It shews considerable acquaintance with classical authors. The reference to Origen (*Opus Pasch.* Pref.), and the play on Elias and ἥλιος (i. 170) imply some knowledge of Greek; of the Latin authors, he shews a knowledge of Terence, Juvenal, and specially Virgil, from whom he frequently borrows lines or parts of lines; possibly too of the poem of Juvencus. There is a growing frequency in the use of leonine rhymes; short syllables are lengthened freely before double letters and before the letter *h* (i. 283); final *o* is shortened in every termination; final *us* of the 4th declension is shortened in the gen. sing. and in the plural; and there are several false quantities (e.g. rĕgulus, iii. 12, tĭbĭcen, iii. 134) and a large number of late unclassical words. Fair specimens of the style will be found in iii. 1–11, v. 202–231. For exact details about the prosody, cf. Huemer, *ubi inf.* The text is printed in Hurter's *Patrum sel. Opuscula*, Innsbruck, 1876. An analysis of

this poem with a discussion of its sources and theology is given by Leimbach, *über den Christlichen Dichter Sedulius.* (Goslar, 1879.)

2. *Opus Paschale.*—This is a prose translation of the *Carmen.* In the main it follows the *Carmen* faithfully, but at times adds illustrations and fills up gaps. It is preceded by another interesting letter to Macedonius, who had bidden the poet translate his poem, which seems to have offended some readers by its freedom in dealing with Holy Scripture. He justifies himself for translating freely, bespeaks kindly approval from Macedonius, and offers the work to Christ. The work is written in a style involved and turgid, and more difficult to us than the poetry, which was more influenced by classical models. The prose on the other hand is affected both by the inaccuracies of ordinary language, and by the pedantry and exaggerations of rhetoric [cf. *Revue de Philologie*, Jan. 1882]. This work is found in fewer MSS. than the poem. An account of the MSS. and an attempt to estimate their relative worth, with a critical text of lib. v., has been published by E. Ludwig, Heilbrunn, 1880.

3. *Elegia.*—This is an elegiac poem of 110 lines, corresponding in subject to the *Carmen Paschale.* It describes the effect of the Incarnation in contrast to the work of Adam, and Christ as the antitype of the types of the Old Testament. In the types, no names are given, so that the allusions are often obscure. The structure of the poem is very artificial, the first half of the hexameter being always repeated by epanalepsis in the last half of the pentameter. The authenticity of this poem has been doubted, but it is attributed to Sedulius by Bede, the MSS. are in favour of it, and the prosody and subject matter are both akin to those of the *Carmen Paschale.*

4. *Hymn.*—"A solis ortus cardine." The authenticity of this also has been denied, but it is attributed to Sedulius by Bede (de art. metr. 8), and its tone is quite consistent with his authorship. Indeed it may be called a lyrical expression of the *Carmen.* It is a call to praise Christ with a description of the chief facts of His birth, life, and death; all the incidents are mentioned in the *Carmen*, and often with the same epithets and the same antithetical comment (e.g. cf. 41–44, with ii. 150; 61, 62, with iii. 271–290). The form is specially interesting. It is an alphabetical hymn, written in iambic dimeters with four-lined strophes, the first lines of the strophes being alphabetical. It also shews a growing tendency to rhyme, and a careful attempt to avoid any conflict between accent and quantity. Two extracts from the hymn have been widely used in church services, viz. A–G in Lauds for Christmas week; and H, I, L, N, which celebrate the adoration of the magi, the baptism, and the miracle at Cana, on the feast of Epiphany, on which day all these events were anciently commemorated. They will be found in Daniel Thes. i. p. 143, and with a full German commentary in Kayser, pp. 347–383.

5. *Cento Virgilianus* "de Verbi Incarnatione" is sometimes ascribed to Sedulius (e.g. by Bähr), but it is only found in one Corvey MS., and there it only follows the other poems without being ascribed to Sedulius. It is to be found in Martene, *Vett. Scr. Coll.* ix. p. 125.

Full information about MSS. and editions will be found in Areval's Preface, and a useful Introduction in Huemer, *de Sedulii Vita et Scriptis.* Vindobonae, 1878. The most available editions are Bigne's *Bibl. Patrum*, viii.; Gallandi, ix.; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xix. (a reprint of Areval); a text of the poetical works based on a collation of Areval with the Munich MSS. by J. Looshorn, Munich, 1879; and Huemer's edition of the whole Works, Vienna, 1885. [W. L.]

SEDULIUS (2), subscribed the canons of the council held at Rome under pope Gregory II. A.D. 721, as "Sedulius Episcopus Britanniae de genere Scottorum" (Mansi, *Conc.* viii. 109); supposed to have been an Irish bishop in the district of Strathclyde. (Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 219; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, ii. pt. i. 7; Herzog, *Real Encyk.* xiv. 194–195.) [J. G.]

SEDULIUS (3), called the younger, to distinguish him from Sedulius the poet of the 4th or 5th century, is known as a commentator upon the Scriptures, but his history is unknown. He is called Scotus, a term equivalent to Hibernus or Irishman, and is identified with the Sedulius who attended the council at Rome in 721 and signed the canons; or with the Sedulius son of Fearadhach who died abbat of Kildare, A.D. 828, or with Sedulius who is mentioned as "Sedulium Scottum clarum habitum" by Hepidannus monk of St. Gall in his *Chronicon*, A.D. 818. His commentaries are not original, but simply compilations from older writers, specially Origen; Migne (Pat. Lat. t. ciii. p. 1–351) gives (A.D. 820) the works of "Sedulius junior natione Scotus" (*Collect. in Pauli Epist.*, col. 9; *Expositio in Evang.*, col. 271; *De rector. Christ.*, col. 291; *Explan. in praef. S. Hieron.* col. 331. Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 109; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 331–332). Ussher *Opp.* iv. 385), on the authority of Joh. Trithemius, mentions his epistles as existing in the 16th century, and frequently quotes him in his *Religion of the Ancient Irish.* Montfaucon, *Palaeograph. Graec.* iii., 7, p. 236, describes a Greek psalter written by him and preserved at the St. Michael's convent in Lorraine; cf. Mai's *Nova Collectio*, t. ix. [J. G. & G. T. S.]

SEGATIUS (Ambr. *Ep.* 87). [FOEGADIUS.]

SEGENIUS (1), SEGENUS, SEGHIN, SEGIANUS, SEGINEUS, SEIGHEN, SEIGINE, SEIGNUS, SIGENIUS (1), fifth abbat of Hy, and connected with several events of great importance to the Scotic church during his abbacy. He was son of Fiachna (Fiachtna or Fiachra) of the race of Conall Gulban, and succeeded Fergna Brit as abbat A.D. 623. Of his own personal acts we have little account beyond his founding a church on Rechra or Rathlin in the year 634 (*Ann. Tig.*; Ussher, *Brit. Eccl. Ant.* vi. 527); and also his being a step in the tradition from St. Columba to his biographer St. Adamnan (*Vit. S. Col.* i. 1, 3; ii. 5), but he evidently headed the Scotic or Columban party in opposition to the Roman or Catholic in the Paschal controversy, and hence it was specially "Segieno abbati, Columbae sancti et caeterorum sanctorum successori" that Cummian addressed his apologetic epistle, giving the reason for his adoption of the Roman calculation, A.D. 634 [CUMMIAN]. A few years later (A.D. 640) he appears to have been included as "Segenus presbyter" among the Irish ecclesiastics (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. c. 19) whom John, while yet but pope

elect, addressed upon this same question (Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 373; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 162; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 506, 540), but this identification is doubted (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 17, col. 2; Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist. Ir.* ii. 409, 415). An event of still greater importance occurred while he ruled at Iona, when Oswald king of Northumbria applied to the Scotic church for a bishop to minister the word of faith to himself and his people, and after the return of the first and unsuccessful missionary, St. Aidan was raised to the episcopate and sent out to be the first bishop of Lindisfarne [AIDAN]. (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. c. 5.) He held the abbacy twenty-nine years, and died A.D. 652 (*Ann. Tig.*); his feast is Aug. 12, or in Scotland April 7. (Reeves, *S. Adamn.* 16, 26, 373, et al.; Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 482 et al.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. 154 sq.) Ware (*Ir. Writ.* i. c. 3) follows Dempster (*Hist. Eccl. Scot.* ii. 572 *) in ascribing to him *Regulae ad Monachos; Epistolae ad diversos; Homiliae de Sanctis.* [J. G.]

SEGENIUS (2), bishop of Armagh, succeeded Thomian A.D. 661, and died A.D. 688 (*Ann. Tig.*). While he was bishop Armagh was burned, A.D. 672 (*Ann. Tig.*). Lanigan (*E. H. Ir.* iii. 35) thinks it probable that he is the "Segenius presbyter" addressed in the paschal letter from Rome (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. c. 19), though Colgan thinks this was another Segenius, abbat of Bangor, co. Down. [SEGENIUS (1).] In *Lib. Armac.* (f. 18 ap. Reeves S. Adamn. 323) there is a curious notice of an interchange of bequests between bishop Aedh and Segene at Armagh. It is probably connected with the Cloc in Aidecta, or "Bell of the bequest" at Armagh. His feast is May 24. [J. G.]

SEGETIUS, bishop. [INNOCENTIUS (3).]

SEGRI. In the visions of HERMAS (*Vis.* IV. ii., 4) he sees a terrible wild beast, whereupon he prays to God who sends "his angel who is over the wild beasts, whose name is Thegri" and shuts (ἐνέφραξε) the beast's mouth. This name Thegri which does not occur elsewhere, has been a puzzle to commentators. In Harnack's edition of Hermas will be found the best explanations they had been able to give. But what has every appearance of being the true solution has lately been given by Mr. Rendel Harris (*Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, iii. 75). He compares the history (Dan. vi. 22) of the angel who "shuts the mouth" of the lions, when Daniel is in the den, the Greek word there being also ἐνέφραξε. In the original, the verb is סָגַר, and it seems almost certain that Hermas had this passage in his mind, and that we must correct Thegri into Segri, and understand "the angel who shuts the mouth of the beasts."

We may infer that Hermas has been rightly connected with Jewish Christianity. We are at least now enabled to add one to the very scanty proofs (see Vol. II. p. 920) of his acquaintance with the Old Testament. It would appear that he read it in Greek; but if he did not read the original himself, he must have mixed with those who did, and have learned from them the name Segri. Whether it was Hermas himself or his transcribers who corrupted the name into Thegri cannot be absolutely determined. The change of the first letter C into Θ is a very conceivable transcriptional alteration, it being assumed of course (what there seems no good cause to doubt) that the original language of Hermas was Greek. But the change, if change there were, must have been made very early; for Thegri seems plainly to have been the original reading of the Latin. It will account for the various readings Tegri and Hegrin, the 'n' of the latter form being also the first letter of the next following word. And it would seem to be this same word Tegri which either St. Jerome or his transcribers corrupted into Tyri (*in Habac.* i. 14). Jerome there charges with folly a certain apocryphal book, which represents reptiles to be made the special charge of an angel named Tyri. [G. S.]

SELENAS (Σελήνας), bishop of the Goths in succession to Ulphilas, whose secretary he had been. Through his mixed descent, from the Goths by his father and from the Phrygians by his mother, he readily spoke both the Gothic and Greek languages, and had accordingly great influence with his people. He belonged to the Psathyrian division of the Arian body. (Soc. v. 23; Soz. vii. 17; Tillem. vi. 631; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, p. 149.) [C. H.]

SELEUCIA, a lady of the Cappadocian Caesarea, wife of Rufinus, a man of rank, and a friend of Chrysostom. She placed her country house at his disposal as a place of refuge when he was driven out of Caesarea by the violence of the monks, but she was reluctantly compelled by the menaces of Pharetrius the bishop of that city to frighten him from his shelter, in the dead of the night, by a false alarm of an incursion of the Isaurians. (Chrys. *Ep.* 14.) [E. V.]

SELEUCIANA, famula Dei, addressed by Augustine (*Ep.* 265 al. 108), concerning baptism and the repentance of St. Peter. [C. H.]

SELEUCIANI, heretics. [SELEUCUS (1).]

SELEUCUS (1), enumerated as a Galatian heretic by Philaster, *Haer.* 55. [HERMOGENES, Vol. III. p. 3.] [G. S.]

SELEUCUS (2), (SELEUCIUS), [LEUCIUS, Vol. III. p. 704]. [G. S.]

SELEUCUS (3), Feb. 16, a soldier of Cappadocia and martyr at Caesarea, in the Diocletian persecution, at the same time that Pamphilus and Porphyry suffered. (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* cap. xi.) [G. T. S.]

SELEUCUS (4), a young man of high birth, nephew of Chrysostom's faithful friend Olympias, and grandson of the celebrated general Trajan, who fell with Valens in the defeat at Adrianople. Seleucus is known to us from two letters addressed to him, one in 333 iambic senarii (the number being adopted out of honour to the Trinity), ascribed both to Gregory Nazianzen, and to Amphilochius of Iconium (on the authorship see *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, Vol. I. 106 b; Vol. II. 757 a), and one in prose, of which only fragments exist, of which Amphilochius was the unquestioned author. The poetical epistle has for its

object the formation of the intellectual and religious character of a young man of rank, directing his reading, and warning him against the vicious pleasures and immoral spectacles of the age. Its chief value resides in the list of the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments it presents, on which see Westcott *on the Canon* (pp. 516, 575, ed. 1855). The poem is printed among the works of Gregory Nazianzen (Vol. II. pp. 190–195), and in those of Amphilochius (ed. Combefis, Par. 1644, p. 132 ff.) From the fragments of the other unquestioned letter of Amphilochius, it appears that it contained a warning against the Apollinarian heresy (Amphiloch. *Opera, u. s.* pp. 136–138). A portion of this letter is quoted by Photius, cod. 229, p. 827. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* ix. 627, 746.) [E. V.]

SELEUCUS (5), a bishop of an unnamed see, who, although aged and troubled by a severe cough, had taken a long journey to Cucusus to visit Chrysostom. Chrysostom wrote two letters on his behalf (*Epp.* 37, 98). [E. V.]

SELEUCUS (6), bishop of Amasea and metropolitan (Le Quien, i. 522). He took a leading part in the various proceedings relating to Eutyches, and like Basil of Seleucia was weak and vacillating. At the council of Constantinople in 448 he declared for the two natures in Christ, and voted against Eutyches (Hard. ii. 167). At the Latrocinium in 449 he retracted and voted for him (ii. 86A, 270); and in 451 he subscribed the decrees of Chalcedon (ii. 366). In 458 he received the circular letters of the emperor Leo to the metropolitans (Mansi, vii. 523). Tillemont's notices of him will be found in his vol. xv. [C. H.]

SELRED (1) (SAELRAED), king of the East Saxons. He is described in the Pedigrees (*M. H. B.* 629) as the son of Sigebert the Good. He succeeded (*ib.* 637) Offa on his departure to Rome in 709, and his death is recorded in the Chronicle under the year 746 (*ib.* 330). With this agrees the Appendix to Florence of Worcester, which assigns him a reign of 38 years (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 543, 637). He met his death by violence (*ib.* 637, H. Hunt. *M. H. B.* 728). In the pedigrees, and also by William of Malmesbury (*G. P.* i. § 98), Swithaed succeeds, with whom the pedigree ends. Some good historians, as Sir T. D. Hardy, have supposed that Selred was really king of East Anglia, and only inserted by error in the East Saxon pedigree, but it is as certain as so obscure a matter can be that he is properly referred to Essex, although the Chronicle of Melrose, which contains some original material, calls him king of the East Angles, and gives him as successor the better known king Elfwold. We must, however, depend on the letter of the more ancient authorities, and accept the date given in the Chronicle. Possibly between 708 and 738 Selred may have reigned conjointly with Swebriht [SUEFRED]. There are no charters in which the name of Selred appears. [S.]

SEMIDALITAE, otherwise BARSANUSSITAE, an obscure Monophysite sect. Joh. Damas. t. i. 107, lib. *de Haeres.* 86; Ceill. xii. 69. [G. T. S.]

SEMIPELAGIANS. [PELAGIUS (2).]

SEMSES, a monk, and the eldest brother of S. Simeon Stylites. (Asseman. *AA. MM.* ii. 268; Ceill. x. 580.) [G. T. S.]

SENACH, bishop of Clonard, co. Meath, disciple of St. Finnian of Clonard (Colgan, *Acta SS.* ii. c. 7, 395, c. 19, 20), and called by some authors his successor; died A.D. 588. (*Ann. Tig.*; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 109, adding to Ware's error from *M. Doneg.*; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 229 following Cotton.) [J. G.]

SENAN, bishop and confessor at Iniscathaigh, in the estuary of the Shannon, two miles from Kilrush. His Lives are full of fable, and historically worthless. At Mar. 8 Colgan (*Acta SS.* 512 sq.) gives a metrical *Vita S. Senani Episcopi et confessoris* (ex vetusto codice Kilkenniensi collato cum alio Salmanticensi), followed by a prose *Secunda Vita sive Supplementum Vitae S. Senani, ex Hibernico transumptum*, with Appendix of six chapters. These Lives are republished by the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Mar. 8, i. 759–798) with Preface and Appendix containing extracts from Albert le Grand's *Saints of Armorica.* If his life was written by St. Colman, son of Lenin of Cluainuamha, it is now lost, but its substance is said to be contained in Colgan's second life [COLMAN (6)]; those we have are not older than the 12th century. (For MS. and other authorities see Hardy, *Descript. Cat.* i. pt. i. 124–6, pt. ii. 886, App.; Colgan, *Acta SS.* 543, c. 6, who (*ibid.* 529) also mentions other Lives not used, but probably still at Brussels as noted in *Proc. Roy Ir. Acad.* iii. 477 sq.; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii 210 sq.; O'Curry, *Lect. Anc. Ir.* i. p. cccxxix. and *Lect. Ir. MS.* 339.)

St. Senan was son of Ercanus, of the tribe of the Corco-bhaiscin, co. Clare; his mother Comgella, daughter of Ernach, also of Munster. His birth about A.D. 488 is said to have been foretold forty years before by St. Patrick, who announced him as his successor, though not at Armagh. He was educated under Cassidus and Natalis, and appears to have been for some time a soldier. On assuming the religious habit he went on pilgrimage to Rome, Tours, and Menevia, forming with St. David a perpetual bond of friendship. Returning to Ireland he laid foundations at Inniscarra near Cork, where he had fifty Roman monks under him, and at several islands in the Shannon, but his chief church and monastery were on Inis-Cathay, now Scattery Island, where the remains of a round tower mark its ecclesiastical importance. In the metrical life he is called "Senanus archipontifex," and is usually regarded as a bishop, but may have only been abbat (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 542–543; Cotton, *Fast.* i. 431; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* ii. 95). His exact date is unknown, but that commonly accepted is A.D. 544 (Ussher), and he is said to have died in the same year as his friend St. David, which however was later. [DAVID (5).] The Clog Oir or bell sent to him from heaven was used so late as 1834 as a sacred relic on which oaths were taken (O'Hanlon, *Hist. Ir.* iii. c. 6; Anderson, *Scot. Earl. Chr. Times*, 238), and his dedications on the West of Ireland were numerous as those of a favourite saint. The remarkable ruins on Oilen-Tsenach, one of the Magherees lying off the coast of Kerry, were probably of

his foundation; they consist of two ruined churches, and three circular beehive cells surrounded by a cashel wall (see Earl of Dunraven, *Notes Ir. Arch.* by Miss Stokes, i. 37–40, with plates and views). He is believed to have been patron of Llansannan, Denbighshire, Bedwelty, Monmouthshire, and one of the three patrons at Llantrissant in Anglesey (Bacon, *Lib. Regis*, ii. 1051, 1071, 1094), and to have given his name to Sennen, co. Cornwall (Cressy, *Ch. Hist. Brit.* xvi. 9); he is also identified with the Scotch St. KESSOG (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 374) and with the French S. Sané, one of the chief patrons of the diocese of S. Pol de Leon (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mar. i. 777–778). Of the *Amhra Senan* of Dallan Forgaill we have now no trace. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 210; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* i. ii.; *Journ. Roy. Hist. and Arch. Ass. Ir.* 4 ser. i. 56, iii. 106 sq., 255 sq. on the island and churches of Inis-Cathay.) [J. G.]

SENARIUS, patrician in the suite and personal friendship of Theoderic the Great in the beginning of the sixth century. He was closely related by blood and friendship to Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, who has addressed eleven of his letters to him (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxiii. 33, 60, et al.). St. Avitus of Vienne (*Ep.* 36) also wrote to him (Migne, t. lix. 252). [J. G.]

SENATOR (1), an officer of state of the highest rank in the Eastern Empire in the time of Theodoret. We have a letter of Theodoret's to him, written apparently about 433, on the subject of the excessive taxation imposed on his city of Cyrrhus, the assessment of which had originally been made twelve years before, when Senator himself was there in an official capacity. At the time of the writing of the letter Senator had been newly raised to the exalted rank of "Patrician," which had been revived by the emperor Constantine, as a personal dignity of the highest grade (Theod. *Ep.* 44). Three years later, in 436, Senator was consul. In 449, Theodoret wrote to him again with reference to the calumnious charges brought against him, against which he begged his assistance (*ib.* Ep. 93). He was present officially among the highest officers of state at the council of Chalcedon in 451. (Labbe, iv. 77.) [E. V.]

SENATOR (2), priest, and probably afterwards bishop of Milan, legate of Leo the Great with the bishops ABUNDIUS and Asterius, and the priest Basilius, to Constantinople, in the summer of A.D. 450. They were bearers of letters, dated July 16th, from Leo to Theodosius, Pulcheria, and the archimandrites of Constantinople (Leo, *Epp.* 69, 70, 71; in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 890, 893, 895; LEO I. vol. iii. 658). They returned to Rome before the following June (*Epp.* 83; in *Patr. Lat.* liv. 919), and Senator and Abundius then proceeded to Milan with letters from the pope to bishop Eusebius. It is almost certain that he is the same as the bishop of Milan of that name, as Ennodius in his series of epigrams on the bishops of Milan (ii. 87), refers to his journey to the East. It praises his eloquence and his skill in interpreting prophecy. He was bishop for three years between Benignus and Theodorus. The exact date is uncertain. Gams (*Ser. Epp.*) makes his episcopate extend from A.D. 472 to A.D. 475, Papebroch (*AA. SS.* Mai. vi. 769) from A.D. 477 to A.D. 480. He is commemorated on May 28 (Tillemont, *M. E.* xv. 607, 627). [F. D.]

SENATOR (3), bishop, to whom Ennodius writes by one Victor, described as "vir magnificus." He complains that whereas Senator had promised to restore one of the slaves that had been carried off by his men from Ennodius' house, he found on his return from Ravenna that the promise had not been fulfilled (Ennodius, *Epp.* iii. 1, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 55). This Senator cannot be the bishop of Milan of that name mentioned by Ennodius in his epigrams (ii. 82), as he died at latest when Ennodius was only eight years old. [F. D.]

SENATOR (4), proper name of Cassiodorius, his full name being Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorius Senator. That it was his proper name, and not a title is shown by the fact, that in his Chronicle he enters his own consulship only by the name Senator, and in books xi. and xii. of the *Variarum* calls himself Senator only. The preceding articles show that the name was not uncommon. A Senator was also consul in A.D. 436. [F. D.]

SENATOR (5), abbat. There is a letter to him from Gregory the Great, dated A.D. 602, which grants various privileges to a hospice at Autun, founded by bishop Syagrius and queen Brunechile, over which he presided (*Epp.* xiii. 8). [F. D.]

SENCHAN (SENCHAI, SEANCHAN, SENCAN) (1) Surnamed Torpeist, Torpestius, or Torpestrius, succeeded Dallan Forgaill as chief bard in Ireland (O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 29, 41). He was contemporary with Guaire Aidhne king of Connaught, who died A.D. 662, and is said to have written a distich upon St. Fursa of Perrone, and, according to Tanner, committed the native laws to writing — "Scriptis commisit leges patrias." (O'Reilly, *Ir. Writ.* xliii.; Tanner, *Bibl.* 662.) [J. G.]

(2), abbat of Emly, co. Tipperary, died A.D. 781 (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 780). He is called both abbat and bishop, and is usually counted among the bishops of Emly (Ware, *Ir. Bps.* Emly; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* i. 84; Gams, *Ser. Ep.* 209). His feast is Dec. 11. [J. G.]

SENECA, LUCIUS ANNAEUS. The chief authorities for the life of this eminent stoic philosopher are, first, his own writings; secondly, the annals of Tacitus, books xii.–xv.; thirdly, the history of Dion Cassius (or rather the abridgment of that history by Xiphilinus), books lix.–lxii. It must be said at once that whereas both from Seneca's own writings and from Tacitus we should gather that Seneca was a man of estimable though faulty character, from Dion on the other hand we should infer that he was altogether hypocritical and base. It has been usual with biographers of Seneca to regard Dion's account as untrustworthy; and the present writer, on the whole, shares this view. The question, however, is not altogether an easy one; we must be content with a fair probability in the answer we accept.

Seneca was born at Corduba (Cordova) in Spain, a year or two after the commencement of our era. He was the second son of M. Annaeus Seneca, a well-known rhetorician, some of whose writings have come down to us. His family was of equestrian rank. He was still a child when his parents came with him to live in Rome. A constant liability to illness, from which he suffered through life, may partly account for his philosophic turn of mind, as well as for that pliability of temper which led him into some great errors. In the reign of Caligula (A.D. 37–41) he was so distinguished as a pleader, that he ran some risk from the jealousy of that emperor, who, however, contented himself with the revenge of disparaging Seneca's style, which he described as "sand without lime," i.e. wanting in continuity and strength of argument; also he called Seneca's speeches mere literary exercises. (Suetonius, *Calig.* 53.) Seneca became quaestor (*ad Helv.* 17), though at what time is not known. In the first year of the reign of Claudius, A.D. 41, he was banished to Corsica, on a charge of criminal intimacy with Julia, one of the daughters of Germanicus, and niece of the reigning emperor. From the words of Suetonius (Claudius 29) it seems a fair conclusion that this accusation was unjust; for though Suetonius does not mention Seneca in that passage, he does mention Julia, and tells us that she was put to death without any proof of crime, and without being permitted to defend herself; and, moreover, that Claudius was persuaded to this and other like decisions by his wives or his favourites, who were actuated purely by passion or self-interest. Messalina was the accuser of Seneca and Julia; it is supposed that she was jealous of Julia. It is evident that Seneca was greatly affected by his banishment, and very uneasy under it. In his letter to his mother Helvia, which apparently was written at the very beginning of it, he does, it is true, express sentiments of the genuine Stoic character. "What matters it," he asks (c. 9), "what soil I tread, so long as I can survey the grand spectacle of the heavens, sun, moon, and stars, and inquire into the causes of their motions?" Again (c. 11), "It is the mind which makes us wealthy; this follows us into exile, and in the midst of the roughest solitudes, when it has obtained enough for the sustenance of the body, abounds in its own blessings and enjoys them. Money has no effect on the mind, any more than the things which are objects of envy to untrained intellects, have an influence on the immortal gods." But these grand sentiments were not maintained to the end. Two or three years afterwards we find him writing to Polybius, the powerful freedman of Claudius, in a tone of misery and despair. He speaks of his mind as "stupified and blunted by long rust," and in the same sentence (the last in the letter) of himself as absorbed in his own misfortunes ("quem sua mala occupatum tenent"), and as having lost his command of his native language in the society of the barbarous people among whom he was placed. But this is not the worst. His letter to Polybius, nominally one of consolation to the latter on the loss of a brother, had for its real aim to obtain through Polybius his own recall from banishment, and the immense flattery of Claudius which the letter contains is painful to read. Polybius, he says, must in the midst of his grief think of the emperor. He cannot grieve as long as that deity is in sight. While Caesar presides over the world Polybius has lost nothing; Claudius is his solace; his tears will be dried up by the sight of that bright luminary. It is to Claudius that Seneca himself owes his life, for the senate would have put Seneca to death, Claudius persuaded them only to banish him. The "divine hand" whose gentleness and moderation Seneca here celebrates, can hardly be believed to belong to that same person whom, after his death, this same Seneca depicted as a stupid, cruel, and brutal lout. Yet there seems no reason to doubt the genuineness either of the Consolatio ad Polybium, or of the Ludus de Morte Claudii Caesaris. It need not be said which of these treatises exhibits Seneca's real opinion of Claudius.

Seneca's flattery was, after all, unavailing. Polybius himself fell under the displeasure of Messalina and was put to death, and Seneca remained in exile eight years. But Messalina at last fell a victim to her own insane folly and profligacy. Agrippina succeeded her as the wife of Claudius (though his niece), and the new empress had a liking for the banished philosopher. Through her, in A.D. 49, Seneca was recalled from exile, appointed to the praetorship, and made the tutor of the young Domitius (afterwards the emperor Nero, and the son of Agrippina by a former husband). And here we approach an entirely new scene, and the most important one, in the life of Seneca.

Before treating of it, we may observe that he had been married for the first time some years (at least) before his exile; for he alludes in his "Consolatio ad Helviam," to two sons, one who had recently died (c. ii. 5), the other a young child, Marcus, whose playful childish ways are prettily described (c. xvi. 13, 14). Seneca refers to his wife (i.e. his first wife—the celebrated Paullina was his second) in the *De Ira*, iii. 36, 3, and to the boy Marcus again in his 8th epigram, written in his exile.

Seneca then was now no longer a mere pleader, much less an exile under the displeasure of the emperor, but one of the most powerful persons in Rome. And that power was still further and greatly increased, when in the October of A.D. 54 Claudius died (he was poisoned) and Nero became emperor. We do not hear much of Seneca's doings during the five years that elapsed between his recall from Corsica and the accession of Nero; but from that time onward the strongest light which ancient history can supply rests upon him. And if, with all the light we have, the character of Seneca is still a problem, this results, not from our having but little evidence about him, but because evidence on the delicate points which concern him is difficult to weigh, and considerations may often be adduced alike on one side and on the other.

He became, from A.D. 54 to A.D. 62, one of the two leading administrators in the Roman world, his partner in this exalted station being Afranius Burrus, prefect of the praetorian guard. One of his first duties was to restrain the immoderate ambition of Agrippina, who having murdered her husband in order to get

her son made emperor, now acted as though the real power lay in herself alone. She had already planned the death of many persons of note in Rome, when Burrus and Seneca interfered to prevent the bloodshed (Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. 2). One critical moment for her power appears to have been on an occasion when ambassadors from Armenia sought an audience of Nero. Agrippina was on the point of ascending the tribunal and exercising joint authority with her son, when Seneca had the presence of mind to bid the emperor step forward to meet his mother, and under the appearance of filial respect divert her real object. Though Agrippina had been the patroness of Seneca, no one can say that Seneca did not act rightly on these occasions. Nor were the public enactments suggested by him less approved of. The evils that had grown up under the rule of Claudius, the seizure of power by irresponsible favourites, the selling of justice, the quasi-legal attacks on obnoxious individuals, were at once checked; and we read with interest that the senate decreed (among other things) that quaestors on receiving office were not to be obliged to exhibit a show of gladiators. This last enactment is one that seems specially to bear the stamp of Seneca's mind, for he is one of the few classical Roman writers (is there indeed another?) who wrote in reprobation of the gladiatorial spectacles. (See esp. *Ep.* vii. 3, xcv. 33.) Nor is it less to the credit of both Seneca and Burrus (as is remarked by Tacitus), that during the eight years during which they jointly administered the affairs of the empire, no shadow of jealousy arose between them; a rare thing in any age, much more in an age so environed with perils and difficulties as was that of Nero.

Thus far then we have found nothing in Seneca's career as a statesman that is not praiseworthy. But there are points in him on which we cannot look with the same complacency; nay, which must arouse in us deep regret, whatever excuse may in part be made for them. The temptation in those days of flattery to an unworthy emperor, of mean compliances, was to a courtier almost overpowering, and it cannot be denied that Seneca yielded to it. It is difficult not to say that he acted basely towards Claudius, in the points already narrated. And if there were any doubt as to the genuineness of the "Ludus de Morte Claudii," there is at all events none as to the treatise *De Clementiâ*, and the expressions in that treatise are calculated to strike us with the keenest surprise, when they are contrasted with the true history of Nero. The *De Clementiâ* was written, as Seneca tells us (i. 9) when Nero had completed his eighteenth year; when, therefore, he had been at least fourteen months on the throne. Now Nero had been only three months on the throne, when he had committed one of the basest of murders, that of Britannicus (his brother by adoption, i.e. through his own adoption by Claudius); nor was it long after this when he designed to put his mother to death, and with her Rubellius Plautus (under the influence of a panic fear), and was with difficulty dissuaded from doing so by Burrus What must we think then when we find Seneca in this treatise affirming repeatedly and with the utmost force of asseveration, that Nero had never slain anyone; had never spilt a drop of human blood; that he was distinguished from all previous emperors by his innocence, by his clemency? It may be expedient to quote one of the passages in which this assertion is made. "Praestitisti, Caesar, civitatem incruentam, et hoc, quod magno animo gloriatus es, Nullam te toto orbe stillam cruoris humani misisse; eo majus est mirabiliusque, quod nulli unquam citius gladius commissus est." (*De Clementiâ*, i. 11. 2.) "You, Caesar, have preserved the state from all bloodshedding; and your magnanimous boast, That in the whole world you have not spilt a drop of human blood, is by so much the greater and more admirable, in that you were entrusted with the sword at an earlier age than any before you." Now it is true that Seneca in this treatise had clearly a good object, that namely of persuading Nero to a worthy feeling of his imperial duties. But is it not plain that flattery so grossly unfounded must have entirely done away with the effect of the salutary advice with which it was accompanied? And Seneca's actions had too much similarity to his words, even though the discrimination of their real character is not an easy task. He facilitated by means that we cannot but consider unworthy the intrigue of Nero with the courtesan Acte (Tacit. *Ann.* xiii. 13), and this was no unimportant point in the life of Nero, for with it began the alienation from his mother Agrippina which ended in that atrocious act, her murder by her son. It must be noted that the intrigue with Acte took place at the very beginning of Nero's reign, before the murder of Britannicus, and that the murder of Britannicus was even in an indirect manner the result of that intrigue. Seneca, we gather, defended himself for his conduct in the affair of Acte by the argument that, had Nero not been allowed to take his pleasure in this way, he might have broken out into assaults on the honour of high-born Roman ladies. It must be owned that what is narrated of Caligula (Suetonius, *Calig.* 36) shews that the fear was not an unfounded one. But did Seneca, either now or at any later period, attempt to recall Nero to his genuine and honourable wife Octavia? This is a question most important for the character of Seneca, but one which, unfortunately, we are without the means to solve. Could we place trust in the tragedy of "Octavia" (once ascribed to Seneca himself) we might answer it with some confidence in the affirmative. And if that tragedy was, as is probable, composed in the first century A.D. the evidence which it supplies is not to be held worthless. Further, we learn from Suetonius (Nero 35) that some friends of Nero did find fault with his desertion of Octavia, and it may fairly be hoped that Seneca was among them. On the other hand, it must be said that Tacitus gives but slight support to such a supposition, none at all indeed directly, though indirect ground may perhaps be gathered from that historian in the two following ways. The first is, that it is plain from *Annals*, xiv. 52, 53, that the overthrow of Seneca's power (which preceded his death by some three years) was caused mainly by Nero's feeling that his old tutor and moral adviser was exerting his functions in this kind too freely to be pleasing to his quondam pupil and present master. This is a

purely general consideration, but if it be true that Burrus was poisoned by the order of Nero (though this is not wholly certain) then it is impossible not to connect together the death of Burrus and the contemporaneous disgrace of Seneca; and we know from Dion Cassius that Burrus had offended Nero by the strong expression of his opinion in favour of Octavia. It is then a probable inference that Seneca had committed the same honourable offence. Dion Cassius, however, is as strong, it may be said as virulent, against Seneca in relation to the wrongs and calamities of Octavia as he is in all other points; but it is so clear that Dion Cassius took his account from the bitter enemies of Seneca, and he gives so little authority for his assertions (at least in the abridgment of his history by Xiphilinus, which is all of his work that we possess in this part of it) that his statements against Seneca are not entitled to very much weight. On the whole, we may hope that Seneca conducted himself with respect to the miserable history of Nero's sexual relations, not certainly without fault, but still with sincere attempts at rectitude. and that our sympathy for him need not be wholly taken away on this account. The present is not a biography either of Nero or of Octavia; it must be sufficient to remind the reader that the life of Octavia, after her marriage with Nero, lasted about nine years; that it was in the second of these years, or very shortly after he became emperor, that Nero deserted her for Acte (though he had never liked her); that she continued to receive the support and friendship of Agrippina (*Ann.* xiii. 18, 19; xiv. 1) up to the death of the latter; and that her ruin was finally accomplished by the same wicked and beautiful woman who was the prime cause of the death of Agrippina herself, Poppaea Sabina, Nero's second and favourite wife.

We must, however, return to Seneca; and the gravest charge against him has now to be examined, the part which he played in relation to the murder of Agrippina. The mutual relations of Nero and his mother, after the accession of the former to the imperial throne, were those of a growing jealousy and alienation, as indeed from their respective characters was almost certain to be the case. The open attempts of Agrippina to exercise a share in the imperial authority had been frustrated by Seneca himself, and in this he acted rightly, for Nero was the recognised *de facto* sovereign, questionable as the legitimacy of his rule was. After this, the violent and seditious language of Agrippina, though under circumstances of great provocation, may have justified the withdrawal of her military guard and escort. If we could believe that Nero was ever in any positive personal danger from his mother, that she had ever contemplated his removal by assassination or poisoning, our deep condemnation even of Nero would be somewhat lightened, and Seneca's conduct would admit of more excuse than has generally been accorded to it. It may be said, in support of such a supposition, that the woman who had poisoned the late emperor her husband would not hesitate to make away with the present emperor her son, if need were; and those who believe the odious story quoted by Tacitus from Cluvius (*Ann.* xiv. 2), and apparently half believed by Tacitus himself, may argue that there was no wickedness from which Agrippina would have shrunk. But that story wears marks of internal improbability, (for would Agrippina have acted as she is there said to have done in the presence of witnesses?) and was probably the invention of a prurient age; and as to the other point, the tenor of the history shews that Agrippina had an affection for her son which she never had, nor was likely to have, for Claudius. "It is not my son who has sent you," were her words to her murderers; the very violence of her language against him on some occasions was proof that she meditated no secret treachery; and in one most important point, her support of Octavia (*Ann.* xiv. 1), she certainly acted an honourable part. All things considered, can we believe that there was no opportunity for Seneca, during the more than four years' quarrel (an ever-growing quarrel) between Nero and his mother, to say a word for the woman to whom he owed his own advancement, nay more, his deliverance from a most burdensome exile? There is no sign that he ever uttered any such word; and it is to be feared that want of courage was his true reason for such abstinence. Cowardice was emphatically the characteristic of the Roman senate (with a few bright exceptions) at this period; and Seneca, it is to be feared, was liable to the same imputation. The murder of Agrippina was finally carried out for three reasons; first, because Nero was afraid of her; secondly, because he was tired of her reproaches (he found her "praegravis," *Ann.* xiv. 3, and compare Suetonius, *Nero*, 34); and lastly, because Poppaea found her marriage with Nero difficult or impracticable, so long as Agrippina, the resolute champion of Octavia, lived to oppose it. Did we believe of Seneca what was asserted of him by his enemies, that he was privy to the whole plot against Agrippina, our opinion of him must sink very low indeed. He, as well as Burrus, did give an assent to it (*Ann.* xiv. 7); but as far as we know, only at the very last moment, when the scheme for drowning Agrippina had failed, and when it might seem that, as reconciliation was impossible, either Nero or Agrippina must fall. Though even then a man of perfect courage would not have given such assent, yet to avoid it was, we may conclude, difficult, since Burrus gave it as well as Seneca. But Seneca, alone of these two, bore the blame in the popular mind of having composed the letter which Nero afterwards addressed to the senate, in which he declared that Agrippina had made an attempt on his life, and then, finding it unsuccessful, had committed suicide in a fit of terror and remorse. The attempt to drown her was in this letter represented as an accidental shipwreck. If Seneca really composed it, it was the worst act we know of him. On the whole it must be taken that he did compose the letter; though the words of Tacitus, strictly speaking, do not state more than that the popular belief was to this effect. ("Adverso rumore Seneca erat, quod oratione tali confessionem *scripsisset*." *Ann.* xiv. 11.)

The remaining charge against Seneca, during the period of his power, was that of having accumulated wealth by oppressive and extortionate means. The charge was especially emphasised by Suilius, who himself had been an oppressive minister under Claudius, and who, partly at the

instance of Seneca, was banished in the reign of Nero for his old oppression (*Ann.* xiii. 42, 43). There may have been some truth in it, for the wealth of Seneca was no doubt enormous; but it must be said in his favour that he was clearly capable of great personal self-restraint (Tacitus speaks of him in his old age as "parvo victu tenuatum," *Ann.* xv. 63, and in his youth he was a vegetarian, cf. *Ep.* cviii. 13–23); and though fear was no doubt a part motive in his offer to resign all his wealth to the emperor after the death of Burrus (*Ann.* xiv. 54), it does not look as if he clung tenaciously to it, or was unduly fond of it.

It is worth while asking, before we leave this part of the life of Seneca, what reasons are to be assigned for his lamentable failure in the task specially assigned to him, as firstly tutor and then ministerial adviser to Nero? One of the most distinguished of philosophers and of moral writers has an emperor for his pupil; and the result is, that that emperor becomes a prodigy of vice and wickedness. What caused this result? It may be said that the task was a difficult one; but the catastrophe of the issue was stupendous. We are not entitled to be surprised that Seneca did not make a Marcus Aurelius of his pupil; but we might have expected some one better than Nero to have been turned out from the operation. How came such a disaster from conditions so apparently promising? Out of various causes that contributed to the result, perhaps none acted so detrimentally as a certain want of practical directness in Seneca's mind. He loves theorising, but he leaves his theories in the air. His letter of consolation to his mother Helvia upon his own banishment is an eloquent treatise; and the process of writing it no doubt consoled himself; but it is difficult to believe that it can have had the same effect on his mother. What can be more absurd in the way of consolation than to accumulate all the ills a person has ever suffered, and present them in one view with an emphatic statement of the misery that they involved? which is what Seneca does to his mother in the second and third chapters of this treatise. And there is a ludicrous naïveté in the way in which he represents his own banishment (to no more distant place than Corsica) as the worst of all ills that his mother had ever suffered, though he has just reminded her of the death of his own father and her husband, not to speak of the deaths of an uncle and three grandchildren. If Seneca instructed Nero as he consoled his mother, the perversity of the effect produced need not surprise us. Take again the treatise *De Tranquillitate Animi*. Annaeus Serenus, an intimate friend of Seneca, had written to him complaining of his own weakness; he desired to practise the precepts of the Stoic philosophy, and at times did so, living in plain and homely fashion, expressing himself in simple phrases, attending to his own business; but he could not keep consistently to his own resolutions, he was continually hurried away into luxury and ambition. Seneca answers him by telling him that he wants tranquillity, and proceeds to write a treatise on the general subject of tranquillity, out of which he tells Serenus that he must pick out those parts which suit his own case. The treatise is full of able and acute observations, it must be admitted; but Serenus must have been very clear-sighted to find any answer to his own question in it. And in fine, while it would be unjust to say that personal vital morality has no place in Seneca, intellectual morality and theories about duty are so far in excess of the vital feeling as rather to swamp the latter. There is perhaps nothing in which he stands so pointedly in contrast with Christianity as in this; for in Christianity, at any rate the Christianity of the New Testament and the early Fathers, there is hardly a point of pure intellectual theory about duty; every perception of duty is accompanied by the instant practical feeling, "it must be done, or it will be the worse for us." Seneca for the most part surveys duty from a distance. He is aware of his weakness in this respect, and very candidly confesses it in the treatise, *De Vita Beata*, c. 17, 18. "I," he says in effect in those chapters, "am not worthy to speak even as a man who has attained to any good, much less a wise man. I am in a very abyss of faults; when I reprove vices, I reprove my own first of all; when I shall be able, then I will live as I ought to live. Yet, O ye calumniators of all that is good, I will none the less persist in praising that life which I do not indeed live myself, but which I know ought to be lived, and at a vast distance I will creep on in pursuit of it." Sentiments so humble must move us in favour of the man who expresses them, though Seneca did not at all adequately feel the danger there is in mere rhetorical praise of virtue. After all, great as is the difference between Seneca and the New Testament in this respect, Seneca had a real interest in practical active conduct, not enough indeed to kindle a spiritual fire in those devoid of it, but enough to inform and interest others in manifold ways.

But it is necessary to return to his personal life, of which the third, the briefest, and the concluding portion remains to be told. He fell from power after the death of Burrus in A.D. 62. Nero was exhorted by his flatterers to rid himself of an instructor who had possibly been of use to a boy, but was useless to a grown man; and Seneca was alleged to show extraordinary vanity, and even to have carped at the emperor's performances in poetry, chariot-driving, and singing. Seneca perceived that the emperor lent an ear to these accusations, and begged leave to surrender his wealth and retire into private life. This was not permitted, but Seneca, not deceived by Nero's apparently friendly manner, mingled but little henceforth in public matters. He made another unsuccessful attempt to retire at the time when Nero, being in want of money, plundered the temples not only in Italy, but in the provinces of Asia and Achaia (*Ann.* xv. 45); being afraid of being regarded as a participator in such sacrilege. It was reported (whether truly or not we have no means of knowing) that Nero made an attempt to poison him about this time. If so, the attempt failed; but the end of Seneca's eventful life was drawing near. The conspiracy of Piso, in A.D. 65, gave the occasion for it. That plot was disclosed to Nero by a slave of Scevinus, one of the conspirators. It was speedily discovered that Scevinus had had a long and secret interview with Natalis; and Natalis, on being threatened with the rack, informed Nero that

Piso and Seneca were two of the conspirators. The evidence against Seneca, however, was still indirect merely, for Natalis could merely say that he had been sent by Piso to Seneca to complain of Seneca's refusal to admit him to friendly intercourse, and that Seneca replied that frequent conversation between them was inexpedient, but that his safety rested on Piso's safety. Slight as this evidence was, Nero was too eager to get rid of his old tutor to hesitate to avail himself of it. He sent Granius Silvanus, a tribune of the praetorian cohort, to ask Seneca if he acknowledged these utterances. Seneca replied, acknowledging Piso's message, but not his own reply. He had merely refused Piso on the ground of ill-health and desire for rest. "He should have regarded," he said, "such an answer as that attributed to him as flattery of Piso, and Nero must know better than anyone that Seneca was no flatterer, having so often had experience of his freedom of speech." This bold answer at once shewed Nero that Seneca was prepared for the worst. "Was Seneca," he asked the tribune, "preparing for death?" "He shews," said the tribune, "no sign of fear. His words, his countenance are cheerful." Poppaea was sitting by with Tigellinus, the worst of Nero's instruments. "Tell Seneca," said Nero, "that he must put himself to death." And now an incident occurred, in itself slight, but which, if correctly reported, seems to shew that Seneca had really knowledge of the plot. The tribune was himself in the conspiracy, and with such a message he shunned meeting the gaze of Seneca; he conveyed Nero's commands through a centurion. Why? It may have been simply that he shunned, being himself guilty, meeting the gaze of an innocent and injured man. But a more likely explanation is that the tribune not only knew himself to be guilty, but knew that Seneca knew him to be so. And this implies that Seneca knew of the plot, and probably Tacitus thought so too, though he lays stress on the absence of evidence against him. If Seneca knew of it, then, though the evidence produced was inadequate in the extreme, his death cannot be reckoned among the villainies which have made Nero infamous.

We need not, even in this case, blame Seneca severely. It is plain that he was no active conspirator himself. We in our day have learned the evil and uselessness of political assassinations, be the cause of the injured parties as just as it may. But the Romans of the first century A.D. had by no means learned this lesson, and Tacitus himself writes as if he approved of the conspirators in this case (he blames the "ignavia" through which the plot failed). Were the rumour in *Ann.* xv. 65 true, we should condemn Seneca more; but it is too devoid of authority to be more than referred to here.

In the last scene of his life Seneca behaved with courage and equanimity. He was at supper in the company of his wife and two friends: he called for his will, but on this being refused, he turned to his friends and said, "Since I may not requite your kindnesses to me, I can but leave you the picture of my life as your bequest. Remember it, and you will have an honourable reputation both from your own character and from our constant friendship." He restrained their tears with exhortations and reproofs, he embraced his wife, and entreated her not to be too sorrowful, but to console herself with the memory of his virtuous life. She, however, declared herself determined to die with him. Their veins were opened with the same stroke. Seneca, with his aged body and the slow flow of blood, suffered greatly, and to prevent their being mutually affected by the sight of each other's pains, he persuaded his wife to be carried to an adjoining apartment. He himself dictated some reflections to his secretaries, which were afterwards published. Death was long in coming to him; he tried poison in vain; at last he desired himself to be placed in a hot bath. As he entered it, he sprinkled his slaves with the water, crying out, "I make this libation to Jupiter the deliverer." He was quickly overpowered by the vapour. He died in A.D. 65. His wife Paullina did not die; for Nero ordered that her veins should be closed again. It was doubted whether she was, or was not, conscious of the act which restored her life. She lived some years afterwards, but with a deathly pallor of face, revering the memory of her husband.

Seneca, with all his faults, had many elements of goodness in him. Above all, his writings shew him to have been a humane and tender-hearted man. No other classical writer can shew a parallel to such a passage as the following, in which he speaks of the gladiatorial shows, "Man, that sacred thing, is now slain for a sport and a jest to his fellow-man. He, who cannot without crime be trained to inflict and receive wounds, is brought out unarmed and defenceless into the amphitheatre. The spectacle that a man gives by his death is all that we care for. In such a perversity of moral character we need some more than usually strong impulse, to strike aside these inveterate evils." (*Ep.* xcv. 33, 34. "Homo, sacra res, homini jam per lusum et jocum occiditur," &c.). In relation to sexual morality, he speaks in the same epistle with a loftiness of tone seldom found among the ancients: it is, he tells us, "the most grievous injury against a wife for a man to keep a mistress." (*Ep.* xcv. 39.) His practical Roman nature resented the subtleties and puzzles which some logicians of the time regarded as proper training for the intellect (*Ep.* xlviii.), and even the paradoxes of greater philosophers (*Ep.* lxxxviii.). It is of interest to find that he agreed with Bacon in disapproving of preambles to laws, and disagreed with Plato. "A law," he says, "should be short, and should command, but not discuss." (*Ep.* xciv. 38.)

It has been said above that the greatest difference between the general character of his moral precepts and Christian morality lies in the far greater urgency, the commanding force of the latter. St. Paul rebukes vice; Seneca was not strong enough for this; he merely argues against it. Nevertheless the style of the morality of Seneca, and even his religion, are in many respects singularly Christian. He knew that improvement in goodness is effected by small insensible advances, "line upon line, here a little and there a little." "You will find," he says, "that the conversation of wise men benefits you, but you will not find how or when the benefit is effected" (*Ep.* xciv. 41). In more than one

place he uses the phrase that the mind is "transformed" (*transfigurari*) into a better state: "I find, Lucilius," he says, "that I am being not merely corrected, but transformed. I can indeed give no promise or expectation of being free from faults: how should I not have many things in me needing correction? but it is a proof of improvement, that my mind sees faults in itself which hitherto it ignored" (*Ep.* vi. 1, cf. xciv. 48). Then, too, there is in Seneca a greater likeness to that which Christianity terms "faith" than is to be found in any other ancient writer. It is, indeed, not an assured and steady faith; but it is full of enthusiasm. Very remarkable is the passage at the end of the "Consolatio ad Marciam," in which he depicts the son whom Marcia had lost as in heaven, as purified from the stains of this life, as conversing with those who had gone before him and learning the truths of nature; in heaven, where there is no war, nor murder, nor strife, where all minds are laid bare, all hearts are open (*detectas mentes, et aperta praecordia*). Or take the very interesting 68th Epistle, in which he describes (though in different parts and without intentional connexion) the wise man as he is in his true being, before and after death, and man as he is on this earth, feeble and miserable. "When we have assigned," he says in the first passage, "to our wise man a republic worthy of himself, that is the world; then *even when he has left his republic, he is not outside of it.* Nay, rather he has perhaps but left a single corner of it, and is passing into larger and ampler spheres, and is set over the heaven, and feels how lowly was the place in which he was formerly stationed, when he ascended to the curule chair, or the seat of judgment." The heavenly kingdom of Christ cannot but occur to the reader. In contrast with this take the following from the same epistle: "There is no reason why you should give yourself the title of philosopher . . . It is a kind of boastfulness to be too much in retreats, to withdraw from the eyes of men. . . . What is it that you ought to converse with yourself about? that which people are most prone to talk about in respect of others: think badly of yourself. Accustom yourself both to say and to hear truth; and handle your own weakest point the most. . . . I like not praises; I would not you should say of me, Great man, he has despised all things, he has condemned the madnesses of human life, and has fled from them. I have condemned nothing but myself; you need not come to me to learn from me; you are wrong if you hope for any help in this quarter; it is no physician, but a sick man who dwells here." Indeed, there is hardly anything on which Seneca dwells more than the sinfulness of man. Take, as one passage out of many, the following from the *De Irâ*, ii. 27. "If we wish to be equitable judges of every matter, let us first persuade ourselves of this, that none of us is without fault. For it is from this that the greatest indignation arises, when a man says: I have not sinned, I have done nothing; nay, rather thy confession it is which is lacking." So, too, in the treatise, *De Vita Beata*, i. 2, the "worn and frequented road" is stated to be the way of error; in *De Providentiâ*, iii. 3, the benefits of suffering are represented in the striking expression, quoted from Demetrius, "Nihil mihi videtur infelicius eo, cui nihil unquam evenit adversi." "Nothing seems to me more unhappy than the man to whom no adversity has ever happened." (This last recalls the Christian phrase, "Nulla crux, quanta crux.")

These quotations, illustrative of the similarity of Seneca's moral teaching to that of the New Testament, might be extended almost indefinitely. The reader who cares to see more of them may refer to pages 275–288 of bishop Lightfoot's essay, *St. Paul and Seneca*, which forms the second dissertation at the end of his "Epistle to the Philippians." Nevertheless, every one who reads Seneca continuously must feel that his mind is not a Christian mind; Stoic he is essentially as well as nominally; though his stoicism is of a far more flexible and expansive character than some doctrine which has borne that name. There is not a sentence in him that reads as if it were out of place, that does not fit in naturally to his whole system; and though that system has apparent inconsistencies within itself, even those inconsistencies have a natural air, they originate from different sides of the whole complex system. And among the special points in which his teaching is even adverse to Christianity, may be mentioned his distinct and frequent praise of suicide in those cases in which a man judges that his useful career in the world is over, the absence of any tone of awe in speaking of God or "the gods," and his doctrine of recurring cycles of renovation, at the close of each of which this whole system of things will be burnt up, and another order begin.

We have spoken of Seneca as having "faith"; and it emphasises the independent origin of this quality in him, when we find that he exercises it with reference to subjects wholly different from morals. Thus, in his treatise, *Naturales Quaestiones*, vii. 25, he dwells with enthusiasm on those discoveries of science which he anticipates in the future: "there will come a time when the things now hidden will be brought to light by length of days and continued industry. One age does not suffice for the investigation of so great things" . . . and in the 31st chapter of the same book: "How many animals have first come to our knowledge in this present age! and many things unknown to us, shall be known to the coming race. Many things are reserved for future ages, when our memory shall have become dim." And in the same tone is that celebrated passage in his play of "Medea," so often quoted as a prophecy of the discovery of America:

> Venient annis saecula seris,
> Quibus Oceanus vincula rerum
> Laxet et ingens pateat tellus
> Tethysque novos detegat orbes
> Nec sit terris ultima Thule.

"There will come an age, when Time has grown old, in which the ocean will unloose the bands that bind the world, and a mighty land will spread open to our view, and the sea-goddess Tethys shall disclose new spheres, and Thule shall no longer be the furthest known country." Indeed, Seneca had a real love for the splendours and wonders of the physical universe, and he sometimes shews an acuteness in dealing with them which entitles this part of his speculations

to receive more praise than Zeller accords to it. For instance, he is perfectly right as to the nature of comets, which he affirms to be heavenly, and not aerial bodies (*Nat. Quaest.* vii. 22), and to move in orbits; at least, he says that two which appeared in his time did so (*ib.* vii. 23). And he was aware that the moon was the cause of the tides (*De Provid.* i. 4); is there among the ancients any earlier instance of this piece of knowledge?

The great popularity of Seneca as a writer in his own day is attested by Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* x. 1, § 128), who, however, finds some fault with his style. In later times, among the Christian fathers, there gradually grew up a belief that he was almost, if not quite, a Christian. Bishop Lightfoot gives a compendious account of the growth of this belief, which may be quoted. "The earliest of the Latin fathers, Tertullian, writing about a century and a half after the death of Seneca, speaks of this philosopher as 'often our own' (Tertull. *de Anim.* 20). Some two hundred years later St. Jerome, having occasion to quote him, omits the qualifying adverb and calls him broadly 'our own Seneca' (*adv. Jovin.* i. 49). Living midway between these two writers, Lactantius points out several coincidences with the teaching of the gospel in the writings of Seneca, whom, nevertheless, he styles 'the most determined of the Roman Stoics' (*Div. Inst.* i. 5). From the age of St. Jerome, Seneca was commonly regarded as standing on the very threshold of the Christian church, even if he had not actually passed within its portals. In one ecclesiastical council at least, held at Tours in the year 567, his authority is quoted with a deference generally accorded only to fathers of the church. And even to the present day in the marionette plays of his native Spain St. Seneca takes his place by the side of St. Peter and St. Paul in the representations of our Lord's passion." (Bp. Lightfoot on the *Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 268.) The belief in the Christianity of Seneca was largely increased if not caused by that collection of letters, purporting to have been exchanged between him and St. Paul, which was current first, as far as we know, in the time of Jerome (who certainly seems, on the whole, to have believed in their genuineness), and which is extant in our own day. The letters contain nothing worthy of either of their reputed authors, and are now universally (and no doubt justly) held to be spurious. They were, however, very popular in the middle ages. It is worthy of note that the persecution by Nero (which took place after, and by reason of, the fire of Rome, in the year before the death of Seneca) is in the eleventh of these letters represented to have included Jews as well as Christians in its scope. This may be true, but there is no other evidence for it; and Poppaea would as certainly have endeavoured to protect the Jews as she would have been prone to excite Nero against the Christians (by reason of her liking for the Jews). Nor is it easy to think that Josephus would have praised Poppaea as he does (*Ant.* xx. 8, § 11) if the Jews had undergone violent persecution while she was in power at Rome.

There is, of course, no impossibility in the supposition that St. Paul and Seneca met between A.D. 61 and A.D. 65; but there is no evidence for it except the spurious letters; there is nothing in the works of Seneca which requires such a supposition, though they do not absolutely forbid it.

This account of Seneca may be concluded with two remarks. All that we know of him, except what is derived from his own writings, comes from historians who delighted to believe evil of every one. How true this is of Tacitus, the greatest of them, will be apparent from the account which he gives of the Christians. Tacitus certainly could not have *known* that Christianity was an abominable superstition, and Christians deserving of the most extreme punishments; he was quite content to take these things on common rumour. In some of the gravest charges which he records against Seneca, he rests on rumour also. If, then, we unhesitatingly reject what he says against the Christians, we should in fairness look with some doubt upon what he alleges, or half alleges, against Seneca.

Lastly, it is impossible not to be reminded, in reading of Seneca, of our own great countryman, Lord Bacon. Both great philosophers, and even not quite unlike in their philosophic character and enthusiasm (for on the one hand Bacon's observations on human nature are weighty, and Seneca on his side had true enthusiasm for natural science, as has been seen); both placed in high governing positions, and exposed to temptations which they could not wholly resist, and which have done much harm to their subsequent reputation. But Bacon had the advantage of living in a Christian country and in a better age; he had the advantage of light in many points where Seneca was groping; and his name has held a higher position than that of Seneca, and is likely to continue to do so. Nevertheless, Seneca is not quite unworthy of being named by his side.

The best, and a very admirable, account of the whole philosophy of Seneca will be found in Zeller's history of philosophy (towards the close of the first volume of the third part). The relations of Seneca to Christianity have been treated of very amply in the valuable dissertation of bishop Lightfoot (already referred to and quoted from), pp. 268–331 of his commentary on the Philippians; where also there is a discussion as to the genuineness and character of the supposed correspondence with St. Paul. The connexion of Seneca with St. Paul is also treated of in pp. 119–128 of the small volume entitled: *St. Paul at Rome*, by Dean Merivale, who in his *History of the Romans under the Empire*, also has much about Seneca. Other writers who may be referred to are Fleury (*St. Paul et Sénèque*), Aubertin (*Sénèque et St. Paul*), Bähr (*Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, vol. i.), and Ritter (*Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. iv.). Diderot also wrote about Seneca, and Montaigne valued him very highly. A list of Seneca's extant works will be found in the DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY. The works of Seneca were translated into English by Thomas Lodge (London, 1614). A recent edition is by F. Haase. [J. R. M.]

SENECA (HENECAS, Georg. Syncell. or SENTHYAS), the 10th bishop of Jerusalem. His episcopate commenced according to the *Chron.*

Armen. and the *Chronicon* of Jerome in the 8th year of Hadrian, A.D. 125. Eutychius assigns him one year only of office. (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 5; Epiphan. *Haer.* lxvi. 20.) [E. V.]

SENECIO, bishop of Scodra, was appointed coadjutor to Bassus c. A.D. 392 (Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*; Siricius, *Epp.* 9, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 1178), whom he succeeded, but at which date is not known. He is mentioned c. A.D. 425, by pope Celestinus (*Epp.* 3, in *Patr. Lat.* l. 427). Finally in A.D. 431, he was present at the council of Ephesus, the acts of which he subscribed (Mansi, iv. 1123, 1365; Farlati, *Illyr. Sac.* vii. 305). [F. D.]

SENOCHUS (1), ST., a presbyter, who gained a great reputation for sanctity in the 6th century, near Tours. Owing to his intimacy with Gregory the historian, we have trustworthy information about him. He was born about 536 in a district near Poitiers, called Theiphalia, which had been for many years settled by people of Scythian or Tartar race, to which he belonged himself. He became a Christian, and entered the ranks of the clergy. In some ruined buildings by Tours he built himself a cell, at a spot where an old oratory existed, in which St. Martin, according to tradition, had been wont to pray. St. Euphronius, the then bishop of Tours, consecrated it afresh, and ordained Senoch a deacon. Here with a little company of three he practised for some time the greatest austerities, but aspiring to still higher sanctity he afterwards shut himself up in a solitary cell. In 573 Gregory became bishop of Tours, and received a visit from him. Soon afterwards Senoch went to see his kinsfolk in Poitou, and came back, according to Gregory, so puffed up with spiritual pride, that the bishop had to take him roundly to task. He was brought to reason and consented, at Gregory's persuasion, to forego his absolute solitude, in order that the sick might be healed by his virtues. At about the age of forty he fell ill, and Gregory, summoned to his couch, found him speechless and on the point of death (circ. A.D. 576). His funeral was thronged by a multitude whom he had redeemed from captivity or healed or fed, and miracles were attributed to his dead body. He is commemorated Oct. 24, and his cult, which was established very early, extended into Burgundy (where he was called St. Enoch), Brittany, and the neighbourhood of Poitiers. His name clung to the spot where his cell had been. (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 7; *Vitae Patrum*, cap. xv.; *De Glor. Conf.* cap. xxxv.; Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. x. 764 sqq.) [S. A. B.]

SENOCHUS (2) (SEDOCUS, SIDOCUS), eleventh bishop of the see of Eause, or Elusa (transferred to Auch in the 9th century), was present at the council held at Rheims under the presidency of Sonnatius, probably in the year 625. In the following year he and his father, Palladius, were driven into exile by Clotaire II., on the charge of being concerned in a Gascon rising (Fredegarius, *Chronicon*, liv.; Mansi, x. 593; *Gall. Christ.* i. 970). [S. A. B.]

SEN-PATRICK. [PATRICIUS (9).]

SENUTI (July 1st in the ancient Coptic Calendar) was the name of an anchorite of the 5th century, whose history was first brought to light by Zoega. It has been investigated of late by E. Revillout in a paper on the Blemmyes contributed to the *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscr.* 1874, Sér. I. t. viii. p. 395, and still more elaborately in a series of articles contributed by him to the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1883 Nos. 4 and 5. Senuti has strangely faded from the page of history, though he seems to have been a leader of special power amid the distracted controversies attendant upon the third and fourth councils. He was called "the prophet," and invested with supernatural powers. He was born about the middle of the 4th century. His father was a farmer in Egypt, and Senuti fed his sheep in boyhood. But this world's affairs had no charm for him. It was an age when every enthusiast devoted himself to the monastic life. His uncle was a famous anchorite. Senuti was brought to him as a boy to be blessed, when his uncle at once recognised his future greatness. He attached himself to the monastery of Panopolis, near the town of Athrebi in Upper Egypt, where he soon attained the greatest fame for sanctity and orthodoxy. Cyril would not set out for the council of Ephesus till he had secured the company of Senuti and of Victor, archimandrite of Tabenna. Zoega, *Cat. MSS. Coptic Mus. Borg.* p. 29, gives us Cyril's own account of this affair. Cyril travelled in the same ship with Senuti and Victor, while he sent his attendant bishops in another vessel. Senuti's conduct at the council of Ephesus, as described by his disciple and successor, Besa, fully justifies those charges of outrageous violence brought by the Nestorian party against their opponents. Besa describes a strange scene which happened at the opening of the council. A lofty throne had been placed in the centre of the hall, and the four gospels placed thereon. Nestorius entered with pomp, and flinging down the gospels on the floor seated himself on the throne. Senuti, filled with rage, at once jumped into the midst, and snatching up the book hurled it against the breast of Nestorius, accompanying the action with vigorous controversial reproaches. Nestorius demanded who he was, and whence and what brought him to the council, being "neither a bishop, nor an archimandrite, nor a provost, but merely a simple monk." "God sent me to the council," replied the undaunted Senuti, "to confound thee and thy wickedness." Whereupon, amid the plaudits of his adherents, Cyril at once invested him with the rank and robe of an archimandrite, and thus removed the technical objection raised by Nestorius. His career was now marked by miracle. Cyril, by mistake, sailed from Constantinople without him, but the sea was no obstacle to Senuti. He was wafted on a cloud to Egypt. His fame was now everywhere established. Roman commanders waging war against those mysterious but most pertinacious enemies of the Roman State the Blemmyes, sought direction and assistance from him. Thus about the year 450 there was a terrific invasion, and the dux of Upper Egypt, Maximinus, hurried to repel the Blemmyes, but before he would advance he sought the presence of Senuti. He had, however, retired into the desert for a period of

spiritual retreat, charging his followers to let no one know of his hiding-place. Maximinus would, however, admit of no excuse, and was led to the saint, who was very angry on account of the interruption, but yet admitted the plea of urgency. He gave Maximin his blessing and his girdle, which he was to wear whenever he joined battle, if he desired success. Revillout thinks that Senuti was specially hostile to the Blemmyes on this occasion, because they had just liberated his ancient enemy Nestorius from his exile in the Oasis of Ptolemais, and thus brought him back to his own immediate neighbourhood of Panopolis, where Nestorius died. Revillout, contrary to the usual authorities, fixes the date of Nestorius's death, as A.D. 451 [NESTORIUS (3)], and supports the tradition, that Nestorius was summoned by the emperor to the council of Chalcedon, but died before the missive reached him. According to the Coptic MSS. Senuti followed Nestorius with bitter persecution to the last, offering even personal violence to the unfortunate man when he lay dying.

Senuti was now about one hundred years old. He would have been fortunate had he died then. But he lived to be a heretic in the opposite extreme from Nestorius. After the council of Chalcedon he became a Monophysite and a violent partisan of the patriarch Dioscorus of Alexandria. Senuti died under Timotheus Aelurus, aged 118 years. The authorities for his life are Zoega and Revillout in the works mentioned above. [G. T. S.]

SEPTIMINUS, proconsul of Africa, A.D. 403, to whom the council of Carthage, held A.D. 401, addressed a memorial requesting protection against the Circumcellions, and permission to admonish the Donatists; to which he replied by giving permission for this to be done with due respect to the law (*Mon. Vet. Don.* xlv. p. 273, ed. Oberthür; p. 213, ed. Dupin). [H. W. P.]

SEPTIMUS, bishop of Altinum, is addressed in one letter of Leo the Great, and mentioned in another to the bishop of Aquileia, both written early in his pontificate (Leo, *Epp.* 1, 2, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 593, 597). For an abstract of these letters see LEO I. Vol. III. 658, and for a discussion of their date and the genuineness of that to Septimus, Tillemont (*M. E.* xv. 890). He is apparently the same as the Sambatinus mentioned in the Chronicle of Altinum (Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, ix. 518). [F. D.]

SERANUS, vicar of Africa during the time of the insurrection of Gildo, about A.D. 393. The violence of the Donatists at this time induced the Catholics to appeal to him to put in force the edict of Valentinian to impose a fine of 10 lbs. of gold on heretics assuming clerical functions (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5, 21, A.D. 392; Aug. *Petil.* ii. 184). [GILDO (2).] He appears afterwards to have become pro-consul, and when an appeal was made to him by Restitutus to eject Salvius from the property of the see of Membresa he was induced either, as was insinuated, by partiality, or as Augustine thought, more probably by the recent decree of the Council of Bagai to decide against Salvius, with the scornful suggestion that he ought either to return to the community of Primian with a promise of indemnity, or according to the Scripture precept accept cheerfully the lot of persecution (Aug. *c. Cresc.* iv. 58). [H. W. P.]

SERAPHIA, martyr. [SABINA (2).]

SERAPION (1), bishop of Antioch, reckoned eighth in succession, A.D. 190–203 (Clinton), succeeded Maximinus in the eleventh year of Commodus (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 12; *Chronicon*). He was a theologian of considerable literary activity, the author of works of which Eusebius had no certain knowledge, in addition to those enumerated by him. Of these latter an account is given by Jerome (*de Script. Eccl.* c. 41) borrowed from Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 19; vi. 12). They are—(1) a letter to Caricus and Pontius directed against the Cataphrygian or Montanist heresy, containing a copy of a letter of Apollinaris of Hierapolis on the same subject, and substantiated as to the facts by the signatures of several other bishops, including some of Thrace (Eus. *H. E.* v. 19; vi. 12); (2) a treatise addressed to Domninus, who during the persecution of Severus had fallen away to the Jewish "will-worship" (*ibid.* vi. 12); and (3) the most important of all, one directed against the Docetic gospel falsely attributed to St. Peter, addressed to some members of the church of Rhossus on the Gulf of Issus, who were being led away by it from the true faith. Serapion, in the extracts given by Eusebius (*ibid.* vi. 12), recalls the permission to read this apocryphal work given in ignorance of its true character, and expresses his intention of paying the church a speedy visit to strengthen them in the true faith. Dr. Neale calls attention to the important evidence here furnished to "the power yet possessed by individual bishops of settling the canon of scripture" (Neale, *Patriarch. of Antioch*, p. 36). Socrates refers to his writings, as an authority against the Apollinarian heresy (Socr. *H. E.* iii. 7). Jerome mentions sundry letters in harmony with his life and character. (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* iii. 168, § 9; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 86; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 702.) [E. V.]

SERAPION (2), Nov. 14, martyr at Alexandria. His martyrdom was described by Dionysius of Alexandria, in his epistle to Fabius of Antioch (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 41). [G. T. S.]

SERAPION (3), a penitent of Alexandria, who fell during the Decian persecution. Dionysius of Alexandria uses his case as an argument against the Novatian schism, to which his correspondent, Fabius of Antioch, was inclined. Serapion had lived a long life without blame, but sacrificed at last. He often begged for admission to the church, but was refused. He was then taken sick, and was three days without speech. At length he awoke to consciousness, and despatched his grandson for a presbyter. He was sick, and unable to come to Serapion, but he sent back a portion of the consecrated Eucharist, telling the boy to moisten it, and drop it into the man's mouth. He lived till he received it, and then died in peace. Dionysius uses this as a divinely-appointed proof against the Novatian view. Reservation of the Sacrament must then have been practised in Alexandria. No argument however for communion in one kind can be drawn from this story, as doubtless the bread had been dipped in

the Eucharistic wine according to Eastern fashion. However, on this point see Bingham's *Antiquities*, lib. xv. cap. v. (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 44.) [G. T. S.]

SERAPION (4), of Corinth, martyr in Egypt, with NICEPORUS (2) under Numerian c. 284. [C. H.]

SERAPION (5), a deacon of Alexandria and a deacon of Mareotis, who subscribed the deposition of Arius at the synod of 320, under the patriarch Alexander (Alex. *Encyc. Ep.* in *Pat. Gr.* xviii. 580, 582). [C. H.]

SERAPION (6), one of the deacons of Mareotis, deposed for Arianism by the patriarch Alexander (Athan. *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 71; Hard. i. 310; Hefele, *Councils*, i. 246; Tillem. vi. 246). Athanasius says he was surnamed Pelycon (Πελύκων). [C. H.]

SERAPION (7), son of Sozon, much praised by Alexander bishop of Thessalonica, to whom he carried a letter from St. Athanasius (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 66). [C. H.]

SERAPION (8), (Σαραπίων, APRION, SAPRION), bishop of Tentyra (Dendera) in Thebais (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 604; Tillem. vii. 175, 210, 211, viii. 30), mentioned in the Life of Pachomius of Tabenna (§ 20 and notes, Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii. pp. 303, 306, Latin, p. 26* at end of vol., Gr., ed. 1866). It was at his suggestion that Pachomius built his monastery at Tabenna in the southern extremity of the diocese of Tentyra, and that Athanasius ordained Pachomius a priest. He may have been one of the two Egyptian bishops Serapion who signed the decrees of Sardica in or about 343 (Ath. *Ap. c. Ar.* § 50). [C. H.]

SERAPION (9), surnamed SCHOLASTICUS, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, March 21. He was a friend of Athanasius and St. Anthony of the desert, and occupied a position of some importance in the theological struggles of the 4th century. He is called a Confessor in the time of Arian supremacy under the emperor Constantius. Fabricius (*Bib. Graec.*) and Ceillier suppose him to have ruled the famous catechetical school of Alexandria, on the strength of a notice by Philippus Sidetus (Dodwell, *Diss. Iren.* p. 488) of a Serapion in the list of its presidents. This is however improbable. Philip makes Serapion fifth in succession from Origen, the intervening names being Heraclas, Dionysius, Pierius, Theognistus, and then Serapion, to whom succeeds Peter, the celebrated martyr, and bishop of Alexandria, who ruled that see from A.D. 300 to 311 when he suffered. This would put Serapion's presidency into the 3rd century, which is almost impossible, considering the time, about 370, when he died. The deferential manner he uses towards St. Athanasius who in this case must have been considerably his junior, and the requests for theological instruction he puts forward, are not consistent with his occupation of such a distinguished position. (See on this subject, and the chronology of the famous school of Alexandria, Dodwell's explanatory notes on the extract from Philip, *ut supra*.) Serapion was a great friend of St. Anthony, and seems to have been his companion towards the end of Anthony's life. He received from Anthony an account of his extraordinary visions, which are very similar to those said to have been granted to St. Patrick and Columba (Cusack's *St. Patrick*, and Reeves' *Adamnan's Columba*). Anthony left in his will one of his sheepskin cloaks to Serapion and the other to Athanasius (*Vita S. Anth. in Opp. S. Athan.*, Migne, *P. L.* t. xxvi. col. 971). Serapion was a man of considerable literary activity. St. Jerome, in his *Catal.* num. 99, mentions several of his writings, as his treatise *contra Manichaeos*, his *liber de Psalmorum titulis*, and some epistles. His work against the Manicheans, described by Jerome as "Egregium librum," and noticed by Photius, *Cod.* 85, is extant, and has been several times republished. It will be found in Canisii *Antiq. Lectt.* t. v. par. i. p. 35, and has been fully analysed by Ceill. iv. 333. His treatise on the Psalms is lost. Card. Mai discovered and published two epistles of Serapion, one to a bishop Eudoxius, who had been put to torture; the other a long epistle addressed to the hermits dwelling in the deserts, and extolling in the most extravagant terms their peculiar mode of life. The first will be found in Mai, *Nov. PP. Bib.* v. 362, 366; the second in his *Spicileg. Rom.* iv. 45, 57. Serapion kept up a correspondence with Athanasius, which elicited from the latter an account of the mode of Arius' death, which will be found in Migne's *Pat. Graec.* t. xxv. 686. It was written about A.D. 358. Athanasius addressed to Serapion a series of doctrinal epistles, in which he contends against a form of the Macedonian heresy which troubled Egypt. Its followers admitted the divinity of Christ, but asserted that the Holy Ghost was a creature, and differed only in degree from an angel. Athanasius bestows four epistles on this topic, extending from col. 530–676 in vol. xxvi. of the *Pat. Graec.* The date of his death is not certain. At the council of Seleucia in 359, one Ptolemaeus, an Acacian, is called bishop of Thmuis. He may have been intruded into the see in place of Serapion deposed. Some place Serapion's death as low as 369. If he had been president of the Alexandrian School before Peter, his would have been an instance of intellectual longevity exceeding the celebrated case of Dr. Routh. Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxix. cap. 2) mentions a church at Alexandria called after a Serapion, who may have been identical with the bishop of Thmuis. The church was probably dedicated however to an earlier Serapion, as Epiphanius in that passage is giving a list of the churches distinguished in Alexandria when Arianism sprung up. [G. T. S.]

SERAPION (10), surnamed ARSINÖITES, presbyter, one of the most eminent fathers of the desert about Arsinoë, superior of many monasteries, and director of ten thousand monks. He was visited by Petronius, who relates how, in harvest time, the brethren all brought him a portion of their earnings and enabled him effectually to extinguish pauperism in the district (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 76; Rufin. *Hist. Monac.* 18, in *Pat. Lat.* xxi.; Tillem. x. 58). It is this Serapion, in the opinion of Papebroch, who occurs in the life of the Libyan anchoret Marcus Atheniensis, whom he buried (cap. i. § 1, ii. § 12, in Boll. *Acta SS.* 29 Mart. iii. 776, and previous comment., new ed.). [C. H.]

SERAPION (11), surnamed SINDONITES from his linen or cotton clothing which he always wore; an Egyptian monk in the time of Palladius. Though uneducated, he knew the scriptures by heart. Some of his sayings are recorded in the *Verba Seniorum* (Rosweyd, *Vit. Pat.* lib. v. libell. vi. § 12, libell. xi. 31), and in the *Apophthegmata Patrum* (Coteler. *Gr. Ecc. Monum.* i. 685, 686), there is an account of his visiting the abode of a lewd woman, whom he succeeded in bringing to repentance. His missionary zeal led him to travel, but in more than apostolic poverty, and he even sold his volume of the gospel to relieve a destitute person, a circumstance alluded to by Socrates (iv. 23), who, however, does not give Serapion's name. Once he sold himself as a slave to a theatrical company, and another time to a Manichaean family, with a view to converting them from their ways and errors. He visited Athens, Sparta, and Rome. At Rome he met with Domninus a disciple of Origen (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 83, 84; *Vit. Joan. Eleemos.* cap. 22 in Rosweyd, *V. P.* lib. i.). He died, aged 60, about A.D. 400, not at Rome as stated in the Latin version of the *Lausiac History*, but in the desert, as in Heraclides (*Paradis.* cap. 24), and the Greek of Palladius. The Greeks honoured his memory on May 21, the *Menaea* erroneously calling him ὁ ἀπὸ Σείδονος, belonging to Sidon. He may be the Serapion of Mar. 21 in the Latin martyrologies (*vid. D. C. A.*), though the Roman Martyrology makes this one the bishop of Thmuis. [C. H.]

SERAPION (12), THE GREAT, a solitary in the Nitrian Mount, mentioned with Macarius, Pambonius, Heraclius, and others, who flourished in the reign of Constantius and maintained the Nicene doctrine (Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 7; Soz. iii. 13 *fin.*, 14; Niceph. Call. *H. E.* ix. 14). He had been contemporary with Antony (Soz. vi. 30). He was visited by Paula in 386 (Jerom. *Ep.* 108 al. 27, § 14), by the elder Melania in 387, and by Palladius in 390 (*Laus. Hist.* cc. 7, 117). For the chronology see Tillem. vii. 165, viii. 618, 790, xii. 102. [C. H.]

SERAPION (13), a solitary of Scetis visited by Cassian, who gives (*Collat.* v. 10, 11), an incident of his earlier life related by him as a warning to the young. Cassian held his fifth conference with him (*Coll.* v. i.). Gazaeus (*vid.* his notes at these passages) believes that this Serapion is ARSINOÏTES (num. 11), which Tillemont (x. 58) does not allow. [C. H.]

SERAPION (14), a solitary, of Scete, and leader of the Anthropomorphites against the festal epistle of Theophilus, Pat. of Alexandria [THEOPHILUS]. The monks of Scete rejected the orthodox view as to God's nature, with the one exception of Paphnutius, an abbat [PAPHNUTIUS]. Serapion, however, was converted by the efforts of Photinus, an Oriental deacon. Cassian tells us that an abbat Isaac explained to him in connexion with Serapion's conversion that the Anthropomorphite heresy was simply a relic of Paganism. Pious men like Serapion had been so long accustomed to an image that they must form a material notion of God or else their prayers seemed objectless. Cassian, *Collat.* x. 1–6; Ceill. viii. 176 [CASSIANUS]. [G. T. S.]

SERAPION (15), a bishop who had presided by five-and-forty years over the diocese of Ostracina in Egypt, who shewed great kindness to the bishops and ecclesiastics driven out by Atticus's persecution of Chrysostom's adherents. (Pallad. p. 202.) [E. V.]

SERAPION (16), bishop of Heraclea. He was an Egyptian by birth, ordained deacon by Chrysostom (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 4), and selected by him for the important and influential office of archdeacon of the church of Constantinople (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). The character drawn of Serapion by contemporary historians is most unfavourable. Presuming on his official power and his influence with his bishop, he treated others with contempt, and exhibited an arrogance in his language and bearing which rendered him intolerable to all who had to deal with him. Impatient of contradiction, his passion broke forth in violent and contumelious language towards those who ventured to thwart his will or failed to shew the subservience he demanded (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 11; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). The influence he acquired over Chrysostom was unbounded, and tended continually to widen the breach between the bishop and his clergy, which the stern uncompromising line of action he had originally adopted at Serapion's instance had opened soon after his accession to the episcopate. Socrates records, as a characteristic speech, that on one occasion when Chrysostom was vainly endeavouring to enforce his own strict notions of discipline on his worldly and luxurious clergy, Serapion exclaimed, so as to be heard by them all, "You will never be able to master these men, bishop, unless you drive them all with one rod" (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 4). Chrysostom, blinded to his true character, looked upon Serapion's violence and harshness as proofs of holy zeal, and gave his hearty sanction to the severe disciplinary measures carried out by him as archdeacon. "Separated," writes Gibbon, "from that familiar intercourse which facilitates the knowledge and the despatch of business, he reposed an unsuspecting confidence in his deacon Serapion," who by relieving him of the more distasteful portion of his episcopal duties, made himself essential to him, and in Milman's words, "being both artful and dexterous, ruled him with an inextricable sway, and like all men of address in such stations, while he exercised all the power and secured the solid advantages he left the odium and responsibility on his master" (Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 136.) δι' ὃν [Σαραπίωνα] τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν μῖσος ἐγήγερτο (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 17).

On Chrysostom's leaving Constantinople in the early spring of 401, to regulate the affairs of the church of Asia, he deputed Severian bishop of Gabala to act as his commissary for all episcopal acts during his absence. The real management of the diocese and its clergy was left with Serapion, with instructions to keep him constantly informed of all that was passing. The relations of the two parties, one possessing the name, the other the reality, of power, were not likely to be very amicable. Seeds of mutual dislike were sown, which were destined to bring forth a harvest of evil, both to Serapion and his unsuspecting master. Severian was an ambitious man, devoid of any high sense of honour, and Serapion had soon to report, probably with ex-

aggerations, that he was abusing the confidence reposed in him to undermine Chrysostom's influence with the court and aristocracy, and outdo him, if possible, as a preacher. Chrysostom on hearing this hastened his return to Constantinople, predisposed to believe the worst of one who had proved so unworthy of his trust without over-strict investigation. Serapion greeted him with the astounding intelligence that Severian had denied the Incarnation; Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐνηνθρώπησε. The grounds of this charge were the following: Severian passing by the place where Serapion happened to be sitting, the latter ostentatiously refused to rise to pay the accustomed homage of a deacon to a bishop, with the express intention, as he declared to the clergy about him, of shewing "how much he despised the man" (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 11; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 10). Severian, stung to the quick by this studied insult, indignantly exclaimed, "If Serapion dies a Christian, then Jesus Christ was not incarnate." Whether Serapion heard the whole sentence or not, he found it convenient to remember the latter clause alone. He delated Severian as a denier of the chief article of the Christian faith. His report was confirmed by some of the bystanders, and was readily credited by Chrysostom, who expelled Severian from the city as a blasphemer (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 10; Socr. *H. E.* vi. 11). This is one account of the transaction. A somewhat different one, more favourable to Serapion, is found in a fragment (unwarrantably embodied in the current English translations of Socrates's History) printed as an appendix to Socr. vi. 11. According to this, Serapion's act of disrespect was brought under the cognisance of a synod, which, on Serapion affirming on oath that he had not seen Severian pass, acquitted him of intentional rudeness, while Chrysostom, in the hope of soothing Severian's ruffled feelings, suspended Serapion from his ecclesiastical functions for a short time. Severian, however, insisted on his rival's deposition and excommunication. Chrysostom, annoyed at his pertinacity, quitted the synod, leaving the decision to the assembled bishops, by whom his mild sentence was immediately confirmed. Chrysostom on this broke off all intimacy with Severian, and recommended him to return to his own diocese, which he had neglected too long. For the remainder of this unhappy transaction, another article must be consulted [SEVERIANUS]. It had a very definite influence on the fate of Chrysostom, as well as of Serapion and all his partisans (Socr. Soz. *u. s.*). It must have been soon after these events that Chrysostom rewarded the supposed fidelity of Serapion by raising him to the priesthood. His having done this while Serapion was still unpurged of a serious charge (ὑπὸ ἔγκλημα ὄντα) (which may have been no more than his disrespect to a bishop) was one of the counts of accusation against Chrysostom at the synod of the Oak (Phot. *Cod.* lix. p. 58), to which he himself was cited together with the presbyter Tigrius (Pallad. p. 70; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 17), and where he was charged by John the Monk with having been Chrysostom's instrument in the many sufferings inflicted on him on account of the Origenists (Phot. *Cod.* lix. p. 58). Chrysostom, on his return from his brief expulsion, rewarded Serapion's fidelity, and compensated him for his trials by appointing him to the metropolitan see of Heraclea in Thrace (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 17). On Chrysostom's second and final banishment Serapion took refuge in a convent of Gothic monks, known as the Marsi (Chrys. *Ep.* 14). He was discovered and dragged from his hiding place, and brought before Chrysostom's enemies, when numerous charges were brought against him, which they were unable to substantiate. He was none the less cruelly beaten, and received such ill-usage that his teeth were knocked out, and being deposed from his bishopric, was finally banished to his native land, Egypt, and left at the mercy of the arch-persecutor, the patriarch Theophilus (Pallad. p. 195; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 9). One Eugenius was ordained bishop of Heraclea in his place as the reward of his conspiracy (Pallad. p. 73). [E. V.]

SERAS. [SERRAS.]

SERENA, in the *Martyrologium Romanum Parvum* (August 16th), is commemorated as a saint. She is there described as the wife of Diocletian. An empress of the same name also appears in the spurious *Acta* of St. Susanna (*AA. SS.* Aug. ii. 63). It is demonstrated in *AA. SS.* Aug. iii. 263, that if such a saint really existed, she was certainly not the wife of Diocletian. [F. D.]

SERENIANUS, AELIUS, member of the privy council of A. Severus, mentioned by Lampridius (*Vita Severi*, 67) as "omnium vir sanctissimus," possibly the same person as the praeses of Cappadocia, described by Firmilian in his letter to Cyprian (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* iii. 1164) as a most cruel persecutor in the local persecution under Maximin. (Tillemont, *M. E.* iii. 264.) [F. D.]

SERENILLA, sister of Desiderius, a learned and eloquent Roman in the end of the 2nd century, and correspondent of Jerome. [DESIDERIUS (2).] She may have been his sister in the spiritual sense (ex conjuge facta soror) as in many similar cases (e.g. RUSTICUS (1)), since Jerome congratulates them both on having together abandoned the world and reached the tranquillity which her name denotes. [W. H. F.]

SERENIUS GRANIANUS. [GRANIANUS.]

SERENUS (1), June 28, two disciples of Origen, who suffered in the persecution of Severus, were called by this name. They suffered with the martyr Plutarch (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 4). [G. T. S.]

SERENUS (2), a monk to whom, jointly with another named Zenas, an epistle was addressed by a certain Justin, by some identified with Justin Martyr. It lays down rules for those living ascetic lives in their own homes. Ceillier thinks it may have been written by one Justin, who was head of a monastery near Jerusalem about the year 610. (Ceill. i. 434.) [JUST. MART. Vol. III. 565.] [G. T. S.]

SERENUS (3), Feb. 23, martyr at Sirmium about the year 307. He was a Greek, a gardener by trade, who settled there and pursued his calling. He reproved a woman for improper behaviour. She complained to her husband,

who was an attendant upon the emperor Maximian, that Serenus had insulted her. He reported this matter to the emperor, who at once despatched him to his home to avenge the matter by legal process. The local president summoned Serenus, who gave such a straightforward account of himself, that the woman's husband withdrew his charge. The president, however, drew from him a confession that he was a Christian, and at once beheaded him. (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 546, Paris, ed.) [G. T. S.]

SERENUS (4), abbat in the Nitrian desert, was of great sanctity and continence, and, when visited by Cassian, A.D. 395, discussed *De animae mobilitate et spiritalibus nequitiis* (*Coll.* vii.), and *De principatibus seu potestatibus* (*Coll.* viii. See Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. xlix. 667 sq.). In the former he treats mostly of the nature of the soul, the rapid movement of the thoughts, the influence of evil spirits upon them, and the duty of fixing the desire on God. In the latter he declares the nature of evil spirits, their fall, subordination, and occupation. His life, but without details, is given in *Vitae Patrum*, c. 50. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiii. 844 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 170 sq.; Fleury, *H. E.* xx. c. 7.) [J. G.]

SERENUS (5), tenth bishop of Marseilles, between Theodorus and Adalongus (circ. A.D. 595–600), is known to us from the letters of Gregory the Great. To his good offices were commended St. Augustine on his mission to England in 596 (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* vi. 52, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 836), and three years later the monks who were despatched to help him (xi. 58, *Patr. Lat.* 1176). Two other letters from Gregory are preserved. Serenus, in an excess of iconoclastic zeal, had entered the churches of Marseilles, and broken and cast forth the images. Gregory, while commending his fervour against idolatry, reproved his violence, pointing out that the use of representations in a church was that the unlearned might read on the walls what they were unable to read in the Scriptures (ix. 105, *Patr. Lat.* 1027). Serenus, however, disregarded the warning, and even affected to believe the letter a forgery, which brought down upon him a severe rebuke and a reiteration of the pope's views (xi. 13, *Patr. Lat.* 1128). This last letter, written on November 1, 600, is the last we know of Serenus; but he is said to have died while returning from a visit to Rome, at a town afterwards destroyed called Biandrate, or Blanderat, near Milan, where he was commemorated Aug. 2, and his tomb celebrated in after-days for its miracles (*Gall. Christ.* i. 639; Ricard, *Évêques de Marseille*, 24, 25; *Vies des Saints de Marseille, S. Serenus*, Bayle). [S. A. B.]

SERENUS (6) (SEVERUS), bishop of Ancona. In A.D. 599, Gregory the Great wrote to him about the complaint of Passivus, bishop of Firmum, against Serenus, deacon of Ancona, who, according to Passivus refused to pay in full money intrusted to him by Fabius, the late bishop of Firmum. In the same year Gregory appointed him visitor of the church of Ausina (Jesi), which had been recovered from the Lombards (*Epp.* ix. 16, 89). [F. D.]

SERENUS (7), patriarch of Aquileia, became patriarch about A.D. 712. (Paulus Diac. *Hist. Lang.* vi. 33.) King Luitprand prevailed on the pope to send him the pallium, which was the first occasion of its being granted to a patriarch of the old Aquileia, after the establishment of the rival lines at Cormons, Cividale, or Udine, and Grado, each claiming to be the rightful patriarchs of Aquileia, and was equivalent to the recognition of the division of the province. On December 1st, A.D. 723, pope Gregory II. wrote to forbid him to infringe the rights of the patriarch of Grado, or to endeavour to exercise jurisdiction beyond the limits of the territory held by the Lombards. (Gregorii II. *Epp.* 15, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxix. 526.) Serenus was alive in A.D. 731, as in the synod held by Gregory III. in the November of that year, a division was definitely made between him and the patriarch of Grado (Joh. *Chron. Grad.* in Pertz, *Script.* vii. 47), but he had died before the end of A.D. 733, as before that date at latest Gregory III. writes to his successor Callistus (Jaffé, *Reg. n.* 1725). [F. D.]

SERFUS, ST. [SERVANUS.]

SERGIA, abbess at Constantinople, and author of a Life of St. Olympias (Niceph. Call. lib. xiii. 24; Tillem. xi. 630). [C. H.]

SERGIOTAE, the disciples of SERGIUS (23), as distinguished from the Baanitae or disciples of Baanos. After the death of these Paulician leaders, a violent strife ensued between the opposite parties of their followers. This lasted some time, with some bloodshed, till the factions were reconciled by the influence of Theodotus the Sergiote (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 40). [M. B. C.]

SERGIUS (1), addressed in Cyp. *Ep.* vi. See ROGATIANUS (1). [E. W. B.]

SERGIUS (2), Oct. 7, a very celebrated military saint and martyr of the Eastern Church. He must have held a high position, as his acts call him "Amicus Imperatoris." He and Bacchus were regarded as the patron saints of Syria. Sergius suffered at Sergiopolis, or Rasaphe, in Syria, in the early part of 4th century. Their united fame soon became wide-spread. Le Bas and Waddington, *Voy. Archéol.* t. iii. num. 2124, notice a church of Eastern Syria dedicated in their honour in the year 354 as the earliest case of such consecration to saints. In the same volume, num. 1915, they describe a church dedicated in 512 to SS. Sergius, Bacchus, and Leontius, where reasons are offered for regarding Leontius as a martyr under Hadrian, when he was ruling Syria during the last years of Trajan. [LEONTIUS (66).] Theodora, wife of Justinian, presented a jewelled cross to one of the churches of St. Sergius, which the Persians in one of their invasions carried off. Chosroes, king of Persia, returned it to Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, in the year 593. (Cf. Evag. *H. E.* iv. 28, vi. 21, where Chosroes is represented as a convert to the cult of Sergius.) The fame of Sergius and Bacchus spread to France, where Le Blant, *Christ. Latin Inscrip. of France*, t. i. p. 305, notices a church at Chartres dedicated in their honour. (Le Blant, *Actes des Mart.* p. 77 notices the marks of

genuineness borne by his acts as told in *AA. SS. Boll.* cf. *Till.* v. 491. [BACCHUS.]
[G. T. S.]

SERGIUS (3), bishop of Birtha, the modern Bir, or Birejik (Prof. Wright), a fortified post on the Euphrates, which he strengthened with additional works in preparation for an inroad of the Persians, A.D. 506, Anastasius providing the cost from the imperial treasury. (Jos. Stylita (xci.) apud Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 282; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 987.) [E. V.]

SERGIUS (4), bishop of Cyrrhus at the beginning of the reign of Justin, c. 520. He was accused to Justin of having sanctioned the act of some of his clergy, who had placed an image of their former bishop, Theodoret, on a triumphal car and introduced it into the city with great pomp, singing hymns in his honour, as well as of having himself held a festival in honour of Theodoret, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Diodorus of Tarsus, all three suspected of Nestorian sympathies, and of Nestorius himself as a martyr. Justin commissioned Hypatius, "magister militum" of the East, to investigate these charges. They were substantiated, and Sergius was deposed and excommunicated, and so remained till his death. (Labbe, v. 550, 560; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 932; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* xv. 313.) [E. V.]

SERGIUS (5), bishop of Cyrrhus, succeeded his namesake on his deposition by Justin, c. 520, as a Nestorian. He had embraced the opposite heresy of the Monophysites, and when Justinian, in his endeavours to promote the union of the church, brought about a conference between the leaders of the two parties at Constantinople in 533, he took the chief place among the oriental prelates, Hypatius, of Ephesus, being the spokesman on the orthodox side. (Labbe, iv. 1763–1779; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 89; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 932.) [E. V.]

SERGIUS (6), bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, mentioned in an edict issued by Justinian, A.D. 541, as having petitioned him in favour of the Samaritans, who, as a punishment for their acts of violence towards Christians, had been forbidden to make wills, and placed under other civil disabilities (Justin. *Novella* 129, tit. 12, c. 1; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 572). [E. V.]

SERGIUS (7), second Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, following Severus, according to the authorities in Assemani (*B. O.* i. 614, ii. 324, 325). The statement that THEOPHANES followed Severus rests on insufficient authority. The original name of Sergius was Beth Chartae; he was a monk of Hola or Arena, and presbyter of Tella or Constantina in Osrhoëne, before his elevation to the episcopate. The date of his consecration is not known with precision. John of Ephesus (Dr. R. Payne Smith's transl. 81) says he succeeded Severus "after a long time had elapsed;" while two different years are given for the death of Severus, 542 according to Severus Aschuminensis, 539 according to Abulfaragius, three centuries later. John of Ephesus says he was sprung from the town of Tella, consecrated by the opponents of Chalcedon, held the dignity three years, and died at Constantinople where he chanced to be. John of Anazarbus is said to have consecrated him, and from the chronology Jacob Baradaeus could have assisted. Antioch was but his titular see, as the Monophysite bishops were not allowed to reside there. He was the first consecrated by that title after the designation of "Jacobite" became current. He was succeeded after an interval by Paul the Black. [C. H.]

SERGIUS (8), bishop of Tarragona, presided as metropolitan over the council of Lerida in A.D. 546, and the first of Barcelona held a few years before. It was to him that JUSTUS (19) of Urgel dedicated his commentary on the Song of Solomon, and he praises Sergius highly in his letter of dedication. (*Esp. Sag.* xxvi. 71; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 145, 686.) [F. D.]

SERGIUS (9), 4th Jacobite bishop of Edessa, was an Armenian, and with his brother Joannes, attacked the writings of Petrus Callinicus, but was reproved by Julian the patriarch; flourished A.D. 591. (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 333; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1432.) [J. G.]

SERGIUS (10), defensor, addressed in five letters of Gregory the Great. The first, after sharply reproving him for his negligence, directs him with Vitalianus, bishop of Sipontum, to cause the daughter of the deceased Tullianus, formerly magister militiae, who after taking the veil, had assumed lay attire, to re-enter her nunnery, and to be kept there in strict custody till Gregory sent further orders. The next refers to the rights of the mother-in-law of PANTALEON. The third is the circular forbidding clergy to have women living with them. The last relates to the affairs of the churches of Callipolis and Hydruntum (*Epp.* viii. 7, 8; ix. 46, 60, 100, 101, 102). [F. D.]

SERGIUS (11), patriarch of Constantinople, was consecrated on Easter Eve, A.D. 610. He had been deacon of the cathedral and had the care of the poor belonging to it (*Chron. Pasch.*). Six months afterwards he crowned the new emperor Heraclius, whose marriage with his niece Martina he vainly tried to prevent four years later. Heraclius admitted he had done his duty as a priest and a friend, but took the responsibility on himself. Certain liturgical innovations introduced by Sergius are noticed in the *Chron. Pasch.* (*sub ann.* 615, 624). In April, A.D. 619, he procured a pragmatic sanction from the emperor (Nov. ii. 4), forbidding any one to be ordained at Constantinople except to take the place of one of the clergy who had died. It was to Sergius and the patrician Bonus that Heraclius committed the government of Constantinople when he started on his eastern expedition in A.D. 622.

The event that marked the patriarchate of Sergius was the origin of the Monothelite heresy. The emperor at the beginning of his eastern campaigns encountered in Armenia one Paulus, a Severian bishop, and had an argument with him, in which mention was made of One Operation in Christ. In writing with reference to Paulus to Arcadius, the metropolitan of Cyprus, Heraclius forbade the use of the term Two Operations. Some four years later the emperor mentioned his interview with Paulus in the

presence of CYRUS (4), then bishop of Phasis, who professed that he was ignorant, whether One or Two Operations should be ascribed to Christ. By the emperor's direction he then wrote to Sergius, inquiring which doctrine was correct, and whether any of the fathers had spoken of One Operation. Sergius, after consulting a synod (Mansi, x. 586), sent him the forgery ascribed to MENNAS, which contained many patristic testimonies in support of One Will and Operation, asserted that no council had decided the question, but said that if it could be proved that any father recognised by the church had used the term Two Operations, he ought to be followed, for not only the doctrines of the fathers should be accepted but their very words should be used. In A.D. 629 Heraclius when at Edessa, desired Sergius to send him the patristic testimony in favour of One Will and Operation contained in the alleged work of Mennas, and the next year Cyrus was translated to the patriarchate of Alexandria. In one of the articles of the compromise agreed on between him and the Monophysites there was attributed to Christ One Theandric Operation. SOPHRONIUS, afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem, then came forward in support of the doctrine of Two Operations, and went to Constantinople with letters from Cyrus to Sergius, who called upon him to cite passages from the fathers distinctly speaking of Two Operations. This, according to Sergius, he was unable to do. Sergius then wrote to Cyrus, forbidding in future the use of either of the expressions One Operation or Two Operations. This account is based on the letters of Sergius to Cyrus and Honorius, read at the sixth general council (Mansi, xi. 525, 529). The account of Theophanes is quite different. According to him (274, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cviii. 677) the heretical bishop encountered by Heraclius was the Jacobite Athanasius, the date was A.D. 630, the place Hierapolis, near Edessa; and the emperor wrote himself to Sergius, who summoned Cyrus to consult with him, but his authority is obviously inferior to that of Sergius, and the sixth council fixes the date of the letter of Cyrus to Sergius as late in A.D. 625, or early in A.D. 626 (Mansi, xi. 360), that is several years before Theophanes' date of the origin of the controversy.

In A.D. 634 Sergius wrote to pope HONORIUS (15), q.v., for a full account of the letter of Sergius, and the memorable replies of Honorius.

The ECTHESIS, q.v., issued by Heraclius was drawn up by Sergius, after whose death Heraclius disclaimed all responsibility for it. It was confirmed by a synod (Mansi, x. 1000) assembled under Sergius, late in A.D. 638, shortly before his death, which took place in the December of that year (Theophanes; Nicephorus, the *Acta* of the Lateran and the sixth general councils *passim* in Mansi, x, xi.; *AA. SS.*, Aug. i. 77*; *Or. Christ.* i. 227; Pagi's notes to Baronius A.D. 626, 627, 633, 639; the articles above referred to).

[F. D.]

SERGIUS (12), the name of the two Monophysite priests, contemporaries of John of Ephesus, and persecuted at the same time with him at Constantinople. Their sufferings are related by John, whose friends the Sergii were, one of them having been his Syncellus, the other his disciple. While John was imprisoned in the penitentiary of the hospital of Eubulus the two priests were seized, and as they would not yield, they were publicly scourged and then imprisoned in a "diaconate," or hospital attended by deacons and laymen, where they were kept forty days. The Syncellus was finally sent to the monastery of Beth-Rabula, where he met with kind treatment, the monks there "having no love for the council of Chalcedon, nor even proclaiming it in their worship" (John of Ephesus, *Eccl. Hist.* p. 110, tr. by Dr. R. Payne Smith). [C. H.]

SERGIUS (13), sub-deacon, addressed by pope Honorius (Honorius, *Ep.* 9 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 478). [F. D.]

SERGIUS (14), bishop of Joppa, c. 633, who after the retreat of the Persians, relying on the authority of the emperor Heraclius, seized on the vicariate of the see of Jerusalem, τοποτηρησίαν τοῦ θρόνου, and assumed the right of ordaining bishops and presbyters of monothelite tendencies, who attached themselves to the heterodox Paul, patriarch of Constantinople. Pope Theodore, on the complaint of Stephen of Dor, annulled these uncanonical ordinations, and appointed Stephen vicar [STEPHANUS OF DOR] (Labbe, vi. 109; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 628, cf. 282). [E. V.]

SERGIUS (15), bishop of Constantia, in Cyprus, in the middle of the 7th century, who addressed a synodal letter in the name of the orthodox bishops of the East, to pope Theodore, in 643, against the rising heresy of the Monothelites, anathematizing the Ecthesis, and appealing against its being placarded at Constantinople as a rule of faith, and accepting Leo's definition that the energy of Christ was displayed in each form, divine and human, not separately, but in communion with the other ἐνεργεῖν ἑκατέρᾳ μορφῇ μετὰ τῆς θατέρου κοινωνίας. The orthodoxy of the document was acknowledged by Theodore, who appointed him vicar of the churches in the East, and it was read in the Lateran council, A.D. 649 (Labbe, vi. 122). According to Le Quien, Sergius afterwards made shipwreck of the faith. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1049; Baron. *Annal.* 643; Ceillier, *Aut. Eccles.* xii. 925; Fabr. xii. 236.) [E. V.]

SERGIUS (16), bishop of Rome after Conon from December, A.D. 687, to September, A.D. 701. The manner of his election, and the exarch's unavailing opposition to it, are spoken of under PASCHALIS (antipope). The most memorable event with which his name is associated was the holding at Constantinople of the Concilium Quinisextum, which was repudiated by him, though accepted in the East as ecumenical, and which proved an important step towards the final schism between the Eastern and Western Churches. In addition to the long standing rivalry between the sees of Rome and Constantinople, and the general resistance of the popes to attempted imperial domination, the monothelitic controversy had lately been the cause of serious discord, and even of interrupted communion. See especially under MARTINUS (3), and EUGENIUS (1). Pope Agatho had, however, triumphed with regard to this dispute in procuring the entire condemnation of the Monothelite heresy at the 3rd

Constantinopolitan council (the 6th ecumenical), A.D. 680, which had terminated peacefully in accordance with his desires. But, after its close, the emperor Justinian II. conceived the idea of convening a supplementary one, on the ground that neither it, nor the previous fifth ecumenical, had passed any canons of discipline, having been wholly occupied with doctrinal definitions. Accordingly, such a council met (691–2), known as Concilium Quinisextum, as being supplementary to the fifth and sixth, and also as Trullanum, or Concilium in Trullo, from the place in which it sat, viz. a hall in the imperial palace called Trullus. It passed 102 canons, intended to form a complete synodical code of discipline, most of them being either re-enactments of older canons, or designed only to give legal sanction to receive church usages. A few, however, were distinctly intended to assert, and thus give ecumenical authority to, Eastern views and usages which were at variance with those of Rome, as well as to confirm the rank and jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople, which had been asserted previously, but which the popes had never allowed. Six of the canons were thus open to objection at Rome. Canon ii., concerning church laws to be considered valid, sanctioned 85 apostolical canons, whereas the Roman Church had accepted only the first 50, and, after enumerating as authoritative a number of councils, some of which had not been accepted at Rome, and omitting mention of many Western councils and of all decretals of the popes, prohibited all other canons as not genuine. Canon xiii. forbade married persons, if ordained deacons or priests, to put away or refuse intercourse with their wives, referring expressly to the Roman requirement to the contrary as not primitive. This was in accordance with the 5th of the Apostolical canons, viz. "Let not a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, put away his wife under pretence of religion; but, if he put her away, let him be excommunicated; and, if he persist, let him be deposed." The canon of the council in Trullo fell short, indeed, of the apostolic canon, in that bishops were not included in it; and, further, canon xii. forbade bishops to remain in the married state; which was, according to Bellarmine (*de cler.* 1, 10) the origin of the present usage of the Greek Church, which has a married priesthood but a celibate episcopate. Still, in allowing the state of marriage to priests and deacons, the council in Trullo distinctly contravened ordinances of popes, and general Western usage. Canon xxxvi. confirmed Canon iii. of the first council of Constantinople (381), and canon xxviii. of the council of Chalcedon (451), which had given second rank after Rome, and patriarchal jurisdiction over the Thracian, Pontic, and Arian dioceses, to the see of Constantinople; and Canon xxxviii. repeated word for word Canon xvii. of Chalcedon, which had given the right of appeal to any one wronged by the metropolitan of his province to the exarch of the diocese, or to the holy throne of Constantinople; and had further ordered that, in case of any city newly erected by royal authority, the ecclesiastical should follow the political order. These canons, thus confirmed, had never received the assent of the Roman bishops, who had ever resisted the claim of Constantinople to spiritual pre-eminence on the mere ground of its being the imperial city. Canon lv., referring expressly to the custom at Rome of fasting on all Saturdays during Lent, required the observance of Can. Apostol. lxvii., which forbade fasting on any Saturday except Easter Eve. Canon lxvii. required abstinence from blood, in any way partaken as food; whereas Acts xv. 29 had long been generally interpreted in the West as laying no such permanent obligation on Christians. Lastly, Canon lxxxii. prohibited, for the time to come, representations of our Lord in sacred pictures under the form of a Lamb.

The pope's legates who were present at the council signed all the canons, having been, it would seem, blind to the drift of some of them, or not bold enough to make a stand. Anastasius says of them (*Lib. Pontif.*), "decepti subscripserant." Their subscription, however, did not compromise the pope himself; for it does not appear that they had been specially deputed to represent him in the council, or to have received any instructions from him. They were probably his ordinary representatives (apocrisiarii) for general purposes in Constantinople, who of their own accord took part in the synod. So strenuously maintains Marca (*lib.* 5 *de concord. c.* 18). See Pagi (*critic. ad ann.* 692, ix. &c.). Present, however, also, and assentient, was Basilius, the metropolitan of Crete, as representing in some sense the Roman Church. For among the extant signatures is found, "Basilius episcopus Gortyniorum metropolis Christo amabilis Cretae insulae, et locum tenens totius synodi sanctae ecclesiae Romanae definiens subscripsi." But that his assent, thus expressed, was not considered to carry with the pope's own, appears from a place being left immediately after the emperor's name for the pope's signature:—"*Locus sanctissimi papae Romani.*" The canons were accordingly sent to him for his confirmation, and were at once by him rejected and disallowed. Thereupon Justinian II., acting in the spirit of former emperors, but overrating his own powers, took measures to enforce compliance. He sent Zacharias, the chief of his bodyguard (*protospatharium*) to Rome with orders to bring Sergius to Constantinople; but the military from Ravenna and from other parts of Italy mustered in the pope's defence, and drove Zacharias, with contumely and ill-usage, from Rome. (Paul. diac. *de gest. Longobard.* vi. 11; Bed. *de sex aetat.*) Anastasius (*Lib. Pontif.*) gives a graphic account of what took place at Rome. He describes Zacharias as "immanem protospatharium," referring, we may suppose, to the huge size of the lifeguardsman, with an intended contrast between his imposing appearance and his contemptible performance. Alarmed, we are told, by the multitudes that were approaching Rome, he implored Sergius to have the gates of the city closed, and took refuge, terrified and trembling, in the bedroom of the pope, whom he begged with tears to have pity on him so that his life might be spared. The army, having entered the city, proceeded to the Lateran palace, where both the pope and his suppliant were, and, finding the doors barred, threatened to break them open. Thereupon the big guardsman hid himself in the pope's bed, having quite lost his senses through excess of

terror:—"ita ut mente excideret, et perderet sensum." Sergius, having comforted him and bidden him have no fear, went out and addressed the military and populace, whom he succeeded in pacifying; but they still kept guard round the palace, and were not satisfied till they had driven Zacharias with insults out of Rome. If the emperor had any thoughts of avenging this insult, and continuing his design of coercing Sergius, such projects were cut short by his own temporary deposition and exile soon afterwards, A.D. 695. Before his restoration Sergius was dead.

The episcopate of Sergius is of interest to us in connexion with the church in Britain. Caedwalla, king of the West Saxons, having in 685, after exile, gained possession of his kingdom, resigned it after two years, and in 688 resorted to Rome for baptism (Bed. *H. E.* v. 7). He had, after his recovery of his kingdom, invaded the Isle of Wight with the view of rooting out heathenism with the sword, having vowed to give a fourth part of the land and the prey to the Lord; and this fourth part he accordingly bestowed on St. Wilfrid, who proceeded to evangelize the remaining inhabitants of the island. (Bed. iv. 16.) It may have been remorse for his cruelty, together with the ghostly counsels of St. Wilfrid, that led him to abdicate in the prime of life, being little more than thirty years of age, and seek in Rome itself the absolution of baptism, which he had so far deferred. Bede thus describes his motives:—"Cum genti suae duobus annis strenuissime praeesset, relicto imperio propter Dominum regnumque perpetuum, venit Romam, hoc sibi gloriae singularis desiderans adipisci, ut ad limina beatorum apostolorum fonte baptismatis ablueretur, in quo solo didicerat generi humano patere vitae caelestis introitum: semel etiam sperans quia mox baptizatus, carne solutus ad aeterna gaudia jam mundus transiret." He attained his desire, with respect both to the baptism he sought, and to death after it before new sins had stained him. He was baptized by Sergius, receiving from him the name of Peter, on Easter Eve A.D. 689; and, while still clothed in his white baptismal robes, expired, and was buried in St. Peter's Church. Sergius placed an epitaph over his tomb, consisting of twenty-four elegiac verses, with the following notice, "Hic depositus est Caedual, qui et Petrus, rex Saxonum, sub die duodecimo Kalendarum Maiarum, indictione secunda; qui vixit annos plus minus triginta, imperante domno Justiniano piissimo Augusto, anno ejus consulatus quarto, pontificante apostolico viro domno Sergio papa anno secundo." (Bed. *ib.*) His abdication and resort to Rome are interesting as being the first example of a practice which was followed afterwards by his successor Ine, and others.

Bede informs us also that Willibrord, the English missionary in Frisia, and the founder of the see of Utrecht, twice visited Rome in the time of Sergius, and on his second visit received consecration from him. Having begun to preach in Frisia under the protection of king Pippin A.D. 692, he had in the same year gone of his own accord to Rome, not only for the pope's licence and blessing, but also (and, as it seems, more especially) for procuring from him relics of apostles and martyrs for deposition in the newly founded churches;—"ut dum in gente cui praedicaret destructis idolis ecclesias instituerat, haberet in promptu reliquias sanctorum quas ibi introduceret." Having obtained his desire, he returned to his work. Afterwards, A.D. 696, Pippin sent him again to Rome, in order to be ordained Archbishop of the Frisians, Sergius being still pope. He was ordained on his birthday in the church of St. Caecilia, receiving the new name of Clemens. (Bed. *H. E.* v. 10, 11; cf. Alcuin. *in vit. S. Wilbrord*, *c.* 7, 8.)

Two letters relating to the English Church are given by William of Malmesbury (*Gest. Pont.* pp. 52–55, *ed.* Hamilton) as written by Sergius on the appointment of Berhtwald to the see of Canterbury, A.D. 692. One is to the kings Ethelred, Aldfrith, and Ealdulf;—the other to all the bishops of Britain;—exhorting to reception of, and obedience to, the new primate. Both are of doubtful authenticity. As to another letter, given also by Malmesbury (*Gest. Reg.* i. 3.), from Sergius to Ceolfrith, abbot of Jarrow and Wearmouth, desiring Bede, "religiosum famulum Dei venerabilis monasterii tui," to be sent to Rome, it is doubtful whether the original referred by name to Bede. (See under BEDA.)

Bede (*De Sex Aetat.*), Paulus Diaconus (l. 5, c. 14), Sigebert (*in Chron.*), and the *Liber Pontif.* (*in Vit. Serg.*), speak of a synod held at Aquileia in the time of Sergius, and after the usurpation of the empire by Aspimar, which was induced by the admonitions of Sergius to accept the fifth ecumenical council, though at first adverse to it. It will be seen in other articles (e.g. VIGILIUS, PELAGIUS) that the bishops of Istria and Venetia had long refused to accept that council, and had been out of communion with Rome in consequence. Even Gregory the Great had failed to bring them round. It thus appears to have been reserved for pope Sergius, about a century and a half after the fifth council, to induce those Italian churches to accept it. Their reluctance to do so was but a survival of the general attitude of the Western Church at the time of the council, and of the contemporary pope Vigilius himself, till he sacrificed consistency by yielding to the emperor's will.

Sergius is said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have done much in the way of renovating and ornamenting various churches in Rome. Among other things he is said to have discovered in the *sacrarium* of St. Peter an old silver casket containing portions of the true cross adorned with gems, which he transferred to the Lateran Church, where it was afterwards adored. He is said also to have first ordered the singing of the Agnus Dei during the consecration of the host. He died in September A.D. 701, and was buried, according to Anastasius, on the 8th day of the month, in St. Peter's, in the 14th year of his episcopate. He is commemorated in the *Roman Martyrology* on Sept. 9. [J. B—Y.]

SERGIUS (17), archbishop of Ravenna, became archbishop between A.D. 742, when his predecessor John was living (Anastasius, *Lib. Pont.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1054) and A.D.

752. He was a layman of noble family, and married. After his consecration in Rome, his clergy separated from him and refused to communicate with him. A more serious quarrel was with pope Stephen, who, on his journey to France, deprived Sergius of the monastery of Galliata, and granted it to Anscausus, bishop of Forlimpopoli for life, and on his return to Rome summoned him before him, and detained him for three years, on the charge of having been uncanonically elected. Sergius replied that at his consecration the pope had made no objection, though he had stated he was a layman and married. Apparently Sergius had given offence by asserting the independence of Ravenna. (*Cod. Car.* 52 in *Patr. Lat.* xcviii. 284.) The pope's intention to depose him was frustrated by his death, and his successor Paul I. released him on his promising to let him take what he pleased from the treasures of the church of Ravenna. When the pope accordingly came to Ravenna, one party of the clergy was for murdering him, but milder counsels prevailed, and they merely hid what they could of the treasure. Paul also, in A.D. 759, restored him the monastery of Galliata (Paulus, *Epp.* ii. in *Patr. Lat.* lxxxix. 1189). The above account is based on Agnellus (*Lib. Pont.* in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 377); but he writes as a champion of the rights of Ravenna, and with a strong prejudice against Rome. Sergius was represented at the Lateran Synod, held in April A.D. 769 (Mansi, xii. 713), but died soon afterwards. (Anastasius, *Lib. Pont.* 276, 282, in *Patr. Lat.* cxxviii. 1155, 1157.) [F. D.]

SERGIUS (18), sacellarius, afterwards secundicerius[a] and nomenclator of the Roman church, son of the primicerius Christopher, and with him, leader of the counter-revolution against pope CONSTANTINE II. in A.D. 768. On Constantine being made pope in July, 767, Christopher and his sons took sanctuary at St. Peter's, which they left on Constantine's promising to allow them to live in their own houses till the following Easter, and then enter a monastery. Christopher and Sergius were accordingly allowed to leave Rome, ostensibly for a monastery near Spoleto. They, however, went to king Desiderius, and asked his assistance. Sent back by him to Reate, they collected a force in the neighbourhood, with which Sergius and Waldipert, a Lombard priest, marched on Rome. A gate was opened to them by their friends, and Constantine, his brother Passivus, and bishop Theodore were taken prisoners. At the instigation of Waldipert, one Philippus was chosen pope, but was immediately deposed, and by the influence of Christopher, Stephen was elected. Then followed a series of atrocities—Passivus, Theodore, the tribune Gracilis, and Constantine himself were seized and their eyes put out, and the tongues of Theodore and Gracilis torn out. The Lombard, Waldipert, on a charge of conspiracy against Christopher, was treated in the same way. Christopher and Sergius were now the most powerful men in Rome. The latter was promoted to the office of secundicerius and nomenclator, and sent on a mission to king Pippin, who had died before his arrival, but he was well received by his sons, Charles and Carloman. Christopher and Sergius, as heads of the Frankish party, and the personal friends of Carloman, became obnoxious to Desiderius. Another cause of discord was their pressing him for the restoration of certain church property. The pope, too, was tired of being a puppet in their hands, and the chamberlain, Paul Afiarta, who was in the pay of Desiderius, inflamed him against them. Desiderius marched on Rome, ostensibly to pray at St. Peter's. Christopher and Sergius, collecting a great number of peasantry from the Campagna, Tuscany and Perugia, prepared for resistance, and closed the gates. After an interview at St. Peter's with Desiderius, the pope returned to the Vatican. Christopher and Sergius, justly suspecting that Paul was endeavouring to turn the people against them, with their armed mob and Dodo, a missus of Carloman, who was then in Rome, and his Franks, broke down the doors of the palace, and forced their way into the pope's presence in the chapel of St. Theodore, demanding the surrender of Paul and his accomplices. They gave way at the pope's rebuke; and the next day at a second interview, Desiderius and Stephen came to an agreement at St. Peter's, the former yielding the matters in dispute, and the latter surrendering Christopher and Sergius. Accordingly he sent two bishops to the gate by the Aelian Bridge, where Christopher and Sergius were posted, offering them the option of entering a monastery, or coming to him at St. Peter's. The last they refused, fearing the Lombards, and prepared to stand their ground, and prevent the return of the pope; but the hearts of their adherents failed them, and their forces melted away. Even their kinsman Gratiosus went over to the pope. Christopher and Sergius, seeing they were betrayed, went at nightfall to St. Peter's, and were seized by the Lombards on the steps of the basilica, and brought before the pope. To save them, as he said, he ordered them to be made monks, and left them in the basilica, while he returned to Rome, intending to bring them away by night. Paul, however, with the approval of Desiderius, and a band of Lombards, dragged them out of St. Peter's, hurried them to the gate of the city, and there tore out their eyes, Christopher being thrust into the monastery of St. Agatha, where he died three days afterwards, and Sergius into that of St. Andrew on the Coelian, from which he was removed to the vaults of the Lateran.[b] Eight days before the death of Stephen (Jan. 24th, 772), by orders of Paul and the pope's brother, Sergius was handed over to Tunisso and Leonatius, a priest and tribune of Anagni, who took him out of prison, stabbed and strangled him on the road leading to St. Maria Maggiore, and buried his still breathing body by the wayside. After the accession of Hadrian, his murderers were detected and punished, and Christopher and Sergius honourably buried at St. Peter's. (*Lib. Pont. Vitae Steph. III. et Hadr.*; *Cod. Car.* 50 in Jaffé *Mon. Ger.* iv. 168; Gregorovius iv. 3, 4; Mansi, xii. 703.) [F. D.]

[a] Of the seven notaries of the Roman church the first and second were styled Primicerius, and Secundicerius, the fourth Sacellarius or treasurer.

[b] Jaffé (*Reg.* 201) places these events in the summer of 771. Gregorovius (p. 369 n.) in 769.

SERGIUS (19), son of Dryinus, the great Paulician reformer in the 9th century (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 32; Phot. *c. Man.* i. 21). He was born at the village of Ania, near the Galatian town of Tavia. Probably his father belonged to the Catholic church, though the account of Photius would suggest that Sergius sprang from a family connected with the sect. While still a young man, he was attracted and won over to the Paulician doctrine through the impression produced on him by conversation with a woman belonging to the sect. At her advice he diligently studied the writings of St. Paul, though with a mind pre-occupied with the theories of the Gnostic dualism. Apprehending Christianity under these forms, Sergius started in his career of an apostolic reformer, taking the name of Tychicus in the Paulician fashion to designate his adhesion to the principles and doctrines of St. Paul. His missionary labours extended over a period of thirty-four years, during which he penetrated almost every portion of Asia Minor, successfully promoting the spread of the reformed Paulicianism. He seems to have led an irreproachable life, winning the praise of even his bitterest opponents. During his itinerant ministry, in imitation of St. Paul, Sergius maintained himself by his own hands, working as a carpenter. His early labours synchronized with the reign of the tolerant Greek emperor Nicephorus, who was born at Seleucia in Pisidia, and refused to persecute the growing Paulician communities of his native districts. At last, in the reign of the rigid Leo the Armenian, he fled before imperial persecution, and sought shelter with his fellow-sufferers in the parts of Armenia subject to the Saracens. Sergius, with his usual gentleness of character, dissuaded the Paulicians from retaliatory measures against their Roman neighbours, though with little success. Some years later, in 835, while felling wood for his carpenter's work in one of the mountain forests near Argasus, he was murdered by an orthodox fanatic, Tzanio of Nicopolis. The "Epistles of Sergius" are repeatedly quoted by Petrus Siculus and Photius in their histories, where they refer to them as acknowledged authoritative writings among the Paulicians (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 346; Gibbon, vol. i. 46, ch. 54). [M. B. C.]

SERNIN, ST. [SATURNINUS (2).]

SERPENTINI. So Philaster translates the name Ophitae. [G. S.]

SERRAS (SERAS, SARAS), at first a presbyter in Libya, where he was one of the leaders of the Arians (Hieron. *Dial. adv. Lucif.* § 20), and subsequently ordained a bishop by Secundus, who had been deposed from the see of Ptolemais for Arianism (Athan. *De Synod.* § 12). In 356 Serras and Secundus desired to advance Aëtius (then serving as a deacon at Alexandria) to the episcopate, but Aëtius declined to be ordained by them on the ground of their having held communion with the Homoousians (Philostorg. iii. 19). In 358 the emperor Constantius, at the instigation of Basil of Ancyra, banished Serras together with Theophilus bishop of Castabala and Aëtius (*ib.* v. 4). In 359 Serras, as bishop of Paraetonium in Libya, subscribed at the council of Seleucia (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxiii. 20). In 360 he was deposed along with Heliodorus and other supporters of Aëtius at the synod of Constantinople (Philost. vii. 6; Hefele's *Councils*, ii. 274). In 362, as it probably was, Serras joined Eunomius and others at Constantinople in ordaining Aëtius a bishop (Philost. vii. 6). For the chronology see Tillem. vi. 247, 410, 435, 469, 488, 490, 508. [C. H.]

SERRANUS, addressed by Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* 13). [R. J. K.]

SERVANDUS (1), deacon and abbat of the monastery of St. Sebastian in Campania, was a disciple of St. Benedict (Gregorius, *Dial.* ii. 35). [F. D.]

SERVANDUS (2), deacon of Faesulae, who with the priest Agrippinus petitioned Gregory the Great, A.D. 600, to aid in repairing their church, which they alleged to be in ruins (*Epp.* x. 44). [F. D.]

SERVANUS (SAIR, SARE, SERB, SERF, SERFFE, SERFUS, SERUAN, SERVAN, SERWANE), popular saint in Scotland, bishop and confessor. His legends are so unhistorical as to give no basis for chronology regarding himself or his contemporaries, but the more general tradition would attach him to the 5th or 6th century rather than to the close of the 7th. Dr. Grub (*E. H. Scot.* i. 29 n.) suggests the likelihood of there having been two bishops of the same name in the 5th and 6th centuries, whose acts have been mixed up together, while Dr. Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 31, 184) prefers a late date, and condemns the device of the *Brev. Aberd.* in making two saints, one in the time of Palladius, and another contemporary with St. Adamnan: still more improbable is Dempster's placing (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 574*) a Servanus in A.D. 440, and a Serfus in A.D. 293, contrary even to his own quoted authority. The oldest authority is the tract *On the Mothers of the Saints of Ireland*, by Aengus the Culdee (quoted by Reeves, *Culdees* 124, from the *Book of Lecan*, p. 43 bb), which calls him Serb, son of Alma, daughter of the king of Cruithne, his father being Proc, king of Canaan of Egypt, and his abode at Cuilennros, between the Ochil hills and sea of Guidi (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 445). Embodying or built on this is the *Vita S. Servani* (printed by Skene, *Chron.* 412–20) full of absurd fables. According to this, Malachias or Servanus is son, miraculously born, of Obeth king of Canaan, and his wife Alpia daughter of the king of Arabia. After abdicating the throne, he becomes successively bishop of Canaan, patriarch of Jerusalem, honoured visitor at Constantinople, and pope at Rome. He then comes to Scotland, finds abbat Edheunanus, or Adamnanus, at Inchkeith, and receives from him "terram Fif, et a monte Britannorum usque ad montem qui dicitur Okhéll," and from Brude son of Dargart king of Scotia land at Culross for a church and cemetery. He does many wonderful works, dies at Dunning, and is buried at Culross. This is the Life on which, in the 15th century, Wyntoun (*Chron.* v. c. 12) has framed his notice of St. Serf and his miracles.

Different in many respects from this are the Lections in the *Brev. Aberd.* (*Prop. SS. p. aest.* ff. xv.–xv.), more local in their character, but as full of miracles, connecting him with Palladius, and also referring to the other legend. The Palladian view of St. Servanus is also given by Fordun (*Scot. Chr.* iii. c. 9), who quotes, as his

authority, from the *Vita Kentegerni imperfecta*, auctore ignoto (published in Bp. Forbes's *Lives of SS. Nin. and Kent.* 243 sq.). But though Jocelyn used this fragment, he has dropped all allusion to Palladius (in his *Vita Kentegerni*, auctore Jocelino monacho Furnesensi), introduces him as living at Culross, Perthshire, where he receives the new-born Kentigern, baptizes, names, and educates him [KENTIGERN]. Jocelyn, however, does not remove him from the Palladian period, as, at the time of Kentigern's flight from Culross, Servanus is infirm with age, "seniles artus baculo regente" (c. 8), and returns to Culross to await in a good old age the day of his call; there his relics are said to have been in the beginning of the 16th century (*Mart. Aberd.* Kal. Jul.). To this Boethius (*Scot. Hist.* lib. vii. f. 128, ed. 1574; Bellenden's *Boece*, l. vii. c. 18, ed. 1821, i. p. 286) adds that Palladius made him bishop, and sent him to the Orkney Isles that he might instruct the rude people there in Christian piety. This addition all the later Scotch annalists have accepted.

St. Serf's connection with Lochleven and the monastery on the island in its waters is important for chronology, as in the monastic charters now incorporated in the *Registrum Prioratus S. Andreae* (pp. 113–118) it is said that Brude son of Dergard gave to St. Servanus and the Keledei hermits dwelling there the Isle of Lochlevine; Dr. Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 258 sq.) identifies this Brude with the Brude son of Derile, a contemporary of St. Adamnan, and thus brings Brude, Servanus, and Adamnan together in establishing the hermits at Lochleven about the close of the 7th century, but unfortunately for the theory the same charters might synchronize Servanus and Macbeth in the 11th century. Skene supposes that his legend points to the same tide of Roman influence as is traceable in that of St. Boniface and belongs to the same period. Ussher (*Brit. Eccl. Ant.* Ind. Chron.) places his death in the year 540, but it must remain doubtful. Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 574*) says he wrote *Epistolae ad Orcadianos* and *Epistolae ad Ecclesias Scoticas*. His baculus was used for swearing upon, and is mentioned by Wyntoun (*Cron.* i. 120) and in *Brev. Aberd.* (*p. aest.* f. xvi.). His feast varies between April 20 and July 1. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 445–447; Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 212 sq.; Skene, *Celt. Scot.* ii. pass.; Grub, *E. H. Scot.* i. pass.; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* iii. 382 sq. on the Culdees and their remains on Lochleven; Reeves, *Culdees*, pass.; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 105; Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Jul. i. 50–53.) [J. G.]

SERVATIUS (1) I., ST., tenth bishop of Tongres, was present at the great council of Sardica, the date of which is now fixed in 343 or 344 (Mansi, iii. 1 sqq.; Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. iii. 210–211; ATHANASIUS). The *Acta* of the council of Cologne, supposed to have been held in 346, represent Servatius as speaking from personal knowledge, derived from the proximity of their sees, to the heresy of Euphratas. But the gravest suspicion rests upon this council. He may well be the Servatius, who, in company with a Maximus, was sent by Magnentius, the murderer of Constans, on a mission to Constantius in 350 (*Apol. ad Imp. Const.* i. 300; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 205), and there is no doubt that he was at the council of Rimini in 359, where he displayed much constancy in the orthodox cause, but was misled, with others, by the device of Ursacius and Valens, (Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 44; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xx. 153–4). Nothing further is known of him unless, as some have contended, he is tbe Servatius or Aravatius of Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 5, and *De Glor. Conf.* lxxii., as to which see SERVATIUS II. His day of commemoration is May 13 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. iii. 209 sqq.). The late lives of him are worthless. [S. A. B.]

SERVATIUS (2) II. (ARAVATIUS, ARVATIUS), ST., fifteenth in the list of the bishops of Tongres. Gregory of Tours, speaking of the invasion of Gaul by Attila and the Huns (A.D. 450), says that when the rumour of their approach arose there was at Tongres a bishop of exceeding sanctity, Aravatius (or Servatius), who with vigils, fasts and tears besought God that the calamity might be averted. His supplications being unheard, he formed the design of making a pilgrimage to Rome and beseeching the intercession of Peter himself. Here, after long fasting and prayer, it was revealed to him that the invasion was not to be averted, but that he himself would be taken away from the evil to come. Returning to Tongres he set his house in order, and, bidding farewell to clergy and people, set out for Maestricht, where he died, and was buried near the city wall (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 5). In the *De Glor. Conf.* lxxii. it is stated that the snow never lay on his tomb, and that in course of time bishop Monulfus (A.D. 550) built a large church in his honour, whither his body was transferred with great pomp, and where it still worked numerous miracles.

The history of the early bishops of Tongres is very obscure, and in particular there has been a vast deal of discussion as to whether the Servatius, who is the subject of this article, is identical or not with the Servatius of the councils of Sardica (A.D. 343 or 344) and Rimini (A.D. 359) treated of above as Servatius I. It seems probable that the *Gallia Christiana* (iii. 813), Ruinart (*not.* ad Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 5; *De Glor. Conf.* lxxii.), and Rettberg (*Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 205) are right in considering the two as distinct, a view which is supported by the fact that most of the MSS. read Aravatius in the passages above quoted from Gregory of Tours (Ruinart, *ibid.*). Henschenius and the others who identify them are compelled to believe that Gregory was mistaken, and refer the journey to Rome, either to the Vandal invasion of 406, which would still make Servatius of an impossible age, or to a Hunnish devastation of 383 (*Acta SS.* Mai. vii. p. xviii. sqq.). The later Bollandists however appear to doubt of their predecessors' conclusions (Aug. iv. 40). Servatius is usually credited with the transference of the see to Maestricht, whence it was afterwards moved again to Liège. He is commemorated May 13 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai iii. 209). [S. A. B.]

SERVILIO, the preceptor of ENNODIUS (Ennodius, *Epp.* v. 14, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 94). [F. D.]

SERVILIUS, a monk, said by Evodius to have appeared to him after his death, in a dream (Aug. *Ep.* 158 al. 258, 9, 11). [H. W. P.]

SERVUS (1) (SERVUS DEI), bishop of a place in Africa, called by St. Augustine, in the same chapter, Thubursica and Thubursicabur. There were two places in Numidia called respectively, by Ptolemy, Thuburnica and Thubursicca (Ptol. iv. 3. 39). Of these, Thuburnica is mentioned in a decree of an African council, A.D. 407 (Bruns, *Cod. Eccl. Afr.* 100, 1. 186; see Clinton, F. R.), as also its bishop Maurentius, probably the same as he whose name appears in *Carth. Coll.* i. 143, A.D. 411. Another bishop of Thubursicus, in Numidia, Januarius, is mentioned in the same (i. 201), but Morcelli suggests, from an inscription, that the word Thubursicubur, as given by Augustine, represents two words, viz. Tibursica, or Thubursica, of the Burenses, a different place from either of the two others just mentioned, but whose site is not known. Servus Dei, who appears in the record of the conference, was probably the same as Servus who, some time before this, when returning to his home, which had been seized by the Circumcellions, was attacked by them, and narrowly escaped with his life. The shock of this event caused the death of his father, a presbyter, a few days after (Aug. c. *Cresc.* iii. 47). A Donatist bishop of Thubursica, named Cyprian, had been convicted of gross immorality about A.D. 406, but the rival bishop of Tubursicabur at the time of the conference was Donatus (*Carth. Coll.* 1. 121; Aug. *Petil.* iii. 39; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 318). [H. W. P.]

SERVUS (2), sub-deacon and martyr with Liberatus at Carthage in the Vandal persecution. [LIBERATUS (3).] [G. T. S.]

SESIN (SEZINUS), Breton saint, whose life is compiled by Albert le Grand (*Les Vies des SS. Bret. Armor.*) from ancient breviaries, &c., of Leon and Cornwall for Sept. 19, and quoted from at length, with notes, by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 477), and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* 6 Mar. i. 428), but the details are doubtful. Colgan seeks to identify him with Iserninus the companion of St. Patrick, but merely as a guess. According to the legend, he was of Ulster birth, A.D. 402; his father Ernest, and mother Wingella. Early in youth he retired to an island for pious exercises, and in A.D. 435 visited Rome, where he became acquainted with St. Patrick, who was then a bishop, and accompanied its apostle back to Ireland with the papal blessing and gifts. After the performance of many miracles, he set out with seventy disciples, and, reaching the diocese of Leon in France, built his monastery at Guic-Sezni, where he died in A.D. 529 at the ripe age of one hundred and twenty-seven years. He was buried beneath the altar in his own church at Guic-Sezni, and his feasts are March 6th and September 19th. Lobineau (*Hist. Bret.* i. No. ccxv. p. 76) can find only his name and patronage. (O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 173–176; Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 87.) [J. G.]

SETHITES. [See OPHITES, p. 87.]

SEVEN BROTHERS. [FELICITAS (1).]

SEVEN MARTYRS OF ANCYRA, female victims of the persecution of Diocletian about the year 304. They were unmarried, about seventy years old, and notable for their piety and good works. As soon as the persecution was finally determined upon, Theotecnus, a magician, a philosopher, and pervert from Christianity, was despatched as governor to Galatia, to root out Christianity. Among the earliest victims were these seven virgins, whose names were Tecusa, Alexandra, Faina, Claudia, Euphrasia, Matrona, Julitta. Having summoned them before him Theotecnus called upon them to offer incense, and upon their refusal condemned them to the public brothel, from which they escaped scatheless on account of their age, and by the ingenuity of Tecusa their leader. He then ordered them to officiate as priestesses of Diana and Minerva in washing their statues according to the annual custom of Ancyra. They were accordingly carried naked in a procession through the streets to a neighbouring lake, where garlands and white garments were offered them in which they should fulfil his commands. Upon their refusal Theotecnus ordered them to be drowned in the lake, and heavy stones to be tied round their necks lest their bodies should be recovered and buried by their fellow-Christians. Legends in abundance now connect themselves with the story. In Ancyra was a tavern-keeper named Theodotus, a very earnest and devout Christian, who had been active in encouraging the martyrs to endure. To him, as the story goes, Tecusa appeared the same night in which they died, calling upon him to rescue their bodies, and warning him at the same time to avoid a traitor among the friends. The next night, in company with her own nephew Polychronus, he went out to the lake, which he found guarded by soldiers to prevent such an attempt. The darkness, too, was so great as to render it hopeless. Supernatural aid, however, was at hand. Two saints appeared with a lighted lamp to guide them, while St. Sosandrus, a martyr famous in those parts, appeared as a tall armed man and affrighted the guards. At the same time a storm of wind drove the water of the lake so to one side as to leave the bodies exposed, whereupon they were seized and brought to Ancyra by Theodotus and his companions, and buried near the church of the Patriarchs in that town. The governor hearing of the rescue, arrested Polychronus, who confessed under torture the names of those who had carried it, and thus fulfilled the warning of the vision. Acting upon the information thus gained, the bodies were disinterred and burned, and Theodotus, after witnessing a good confession and suffering excruciating tortures, was finally beheaded. He is commemorated by the Greeks on the 7th of June. The seven virgins of Ancyra are commemorated in the Greek, the Roman and Egyptian Martyrologies on May 18. The acts of the seven virgins and of St. Theodotus are recorded in Greek in a Vatican manuscript which professes to have been written by an eye-witness named Nilus. They were translated into Latin by the Jesuit priest Daniel Papebrochius. They are found in Greek and Latin in the Boll. *Acta SS.* May 18; cf. also Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 336; Ceillier, iii. 15. The church of the

Patriarchs, mentioned frequently in these acts, was probably one dedicated to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whose festival the Greeks observe on Dec. 13. [G. T. S.]

SEVERA (1), called Marina in the *Chron. Pasch.*, first wife of VALENTINIANUS I., and mother of GRATIANUS (5), q. v. and also JUSTINA (5). [F. D.]

SEVERA (2), a lady addressed by Chrysostom (*Ep.* 229) in his exile at Cucusus, A.D. 404. [C. H.]

SEVERIANA, daughter of Sidonius Apollinaris, who (*Ep.* 12) was about to take her into the country for the restoration of her health. [R. J. K.]

SEVERIANS [SEVERUS (3) and (27)].

SEVERIANUS (1), confessor of Carthage as STATIUS, Cyp. *Ep.* 21. [E. W. B.]

SEVERIANUS (2), bishop of Gabala on the northern seaboard of Syria, c. A.D. 400, Chrysostom's episcopal commissary during his Asiatic visitation in A.D. 401, and afterwards one of his most determined enemies, and a leader of the cabal against him. Severian was an ambitious man, and having a natural gift of eloquence, and a fair amount of theological and scriptural learning, he was anxious to display his powers in a wider field than a small provincial city. He is described by Gennadius (*Ill. Eccl. Script.* c. 21) as "in Divinis Scripturis eruditus, et in Homiliis declamator admirabilis." The success of his neighbour Antiochus bishop of Ptolemais, who had acquired great celebrity as a preacher at Constantinople, led Severianus to resolve to try his fortune also in the imperial city. Having carefully prepared a large stock of sermons he turned his back on his diocese and repaired to Constantinople, where he was kindly received by Chrysostom, who often selected him to address the people on important occasions. In spite of a rough provincial accent, he obtained considerable popularity, not only with the people in general, but with the emperor and empress, who often appointed him to preach (Gennad. *u. s.*). When in the spring of A.D. 401 Chrysostom left Constantinople for the visitation of Asia Minor, he deputed his official authority to Severian as commissary, all real power being vested in his archdeacon Serapion, who was instructed to watch Severian narrowly and acquaint Chrysostom with all that passed in his absence. Severian abused the opportunity of Chrysostom's absence to undermine his influence with the emperor and empress and the court, and to render him increasingly distasteful to the worldly and luxurious clergy of Constantinople, whom his severity had already greatly alienated. His conduct was reported in the darkest colours to Chrysostom by his jealous and artful rival in popular favour, Serapion. The insult offered to Severian by Serapion, the outburst of temper which followed, the mutilated words eagerly reported to Chrysostom, and vouched for by those who wished to curry favour with their bishop, and the ill-judged haste with which Chrysostom, without waiting to enquire fully into the truth of the charge, compelled Severian to leave for his own diocese, are to be found in a previous article [SERAPION (16)]. But whether, according to the more highly coloured account, Severian was actually expelled as a blasphemer (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 10; Socr. *H. E.* vi. 11), or, as we find in the alternative passage in Socrates (*Append. ad lib.* vi.), Chrysostom contented himself with the suspension of intercourse, and the advice that he should return to his own diocese, from which he had been absent so long—a recommendation which, at the synod of the Oak, Chrysostom was charged with having incited the "deacons" of the church to carry out by force (Phot. *Cod.* lix. p. 55)—Severian had barely crossed the Bosphorus when court influence procured his recall. The imperious Eudoxia, annoyed at the loss of a favourite preacher, compelled Chrysostom to allow his return. But though he yielded so far, he steadily refused to re-admit the offender to his former friendly intercourse. The influence Severian had acquired by his flattery and his eloquence over the empress's mind led her to resort to a most extraordinary measure to bring about at least the appearance of amity. Taking her infant son, the future emperor Theodosius, in her arms, she carried him into the church of the Apostles, where Chrysostom was seated, and, casting him in his lap, conjured him with solemn imprecations to be reconciled with Severian. Chrysostom consented; but in the words of Socrates the seeming reconciliation only cloaked a secret ill-feeling which Severian, at any rate, was watching his opportunity to indulge. Nothing was wanting, however, on either side to convince the public of the reality of the reconciliation. Chrysostom, at least, was thoroughly honest in his protestations that all angry feeling was laid aside; and exhorted his congregation who had been much offended by the conduct of Severian towards their reverend spiritual father, to submit as loyal subjects and good Christians to the wishes of those in authority, forget all past dissensions, and receive their offending brother with a full heart and open arms (*Homil. de recipiend. Severian.* tom. iii. p. 422, ed. Migne). The request was acceded to with applause. Severian next day delivered a short rhetorical eulogy on the blessings of peace—a studied composition, as devoid of naturalness as the event proved it to be of honesty (*Sermo ipsius Severiani de pace, ibid.* p. 493).

The hollowness of the reconciliation was soon proved. Severian came forward with Antiochus of Ptolemais and Acacius of Beroea as the chief leaders of the cabal against Chrysostom. Their own neglect of their sacred duties as "hireling shepherds," calling themselves what they were not, and being really what they had no mind to be called, already the theme of the satirical ballads of the theatres, inspired them with envy of the true pastor, with whom the comparison was so disadvantageous; and having no other way of ridding themselves of him, these base intriguers, under the inspiration of the empress and the powerful female influence of the court, formed a plot for Chrysostom's humiliation, which ultimately proved only too successful (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 35, 48, 72). At the assembly of the Oak, Severian took a leading part, acting at the same time as accuser, witness, and judge (Pallad. p. 72, Phot. *Cod.* 59, p. 53). On his deposition, Severian mounted the pulpit and publicly expressed his approbation of the act,

which he said Chrysostom had well merited for his haughtiness alone. This was an unpardonable sin, for which, as Holy Scripture declared, even God made no allowance. The people were already in a very excited state at the loss of their revered bishop; this "barefaced attempt to justify injustice" only rendered them more furious, and they were only prevented from taking summary measures against his persecutors by his speedy recall (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 16; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 19). On Chrysostom's triumphant return Severian and his brother intriguers consulted their safety by flight (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 17; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 19; Pallad. *Dial.* p. 16). We find Severian and the other intriguers at Constantinople seconding the new designs for the destruction of Chrysostom set on foot by Eudoxia and the court party, and securing his condemnation. Having obtained an audience of the emperor, Severian joined with his brother caballers in urging the immediate removal of Chrysostom, who had no longer any legal right to occupy the palace, as the only security for the pacification of the city (Pallad. *Dial.* pp. 79, 88; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 22). Severian's malice did not cease with the expulsion of his enemy. He was one of the concocters of the letters of accusation addressed to pope Innocent sent by Paternus (Pallad. *Dial.* p. 25). He is charged by Palladius with using his influence to obtain an order for the removal of the aged invalid from Cucusus, where the climate had not proved so fatal as the malice of his enemies desired, to the more bleak and inaccessible town of Pityus (*ibid.* 97). Severian had previously been one of the uncanonical consecrators of Porphyrius as bishop of Antioch (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24). The time of his death is uncertain. It may be placed under Theodosius II. between A.D. 408 and A.D. 430.

Severianus was a copious author. Very few of his works have been preserved to us. Some of the homilies printed in Chrysostom's works have been attributed to him with more or less probability. The following are regarded as his on satisfactory grounds: (1) *De Creatione Mundi*, orationes sex, Chrys. ed. Savil. tom. vii. p. 587 ff. Combefis, *Auctarium*, Paris, 1672, tom. iii. p. 211. (2) *De Nativitate Christi* (quoted as his by Theodoret, *Dial.* ii.), ed. Savil. tom. vii. p. 307. (3) *De Sigillis Librorum*, *ibid.* p. 134 (also quoted by Theodoret, *Dial.* iii. p. 169). (4) *De Serpente Aeneo*, *ibid.* tom. v. p. 44 (quoted as his by John of Damascus, *de Imag. Orat.* and other ancient writers). (5) *De Nativitate*, *ibid.* tom. v. p. 134. We may mention also a homily, *De Morte Innocentium*, Chrysolog. No. 152, and *de Cruce homilia*, published by Combefis with some homilies of Chrysostom's, Paris, 1656. Du Pin attributes to Severian, from internal evidence, a large number of the homilies which pass under Chrysostom's name. He mentions in the sixth volume of Savile's edition, Nos. 4, 12–15, 17–21, 25, 34, 37–42, 44, 57–59, 61–63; and Nos. 102, 105, 133, and 144 in the fifth volume. Combefis (*Auctar.* iii. p. 291) cites a number of passages from various Greek catenae, but leaves it uncertain whether some of them do not rather belong to Severus, the Eutychian patriarch of Antioch. Severus is quoted together with Antiochus by the monks of Constantinople as theological authorities against Nestorius (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 416). Severianus is said to have composed a large number of commentaries on Holy Scripture, the whole of which are lost with the exception of fragments contained in the *Catenae*. Commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy are quoted by Fr. Zephyrus in his *Catena in Pent.* Colon. 1572. A commentary on Job is quoted in the Catena of Paulus Comitolus; a commentary on the Galatians is mentioned by Gennadius as having been read by him, and a fragment is given by Oecumenius in his commentary on that epistle. Oecumenius also quotes his commentary on the Romans, 1 Cor., and 2 Thess.; and Anastasius Sinaita (Ὁδηγός, c. 16) that on the Colossians. There is, however, some doubt whether these belong to him or to Severus of Antioch. Gennadius speaks of having read with pleasure a treatise of Severian's on *Baptism* and on the *Epiphany*. A work *contra Novatum* is quoted by Gelasius, *de duabus Christi Naturis;* and one *contra Judaeos* by Cosmas Indicopleustes, vii. 292. According to Mabillon (*Mus. Ital.* i. pp. 13, 124) eighty-eight homilies bearing Severian's name exist in MS. in the Ambrosian library, and others in the Coislinian. (Fabr. *Bibl. Graec.* ix. 267; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 375; Dupin, *Hist. Eccl.*) [E. V.]

SEVERIANUS (3), Count of Ancyra, to whom Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, paid a visit. He gives an account of him and his wife, Bosphoria, in his *Historia Lausiaca*, cap. 114, where he describes their almsgiving to hospitals, monasteries, and churches about A.D. 413. Cf. Ceillier, vii. 486. [G. T. S.]

SEVERIANUS (4), confessor in Africa with Novatus and POSSIDIUS under Genseric, Coss Aëtio II. et Sigisvulto (Prosper, *Chron.* in *Pat. Lat.* li. 597), *i.e.* A.D. 437 (Clinton, *F. R.* i. 620) [C. H.]

SEVERIANUS (5), bishop of Scythopolis, attended the council of Chalcedon in 451. (Labbe, iv. 788.) The following year, on his return from the council, he was brutally murdered, together with his attendants, by the partisans of Theodosius, the fanatical Eutychian intruder into the see of Jerusalem. The emperor Marcian, in his eighth letter, speaks of his murder as πάρεργον τῆς Θεοδοσίου μανίας (*ibid.* 851) and mentions it again in his ninth and fifteenth letters (*ibid.* 858, 879). His name occurs in the Roman martyrology on Feb. 22. (Theoph. p. 92; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 688; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* xv. 735.) [E. V.]

SEVERIANUS (6), bishop of Arethusa in Syria Secunda, at the beginning of the 6th century. In common with most of the ecclesiastics of Syria Secunda, then suffering under the sanguinary tyranny of Peter the intruding metropolitan of Apamea, the follower and zealous partisan of Severus the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, Severianus refused to receive the synodical letters of that prelate, and in conjunction with Cosmas, bishop of Epiphania, he dispatched an instrument of deposition by the hands of Aurelian, archdeacon of Epiphania, who, in the garb of a female petitioner, surreptitiously placed the document in the hands of Severus himself. The emperor Anastasius, whose sympathies were with the Monophysites, learning this, ordered that Severianus and Cosmas

should be deposed and banished. But on learning that through the popularity of these bishops his orders could not be carried out without bloodshed, he revoked them, and Severianus and Cosmas remained undisturbed. (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 34.) Severianus signed the petition of his metropolitan, Paul of Apamea, to Justinian at the council under Mennas, A.D. 536, condemning the errors of Severus, Peter and Zoaras. (Labbe, v. 105.) [E. V.]

SEVERIANUS (7), the father of Leander and Isidore of Seville. [LEANDER (2), ISIDORUS (13).] [F. D.]

SEVERINA and ROMULA, ladies of Constantinople, probably sisters, to whom Chrysostom writes from Cucusus. (Chrys. *Ep.* 219.) [E. V.]

SEVERINUS (1), bishop of Cologne, who succeeded Euphratas A.D. 346, and is very highly spoken of by St. Gregory of Tours (*De Mir. S. Mart.* i. c. 4, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 918), according to whom he was favoured with a special intimation of St. Martin's death, *c.* 397. But the facts of his life are uncertain, as there is a confusion between him and a contemporary of the same name at Bordeaux, if as some suppose they be not one and the same person. The difficulty of regarding them as one lies in the fact, that Gregory mentions both as separate persons. Surius (*Vit. SS.* x. 360 sq.) gives a Life of St. Severin by an anonymous author, but it is not of much value; the Bollandists (*AA. SS.* Oct. x. 56) reproduce it with annotations, and it is plainly based upon Gregory's statements of the two Severini blended together. In this Life he became bishop of Cologne after Euphratas, defended his see against heresy and disaster, until, after the notice of St. Martin's death, he was summoned by a vision in his old age to proceed to Bordeaux, where St. Amand welcomed him, and at death (c. A.D. 403) buried him. The second part of the Life gives an account of the translation to Cologne at a much later date. His feast is Oct. 23 (Boll. *AA. SS.* Oct. x. 50 sq., discussing the intricacies, in the Comment. praev. and notes: Tillemont, *H. E.* x. 234 sq., 358 sq. *Gall. Christ.* iii. 623; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 177–8). [J. G.]

SEVERINUS (2), fourth bishop of Bordeaux, has his tradition mixed up with that of his contemporary bishop at Cologne [SEVERINUS (1)]. In the *brevis Vita* given by the Boll. (*AA. SS.* Oct. x. 65–66) as extracted from Gregory of Tours (*Lib. de Glor. Conf.* c. 45; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 862) he came "ex partibus Orientis" to Bordeaux when Amandus was bishop, who ceded to the stranger the episcopal seat, until after a few years Severinus died, and the see reverted to Amandus about the beginning of the 5th century. He is patron of Bordeaux as St. Seurin, and his feast is Oct. 23. But the account of his relations to Amandus and the see of Bordeaux is very improbable, yet Tillemont (*H. E.* x. 236 sq. 358) thinks there may be a portion of truth in it. (See Boll. *AA. SS.* Oct. x. 66; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 789.) The Life written by Fortunatus (Greg. Tur. *De Glor. Conf.* c. 45) is lost. [J. G.]

SEVERINUS (3), a kinsman of St. Augustine, who belonged to the Donatist party, and to whom, in reply to a letter from him expressing a desire to return to the church, Augustine wrote *c.* 400, urging him to do so (Aug. *Ep.* 52 al. 170). [H. W. P.]

SEVERINUS (4), Jan. 8, monk and apostle of Noricum (Austria) in the fifth century. He was assisted by EUGIPPIUS (1) who afterwards presided over a monastery dedicated to his memory, and there wrote his life about A.D. 511, for the use of a deacon named Paschasius. Severinus is described in his Life as coming from the East to preach in Pannonia and Noricum, about the time of Attila's death, followed as it was by contests among his sons, which wrought havoc and destruction among the inhabitants of these provinces. He lived a life of the sternest asceticism, inhabiting a small cell where a man could barely stand erect. There he gained the character of a prophet and a worker of miracles. His Life is filled, chapter after chapter, with narratives of the wonders wrought and the predictions uttered by him. He seems to have been gifted with some kind of second-sight, similar to that which Adamnan's Life of St. Columba claims for the Celtic saint of the following century. (Cf. cap. vii. for an instance of this.) The narrative of Eugippius is important as illustrating the social life of the outlying provinces of the empire when the foundations of the modern European system were just beginning to be laid. Thus Chap. VI. tells of the influence he exercised in introducing the payment of tithes. Poverty was widespread, owing to the ravages of the barbarians, and there was no system of relief for the poor who were perishing under his eyes. So Severinus urged upon the rich and well-to-do the payment of a tenth for the relief of their brethren and the redemption of captives, a practice as we learn from St. Patrick's *Epistle to Coroticus*, common among the Romans of Gaul in that age [PATRICIUS (10)]. The rich neglected the duty and refused to hearken to the exhortations of Severinus with a selfishness which we find exactly paralleled in the denunciations of Salvianus addressed to the Christians of Gaul. A famine soon followed, and Severinus pointed to it as a manifest judgment of God upon their misconduct. (Cf. TITHES in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* p. 1965.) Severinus was a most devoted missionary, without any ambitious desires for himself. He was offered a bishopric, but refused it, preferring the life of a simple monk. Yet he was reverenced, by Roman and barbarian alike, so much so, that Odoacer sought him out and desired his blessing when about to invade Italy. "The lowness of the door would not admit the lofty stature of Odoacer. He was obliged to stoop, but in that humble attitude the saint could discern the symptoms of his future greatness, and, addressing him in a prophetic tone, 'Pursue,' said he, 'your design; proceed to Italy; you will soon cast away this coarse garment of skins, and your wealth will be adequate to your liberality of mind.'" (Gibbon, cap. xxxvi.) Severinus died A.D. 482, near Vienna. His body, six years afterwards was carried into Italy, and deposited in the villa of Lucullus, on the bay of Naples, then converted into a monastery. His Life will be found in

AA. SS. Boll. (Jan. 1, 483) and in Pez, *Scriptt. Res Austr. I.* 62; cf. Till. *Mém.* t. xvi. p. 178-181. The new edition of Herzog's *Encyclop.* has a very exhaustive article upon him. Potthast *s. v.* gives a full list of MSS., authorities, etc.

[G. T. S.]

SEVERINUS (5), bishop of Miria, had taken with him the ornaments of that church to Squillace. After his death the clergy of Miria petitioned Gregory the Great for their restoration (*Epp.* v. 9). The position of Miria is unknown. Another reading adopted by Gams (*Ser. Ep.*), but not by Jaffé (*Reg. Pont.*), gives Aleria, the well-known town in Corsica.

[F. D.]

SEVERINUS (6), bishop of Rome, elected shortly after the death of pope Honorius (12 Oct. A.D. 638), but not ordained till more than a year and a half afterwards, on 28 May, A.D. 640. He died at the beginning of August in the same year, after a reign of only two months and a few days. He was a Roman, and his father's name Abienus (Anastasius). The delay of his ordination was owing to the refusal of the emperor Heraclius to confirm his election, except on condition of his accepting the *Ecthesis*, issued before the death of Honorius, but too late for him to express an opinion upon it. [See JOANNES (349) IV.] The document had been sent from Constantinople to Isacius the exarch of Ravenna, with orders to him to require its acceptance by the new pope. This appears from a letter of Cyrus of Alexandria to Sergius of Constantinople, read at the third session of the first Lateran council, which was held under pope Martin, A.D. 649. In it are the words, "Ectheseos venerabilis nostrae fidei a piissimo et a Deo conservando domino nostro magnoque Principe pro pia fide nostra ad Isacium excellentissimum Patricium et Exarcham Italiae destinatae, quam debet profiteri communis frater noster Severinus sanctissimus Deo adjuvante, qui ordinatur Romae." But Severinus at once rejected it. So assures us pope Martin, who, after the reading of the letter above quoted in the Lateran council, said: "Ceciderunt a spe sua. Nec enim suscepta est omnino aut admissa secundum vanam eorum spem; magis autem condemnata est et anathematizata ab Apostolica auctoritate huc transmissa pessimae et praesumptae novitatis eorum Ecthesis." Messengers (apocrisiarii), then sent from Rome to Constantinople, were informed, on their arrival there, that confirmation of the election could not be granted unless they promised to persuade the new pope to accept the *Ecthesis*. Hence, it would appear, the long delay. At length they are said to have obtained the emperor's confirmation of the election by promising insincerely to lay the document before Severinus, and to ask him to sign it, if he approved of it, undertaking at the same time not to dissuade him from doing so. Our authority for this assertion is the contemporary abbat, St. Maximus, in a letter to the abbat Thalassius (Anastas. *in Collectan.*) Severinus, however, after his ordination, certainly did not comply with the emperor's required condition: for not only have we the assertion of pope Martin, above quoted, that the *Ecthesis*, when sent to Rome, was condemned by apostolical authority, but also the evidence of the profession of faith afterwards made by popes on their election (*Lib. diurn. Roman. Pontif.*, c. 3, *tit.* 6), in which the words occur, "Profitemur etiam cuncta Decreta Pontificum Apostolicae Sedis, id est sanctae recordationis Severini, Joannis, &c. . . . custodire; qui adversus novas quaestiones in Urbe Regia exortas, et pro propria doctrina cuncta zizaniorum scandala amputasse noscuntur, profitentes, juxta duarum naturarum motum, ita et duas naturales operationes, et quaecunque damnaverunt sub anathemate damnamus." *Decreta* of Severinus and other popes being here spoken of, it may be inferred that he held a Roman synod during his short tenure of office, in which the heresy involved in the *Ecthesis* was condemned; since only synodical decrees of popes were thus at that time designated.

During the vacancy of the see Anastasius informs us (*Vit. Severin.*) that Mauritius, the *Chartularius* (keeper of the records) of Rome, in concert with others, *Judices* of the city, made an attack on the Lateran palace, where the pope elect was in possession, with the view of plundering it. They got, we are told, the co-operation of the army at Rome, whose pay was in arrears, by suggesting that pope Honorius had accumulated large treasures in the Lateran, which were of no use where they were, and might be utilised with advantage. Having, after a siege of three days, gained entrance into the palace, they sent word to Isacius, the Exarch, who at once came to Rome, banished from the city the leading clergy, and took possession of the treasures, which he plundered, sending a part of them to the emperor Heraclius; and it was not, it is added, till after the ordination of Severinus that he returned to Ravenna. Though it is not intimated by Anastasius that this action was taken with the view of intimidating Severinus into acceptance of the *Ecthesis*, yet Isacius at least, acting in the interests of the emperor, may be supposed, with probability, to have had such a design in view. At any rate the state of things with regard to the *Ecthesis* afforded the opportunity for the attack and plundering of the Lateran.

We learn from Bede that the Scottish bishops and clergy, who were still at variance with the Roman communion in England on the Easter question, addressed a letter on the subject to Severinus, who died before it reached Rome. It was answered by his successor, John IV., while still only pope elect. (Bed. *H. E.* ii. 19.)

[J. B—Y.]

SEVERUS (1), L. SEPTIMIUS, emperor, was born at Leptis in Tripoli in April A.D. 146. His family were of equestrian rank, and two of his uncles had been consuls. His early life was spent at Rome in a mixture of study and dissipation. There his talents appear to have attracted the attention of M. Aurelius, who conferred various offices upon him. In one capacity or another he held office in nearly all the western provinces—Baetica, Sardinia, proconsular Africa, Tarraconensis, Lugdunensis, Pannonia, and Sicily. In A.D. 193 he was in command of Pannonia and Illyricum. When the news arrived of the murder of Pertinax, and the sale of the empire to Didius Julianus, it aroused great indignation in the

minds of the Pannonian army, and Severus, taking advantage of this feeling, got himself saluted emperor by them at Carnuntum in the month of April or May.

He immediately marched on Rome. Julian's preparations for defence proved unavailing; he was abandoned by the praetorians themselves, and put to death by order of the senate on the 1st or 2nd of June. Severus, after disbanding the mutinous praetorians, and raising a new force in their place, paying the last honours to Pertinax, attending to the corn supply of Rome, and transacting various other business, left Rome, after a stay of thirty days—having secured his rear by a treaty with Clodius Albinus, the governor of Britain, on whom he conferred the dignity of Caesar—to take the field against his most formidable rival, Pescennius Niger, who had assumed the purple at Antioch a few days before himself. All the East, including Egypt, had acknowledged him, and he was also master of the city of Byzantium. Severus, however, forced the passage of the Hellespont, routed Aemilianus, Niger's lieutenant, at Cyzicus, defeated Niger in person at Nicaea, forced the passes of Mount Taurus, and finally won a decisive victory at Issus on the field where Alexander had defeated Darius. Niger fled to Antioch, was captured in one of the suburbs and beheaded. Severus proceeded to punish severely the persons and cities who had taken his rival's part. Among others, Neapolis (Nablous), the ancient Shechem, was deprived of the franchise, which, however, was restored some years afterwards (*Vita Severi*, 9, 14). The fall of Niger took place in A.D. 194, and the next two years were spent by Severus in wars in Osrhoene, Adiabene, and Arabia. In the beginning of A.D. 196, he had the pleasure of hearing of the fall of Byzantium, the last refuge of Niger's partisans, which had held out bravely for nearly three years. He was recalled from the East by the outbreak of a new civil war. Albinus, whom after the fall of Niger he had ceased to treat as Caesar, had assumed the title of emperor, and had crossed into Gaul. After various indecisive actions, the rivals met on February 19, A.D. 197, in the plain of Trevoux near Lyons. After a protracted and sanguinary battle, Albinus was defeated and slain. Severus, on his return to Rome, put great numbers of the real or supposed partisans of Albinus to death, among whom were twenty-nine senators. He then marched again to the East against the Parthians, who had overrun Mesopotamia. The following year he marched down the Euphrates and took Seleucia and Ctesiphon, which, however, he did not attempt to hold permanently. In A.D. 199 he was, like Trajan, repulsed before the little town of Atra. The next two years were spent in Syria, where search was made for the relics of Niger's party. Some obscure notices are found of a rising of Jews and Samaritans about this period (*Vita Severi*, 16; S. Hier. *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xxvii. 635). From Syria he proceeded into Egypt, where he ascended the Nile and visited Memphis and the pyramids, the labyrinth and Memnon. In A.D. 203 he returned to Rome, where he remained till A.D. 208. The most notable event of this period was the fall of the cruel and arrogant Plautian, who had attained an absolute ascendency over the emperor's mind. He had been made praetorian prefect and his daughter Plautilla had been married to the emperor's eldest son. Not satisfied with the position he had attained, and also fearing the hatred of Caracalla, he plotted to kill the emperor and his sons. His designs were disclosed by the centurion to whom he had entrusted their execution; he was summoned to the palace, and slain there (January A.D. 204). This, at least, is the account of Herodian; according to Dion, the plot was a fiction got up by Caracalla in order to remove his father-in-law. In the autumn of the same year the secular games were celebrated with great magnificence for the last time. In A.D. 208 Severus set out for Britain, where he marched through Caledonia to the extreme north of the island, cutting down the forests and making roads. Though he met with no opposition from the natives, the army suffered greatly from the hardships they underwent, and after making peace he returned to the Roman part of the territory. He added a new rampart to the wall built by Hadrian from the Tyne to the Solway. His last years were embittered by the quarrels of his sons, and the plots of the eldest against his own life, and he felt the vanity of all his successes. He had been all things, he said, and it profited him nothing. He died at York on February 4th, A.D. 211. A little before his death he asked for the urn to be brought in which his ashes were to be placed, and taking it in his hands said, "Thou shalt contain one whom the world did not contain." Of all the emperors from Augustus to Diocletian, Severus was probably the man of greatest power. Hated and feared by the senate, who felt notwithstanding that he was indispensable, he relied on the support of the army, and spared no pains to secure their attachment. Crafty, ambitious, and unscrupulous, he allowed no considerations of humanity to stand in his way. Yet he did not delight in cruelty for its own sake, and any weakness on his part would not only have been fatal to himself, but would have plunged the Roman world again in the anarchy from which he had rescued it. Under his rule disorder and brigandage throughout the empire were put down with a firm hand. The only weak point in his character was his belief in astrology and magic, in which he was himself an adept.

In the earlier part of his reign, Severus was favourable to the Christians. He believed that he had been cured of an illness by oil administered by a Christian named Proculus [CARACALLA], whom till his death he maintained in the palace; and the nurse and some of the playmates of Caracalla were Christians. No Christians took a prominent part on the side of Niger or Albinus, and it is even probable that the defenders of Byzantium ill-treated the Christians there during the siege. The number of councils held in the early years of Severus on the question of the time of observing Easter, proves that the church was then unmolested. The first change for the worse appears to have been on the occasion of the emperor's entry into Rome, in A.D. 197, after the defeat of Albinus. The Christians excited the fury of the mob by refusing to join in the demonstrations of rejoicing, an act, which they considered inconsistent with their religion. But Severus was so far from yielding to the mob, that he used his influence to protect

men and women of rank who were Christians against their fury (*Ad Scap.* 4).

But these troubles were only the forerunners of the storm. In A.D. 202 the emperor issued an edict by which future conversions to Judaism or Christianity were forbidden (*Vita Severi*, 17). His motives for this step are unknown. Probably Severus, a stern statesman of the old Roman school, foresaw the peril to which the national religion and the constitution of the state were exposed by the active propaganda carried on by the Christians, and though he was personally friendly to some among them, yet he thought it was time to check the further progress of the *religio illicita*. The prohibition against Jewish proselytism may have been caused by the obscure disturbances in Palestine already mentioned, and it seems to have been soon relaxed, if indeed it ever was enforced. At least this is a natural inference from the fact, that one Domninus abandoned Christianity for Judaism during the persecution (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 12).

Though the terms of the edict applied only to new converts, and though it appears that accordingly the catechumens were the greatest sufferers, yet there were numerous victims among those who had long embraced Christianity. The pronounced disapproval of the emperor naturally tended to intensify the persecutions in provinces where they had already commenced, and to spread them to others where hitherto the Christians had been secure. In the eastern part of the empire it was in Egypt that the Christians suffered most, which may have been caused by the fact, that the emperor had visited it immediately after the promulgation of his edict. So terrible was the outbreak that Judas, a Christian writer, interpreting the prophecies of Daniel, made the seventy weeks expire with the tenth year of Severus, and considered the advent of Antichrist was at hand. Laetus the prefect, and his successor Aquila, shewed themselves merciless enemies of the Christians, who were dragged from all parts of Egypt to their tribunal at Alexandria. Among the most notable of the martyrs was Leonidas the father of the famous Origen, who was only prevented by a stratagem of his mother's from sharing his father's fate. The property of Leonidas being confiscated to the imperial treasury, his family was reduced to poverty. Yet, notwithstanding the persecution, Origen was allowed to open a school, where many in consequence of his teaching became Christians and suffered martyrdom. The most famous of them was Potamiaena, the story of whose martyrdom resembles the well-known legend of St. Dorothy. Their names are given by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 4, 5). By a strange inconsistency, which also appears in the accounts of the African persecution, Origen was allowed to visit them in prison, and to be present at their trial, and even to accompany them on their way to execution, apparently without being molested by the government, though he was several times in great danger from the violence of the mob.

In Africa the persecution began with a violation of the cemeteries, and a bad harvest that followed increased the rage of the people against the Christians[a] (*Ad Scap.* 3). In the spring of A.D. 203, under Hilarianus the procurator, who had assumed the government on the death of the proconsul, suffered that famous group of martyrs among whom St. Perpetua is the most conspicuous. Yet here again we find the same inconsistency as at Alexandria. Deacons were allowed to visit the imprisoned Christians unmolested, to alleviate their sufferings, and even to procure their removal to a better part of the prison. In A.D. 205 or 206, under the milder government of Julius Asper, the persecution seems to have abated, after raging for three years (*De Pallio*, 2). So perilous was the position of the Christians that many sought refuge in flight, while others tried to escape by bribing the Roman officials, and in some cases the Christian community as a whole seems to have done so. These subterfuges were regarded with scorn and abhorrence by the more enthusiastic Christians, but no trace is to be found of the Libellatici so notorious in later persecutions, who procured by a payment a certificate that they had complied with the requirements of the law. This abatement seems to have continued till near the close of the reign, but in A.D. 210 and 211 the persecution broke out again in its sharpest form under the proconsul Scapula, when it also extended to Mauritania. There, however, the sword was the instrument of execution, whilst the cruel Scapula burnt his victims alive or flung them to the wild beasts of the amphitheatre.

Of the persecutions in other parts of the empire, we have only a few isolated notices. The aged Irenaeus and his companions suffered at Lyons in the reign of Severus, but no details of their martyrdom are preserved, and even the date is uncertain. In Syria, Asclepiades, who was afterwards bishop of Antioch, was a confessor (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 11). It was probably in this reign[b] that the cruel persecution in Cappadocia to which Tertullian (*Ad Scap.* 3) alludes, took place. The governor, Herminianus, was enraged against the Christians, because his wife had been converted. It may have been on this occasion that Alexander, who was bishop of a Cappadocian see, and who was afterwards bishop of Jerusalem, was imprisoned in A.D. 204 (Eus. *Chron.*). The fact that he was again in prison in A.D. 211 (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 11) shews that the persecution, at any rate to some extent, still continued in the East, and Tertullian's letter to Scapula proves that it continued in Africa after the death of Severus. It however ceased soon afterwards (Sulp. Sev. ii. 32, in *Patr. Lat.* xx. 147) and it must have finally ended in A.D. 212, when Caracalla, after his brother's death, issued a general amnesty (Dion, lxxvii. 3). Cruel as it was, and severer than any previous persecution, it had not the systematic character of those of Decius and Diocletian. With the exception of Irenaeus, none of the bishops or prominent mem-

[a] Till lately the Scillitan Martyrdoms were assigned to the reign of Severus, and consequently those of Namphamo the protomartyr of Africa (St. Aug., *Epp.* 16 17) and his companions, which immediately preceded those of the Scillitans, but the *Acta* recently published by Usener (*vid.* App. to *Index Schol.* Bonn, 1881) and Aubé (*Étude sur un nouveau texte des Actes des Martyrs Scillitaines*) fix the date of the Scillitan Martyrdoms as July A.D. 180. See also Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II., vol. i. 507.

[b] The change in the date of the Scillitan Martyrdoms renders this doubtful. See Lightfoot, *Ap. F.* II. i. 523.

bers of the church seem to have been executed; many, like Tertullian and Origen, who might have been thought certain victims, were unmolested, and the resolution with which the martyrs bore their sufferings was the cause of many conversions. (The authorities are, for general history, the epitome of Dion Cassius, lxxiii. 14–lxxvi.; Herodian, ii. 9–iii.; the lives of Severus, Pescennius, and Albinus in the Augustan History; Tillemont, *Emp.* iii.; Gibbon, c. 5, 6; for the persecutions in general, Eus. *H. E.* vi. 1–12; Tillemont, *M. E.* iii.; Görres, in *Jahrbücher für Protest. Theol.* 1878, 273; for that in Africa in particular, Tertullian, *Apologeticus; ad Martyres; ad Nationes; ad Scapulam; de Fuga; de Corona Militis;* Aubé, *Revue Historique*, xi. 241.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (2), AURELIUS ALEXANDER, emperor, was born at Arca Caesarea, in Syria, on October 1st, A.D. 205 (Lampridius) or A.D. 208 (Herodian). For an account of his family see ELAGABALUS. Like him he was made in childhood a priest of the Sun at Emesa, and when his cousin became emperor he and his mother Julia Mamaea accompanied him to Rome. Mamaea took the utmost pains to educate her son, and to preserve him uncontaminated by the monstrous excesses of his cousin. After having been created Caesar by the emperor in A.D. 221, on the 1st February in the following year (Clinton) he became emperor on the death of Elagabalus and his mother Soaemis at the hands of the indignant soldiery. Being then at the most not yet seventeen the administration of affairs rested with his mother and grandmother Julia Mamaea and Julia Maesa, the latter of whom, down to her death, which took place about A.D. 225, enjoyed the greater share of power. Under them the chief minister or rather regent was the famous jurist Ulpian, whose appointment appears to have been due to Maesa's influence, though Mamaea afterwards acquiesced in it (Lamp. 50). He was assisted by a council of not less than seventy members, of whom from sixteen to twenty, who were eminent jurists, formed a sort of inner cabinet (compare Herodian, vi. i. with Lamp. 15). To separate committees of this council was referred the business of the different departments of the state.

The first step of the new administration was to reverse the acts of Elagabalus. The images of the gods which he had collected at Rome from all parts of the empire were restored to their former shrines. The creatures of Elagabalus were removed from the offices they had obtained by disgraceful means. The senate, the knights, the tribes, and the army were purged of the infamous persons with whom they had been filled by the late emperor. Not only was the palace cleared of the vile associates of Elagabalus and the ministers of his vices, but the imperial establishment was reduced as low as possible.

The praetorians and the army in general did not easily acquiesce in these reforms. Probably in order to check their mutinous spirit their prefects Flavianus and Chrestus were removed and put to death, and Ulpian was made sole prefect in their stead. One example will shew the temper of the praetorians. From some trifling cause a riot broke out between them and the people, which lasted for three days. The soldiers, getting the worst of it, set fire to the city and thus checked their assailants. They could not endure the firm rule of Ulpian. Several times he had to take refuge in the palace, and was saved with difficulty by the emperor from their fury. At last, probably in A.D. 228, he was killed by the soldiers in the presence of Alexander and his mother, who felt themselves so much at the mercy of the army that it was only by a stratagem they were able to punish the ringleader.

Throughout the empire the same insubordinate spirit prevailed. The troops in Mesopotamia mutinied and killed their commander Flavius Heracleon. The historian Dion by his firm rule in Pannonia had excited the hatred of the praetorians to such a degree, that Alexander was driven to the humiliating expedient of requesting him not to come to Rome during his consulship.

This spirit of mutiny was the more dangerous as the reign of Alexander witnessed the restoration of the Persian power. The Persians under Artaxerxes revolted against the Parthians. In three great battles, in one of which the Parthian king Artabanus fell, he completely broke their power, and by the most extraordinary revival recorded in history re-established the kingdom of Darius in A.D. 226. As heir of the ancient monarchy he claimed to be entitled to all the Asiatic provinces of Rome. Such pretensions naturally produced a war. At the end of A.D. 231 or the beginning of A.D. 232 the emperor, accompanied by his mother, left Rome to take the field against the Persians. He was detained for some time at Antioch by the seditious state of the army. One legion, following the example of Julius Caesar, he reduced to obedience by addressing the soldiers as Quirites and disbanding it. The accounts of the war are irreconcilable. According to Lampridius and the speech of Alexander, he reports, he vanquished Artaxerxes with heavy loss and conquered Mesopotamia. The account of Herodian, who gives a more detailed narrative, is totally different. According to him the plan of campaign was an invasion by three combined armies, the first marching on Media through Armenia, the second invading the country near the mouths of the Euphrates and Tigris, while the centre, under the emperor in person, was to support the other two, and all three were to unite at an appointed rendezvous. The execution, however, was unequal to the conception. The northern army indeed advanced into Media and gained considerable advantages, but on its retreat in winter through the Armenian mountains it suffered terribly from the cold. Neglecting its movements Artaxerxes concentrated his forces against the southern army, surrounded it and destroyed it, though the soldiers fought bravely, and though the Persian loss was as great as that of the Romans. This disaster was due to the inactivity of the central army, which should have advanced in support, but the emperor, either from illness, cowardice, or yielding to his mother's fears, had halted on the road. Thus covered with disgrace he returned to Antioch with the remnant of his troops. The Persians had however suffered so much that they kept quiet for three or four years, and thus allowed Alexander to return to Europe, where he was summoned by news of the movements of the Germans on the Rhine and Danube. After a

triumph at Rome on September 25th, A.D. 233 (Clinton), he proceeded to the Rhine frontier, where he was slain in his tent near Mayence, at the beginning of A.D. 235 (Clinton), by the mutinous soldiery, his mother perishing along with him. Whether his successor Maximin had any hand in his death, and whether he had previously been saluted emperor, is uncertain.

Thus perished the most virtuous of the emperors (except Antoninus and M. Aurelius) who had occupied the throne. Apparently his only faults were an excessive deference to his mother, and a certain want of energy. In his private habits he was frugal, temperate, and chaste. He was fond of reading, preferring Greek to Latin authors. His favourite works were the "Republic" of Plato and the "De Officiis" and "De Republica" of Cicero. He was also fond of Virgil and Horace. He was acquainted with geometry, was able to paint, and could sing and play on various instruments. Though he attended the temples regularly and visited the Capitol every seventh day, and though he rebuilt and adorned the shrines of various deities, yet, by a curious anticipation of Comtism, the objects of his peculiar veneration were not the gods of the various popular religions, but deified heroes and men. The private chapel in which he performed his devotions every morning contained no images of gods, but statues of canonised men. There were found the best of his predecessors, Alexander the Great, who might be called his patron saint, Orpheus, Apollonius of Tyana, Abraham, and Christ. In a smaller chapel were images of Achilles, Virgil, whom the emperor used to call the Plato of poets, Cicero, and other great men. From his mother's intercourse with Origen (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 21) he would naturally have better means of learning the doctrines and practices of Christianity than any of his predecessors. It is said indeed that he contemplated erecting a temple to Christ and placing Him among the gods. At any rate, though he did not give Christianity the status of a *religio licita*, yet the Christians during his reign enjoyed a *de facto* toleration. In the famous suit between the guild of cooks and the Christians for the possession of a piece of land, which according to tradition is the site of S. Maria in Trastevere, he decided in favour of the latter on the broad ground, that it was better that God should be worshipped there under whatever form than that it should be given to the cooks. This decision implies a certain recognition of the right of the Christians as such to hold property, which is also implied by the life of Callistus. [CALLISTUS, Vol. I. 391.] Consistently with this, it is in the reign of Alexander that edifices set apart for Christian worship begin to appear—at any rate in some parts of the empire (compare the letter of Firmilian to Cyprian (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* iii. 1163) with Origen, *homily* 28 *on St. Matthew*, (quoted in *contra Celsum*, viii. 755, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.* xi. 1539)). A form of the golden rule of Christian morality (Do not do to another, what you would not have done to yourself) was so admired by the emperor that he caused it to be inscribed on the palace and other buildings.[a]

[a] This may have been derived, not from a Christian source, but from the similar precept in the book of Tobit (iv. 15), "Do that to no man which thou hatest."

A curious anecdote of Lampridius (44) shews at once the emperor's acquaintance with Christian usages and the antiquity of the practice of publishing to the congregation the names of those who sought ordination. In imitation of this custom the emperor caused the names of persons he was about to appoint to be published beforehand to the people, who were exhorted if they had any charge against them to come forward and prove it.

Strange to say, in later tradition the emperor, whom all the authorities who wrote near his time represent as a friend, nay almost a convert, to Christianity, whose chapel contained an image of Christ, and whose household was filled with Christians (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 28), appears as a cruel persecutor. It is said that pope Callistus with many companions, St. Caecilia and her comrades, pope Urban I., and many others suffered in his reign and that he personally took part in their martyrdom. On the other hand, no father of the third, fourth, or fifth centuries knows anything of such a persecution, but they all on the contrary agree in representing the reign of Alexander as a period of peace. Firmilian, in the above passage testifies that before the persecution of Maximin the church had enjoyed a long peace. In like manner Sulpicius Severus (ii. 32 in *Patr. Lat.* xx. 447) includes the reign of Alexander in the long peace that lasted from the reign of Septimius Severus to that of Decius, broken only by the persecution of Maximin. Against this mass of testimony can be set only the evidence of late authors such as Bede, Ado, and Usuard and unauthentic Acts of Martyrs. The most famous of the alleged martyrs of this reign, St. Caecilia and her companions, are placed by other accounts in the reigns of M. Aurelius or Diocletian. [CAECILIA (1).] All these martyrs are given up by Tillemont with the exception of Callistus. His chief ground for considering him a martyr is that in the *depositio Martyrum*, written in A.D. 354 (in *Patr. Lat.* cxxvii. 123), a Callistus is mentioned as martyred on October 14th, the day on which the pope is commemorated. Lipsius, however (*Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe*, 177, 8), acutely conjectures that this notice does not refer to the martyrdom, but to the confession of Callistus before Fuscianus mentioned by Hippolytus [CALLISTUS, Vol. I. p. 390], as up to the Decian persecution the word martyr was still used in the wider sense. We may therefore conclude that all these accounts of persecutions and martyrdoms, which are so inconsistent with what is known of the character of the emperor, and which are passed over in silence by all the authors who lived for more than two centuries afterwards, are fictions of a later date. (Dion Cassius, lxxx.; Herodian, vi.; Lampridius; Tillemont, *Emp.* iii. 157, *M. E.* iii. 250, 258; Müller, *Studien zur Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit;* Muche, *de Imp. Alex. Sev.:* Görres, *Zeitsch. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1877.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (3) and SEVERIANS. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 29) having quoted the account given by Irenaeus of Tatian and the Encratites, proceeds to say that some little time after Tatian, these heretics had for their leader one Severus, from whom they obtained the name Severians. He says that they used the law, the prophets,

and the gospels, but put their own interpretations on the sacred writings; and that they blasphemed Paul the apostle, and rejected both his Epistles and the book of the Acts of the Apostles. This description would lead us to think of these Severians as an Ebionite sect.

A sect of Severians is described by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 45) which except the feature of Encratism has little in common with the sect described by Eusebius. Epiphanius evidently had not found this sect described in any previous treatise on heresies, for he is uncertain in what place in his list it ought to come. Nor does he describe the sect from personal knowledge, for he concludes his account with an expression of doubt whether any remains of the sect were still surviving in his day. His description, whencesoever derived, indicates a heresy of the Ophite family. It taught the existence of a good God dwelling in the highest heaven, but that the material Creation was not His work but that of certain Principalities and Powers. The devil, it was said, was the son of the great Archon, to whom some gave the name of Ialdabaoth, others of Sabaoth. They said that woman was made by Satan; and that those who married did the work of Satan. Indeed they taught that only half of man, from the navel upwards, was God's work; his lower parts had been made by the devil. This theoretical justification of abstinence from marriage they had in common with other Gnostic sects (Iren. I. xxiv. 2). But they justified their abstinence from wine by a myth, of which we do not read elsewhere, that the vine had sprung from carnal intercourse between the serpent and the earth; and they pretended to discover in the form of the plant and of its fruit, traces of its serpent origin. Though the sect described by Epiphanius has affinities with those called Ophites, they plainly held the serpent in no honour, but regarded it as a type of the evil principle.

It may reasonably be doubted whether there really was an Encratite teacher named Severus, or whether sects did not merely get the Latin name of Severians from the austerity of their rule of life. [G. S.]

SEVERUS (4), Oct. 22, priest of Heraclea, and martyr with St. Philip, bishop of that city, under a magistrate named Justinus. His sufferings are narrated in acts of Philip in Ruinart's *Acta Sincera* [PHILIPPUS (3)]. [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (5), FLAVIUS VALERIUS, chosen Caesar at Nicomedia in 305 by Diocletian; died as Augustus in April 307. Clinton's *Fasti*, A.D. 305–307. [*Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.*] [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (6), a correspondent of Lactantius, to whom he addressed two books of his epistles. Jerome mentions among ecclesiastical writers one Aquilius Severus, a Spaniard, and a member of the same family [LACTANTIUS, Vol. III. p. 615]. (Ceillier, ii. 507, iv. 347.) [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (7), ST., bishop of Ravenna. The one certain fact about him is that he attended and subscribed the decrees of the council of Sardica, A.D. 343 or 344. (Hilar. *Frag.* ii. 14, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* x. 643.) See also Agnellus, *Lib. Pont.* in *Patr. Lat.* cvi. 491, *Script. Rer. Lang.* 283, and *AA. SS.* Feb. i. 79). [F. D.

SEVERUS (8), a tribune of the city of Eleutheropolis in Palestine. He was a Luciferian and is mentioned in the *Libellus Precum* of Faustinus and Marcellinus. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xiii. 82.) [FAUSTINUS (33).] [MARCELLINUS (3).] [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (9), a chorepiscopus and witness to the subscription of Eustathius appended to the confession drawn up by St. Basil to satisfy Theodotus of Nicopolis. (Basil. *Epist.* 125.) [BASILIUS, Vol. I. p. 292.] [EUSTATHIUS (4).] [THEODOTUS.] [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (10), a blind butcher of Milan, whose restoration to sight St. Ambrose declares to have been effected by touching the relics of St. Gervasius. See GERVASIUS (1), Vol. II. p. 666, where this case is discussed. [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (11), a bishop of Southern Italy, to whom one of St. Ambrose's letters (lix.) was written [AMBROSIUS, Vol. I. p. 91]. He may probably be identified with St. Severus, bishop of Naples. [J. Ll. D.]

SEVERUS (12) SANCTUS (ENDELECHIUS). Perhaps identical with the rhetorician mentioned in the subscription of the cod. Flor. of Apuleius, as teaching at Rome in the year A.D. 395. He is the author of a Christian idyl, in Asclepiad metre, upon the subject of a great cattle-plague; possibly that mentioned by St. Ambrose (*comm. in Luc.* x. 10). This plague occurred about A.D. 376, which fact, together with the date assigned for Endelechius's teaching, and the possibility that he was the correspondent of St. Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 28, 6), would fix the date of the poem to the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century. The poem itself, which is entitled "de mortibus boum," is written with some taste and a good deal of vigour. It represents certain herdsmen—apparently Aquitanians—discussing their fortunes in the general affliction. One of them asserts that his herds have been protected by the sign of the Cross, and by his own belief in Christ. The others resolve to adopt a religion which, according to his account, is at once profitable and easy. The poem has been often edited: first by Pithoeus, Paris, 1586. It is to be found in Wernsdorf, *Poetae Lat. min.* ii.; Migne, xix. (Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 290; Ebert, *Gesch. der Chr.-Lat. Lit.*; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, x. 626, 2nd ed.; Teuffel, vol. ii.) [ENDELECHIUS.] [H. A. W.]

SEVERUS (13), presbyter of Constantinople, who in 403 accompanied GERMANUS (32), and the rest of Chrysostom's deputation to the synod of the oak (Pallad. *Dial.* c. 2 in *Pat. Gr.* xlvii. 9). [C. H.]

SEVERUS (14), bishop in Bruttium or Calabria, addressed by pope Innocent I. (Innocentii *Epist.* 38, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 605.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (15), bishop of Sitifa, whose niece was carried off by barbarians, A.D. 409, but restored (Aug. *Ep.* 111. 7). [H. W. P.]

SEVERUS (16), addressed by St. Nilus (lib. iii. ep. 199), in reference to Chrysostom's exile and sufferings. [C. H.]

SEVERUS (17), a presbyter, a friend of Chrysostom who writes remonstrating on his silence. (Chrys. *Ep.* 101.) [E. V.]

SEVERUS (18), SULPICIUS (as to the different modes of writing the name, see Ceillier viii. 110 note and *Hist. Litt.* ii. 95), ecclesiastical historian in Gaul in the latter half of the 4th and beginning of the 5th centuries, belonged to a noble family of Aquitaine, and, being rather younger than his friend St. Paulinus, of Nola, was born after the year 353. He adopted advocacy as his profession and married a woman of consular rank and wealth, who however did not long survive the marriage. About 392, while yet in the flower of his age, caressed and praised by all, and attaining eminence in his profession (Paulinus, *Ep.* v., Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxi. 169–170), he braved the anger of his father and the flouts of worldly acquaintances (*ibid.* i. col. 154), to retire from the world. Thenceforth in the company of a few disciples and servants he led a life of ascetic seclusion and literary activity, varied by occasional visits to his friend and master St. Martin of Tours (Paulinus, *Ep.* xvii.), and chequered, as we gather from Paulinus, by some troubles and serious illness (*Epp.* i., xvii.). The place of his abode is not quite certain, but was probably Primuliacum, a village between Toulouse and Carcassonne, where he built two churches (ibid. *Ep.* xxxii.) It was probably an estate of his wife or mother-in-law, his father apparently having disinherited him (cf. *Epist. ad Bassulam*). According to Gennadius he was a priest, but this has been questioned, and his tone towards the bishops and clergy, against whom he never misses an opportunity of inveighing as vain, luxurious, self-seeking, factious foes of Christianity and envious persecutors of his hero St. Martin, lends countenance to the doubt (*Hist. Sacr.* ii. 32; *Vita S. Martini*, 27; *Dialogi* 1, 2, 9, 21, 24, 26). Later authors have believed him a monk, some of Marmoûtiers, Martin's foundation at Tours, others of Marseilles, whither he may have been driven by the Vandal invasion. That he had taken monastic vows seems probable from the 1st cap. of the 1st Dialogue (cf. also ii. 8). The same Gennadius asserts that in his old age he was deceived into Pelagianism, but recognising the fault of loquacity he remained mute till his death, in order by penitential silence to correct the sin he had committed by much speaking. Others upon the ground of a passage in St. Jerome (Hieronym. *in Ezech.* cap. xxxvi., Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xx. 85) have accused him of Millennarianism. There is no doubt that at the Roman council held by pope Gelasius in A.D. 494 the *Dialogi*, under the name of *opuscula Postumiani et Galli*, were placed among the *libri apocryphi* (Mansi, viii. 151). The charge rested on *Dial.* ii. 14, where a strange theory as to the imminent appearance among men of Nero and Antichrist is put into the mouth of St. Martin. The chapter has been expunged in many of the Italian MSS. (Halm. *Sulpic. Sev. Praefatio*). The date of his death is unknown, and various years have been suggested between 406 and 429. Though he was never canonized, the belief to that effect having probably arisen from a confusion between him and St. Sulpicius, bishop of Bourges (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 968–9), he was commemorated from immemorial antiquity at Tours (Ceillier, viii. 110). The principal authorities for his life are the short biography of Gennadius (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* xix. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 1071), the letters of his friend Paulinus of Nola, with whom between the years 394 and 403 there was a constant interchange of gifts and letters, though only one letter of Sulpicius, and that probably a forgery, survives (*Epp.* i., v., xi., xvii., xxii.–xxiv., xxvii.–xxxii., Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxi., 153–330; Ceillier, vii., 55 sqq.), allusions in his own writings, especially in the *Vita S. Martini*, the *Epistolae*, and the *Dialogi*, and a panegyric by Paulinus of Périgueux (*De Vita S. Martini* lib. v. *Pat. Lat.* lxi. 1052). He is often referred to by Gregory of Tours, who himself wrote four books on the Miracles of St. Martin (see *Mirac. S. Martini*, I., 1), and many other ancient authors. These passages are collected in *Pat. Lat.* xx. 88 sqq. Among modern accounts of him may be mentioned the *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 95 sqq.; Ceillier, viii. 110 sqq.; Herbert, *Oeuvres, Traduction, Pref.* p. 5; and particularly the exhaustive notice of Jacob Bernays, *Die Chronik des Sulp. Sev.*, Berlin, 1861.

His works consist of the *Historia Sacra* or *Chronica*, a Life of St. Martin of Tours, three letters, and three Dialogues. The first of these, written about 403, was, as he informs us in the preface, an attempt to give a concise history of the world with dates from the Creation down to his own times, the consulship of Stilicho in 400. The sources he draws from are the Septuagint, the ancient Latin version of the Scriptures, the Chronicles of Eusebius, and the *Historici Ethnici*, as he calls the non-Christian authors (Herbert, *Notice*, p. 7). The first book and a portion of the second (caps. 1–27) are occupied with universal history down to the birth of Christ (see Ceillier, viii. 115; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 106–8; Herbert, *Notice*, p. 6–7 and Bernays, pp. 29 ff. for a discussion of the chronology and distinctive points of this portion). Then, omitting the period covered by the Gospel narrative and Acts of the Apostles, he adds some details to Josephus' narrative of the siege of Jerusalem, recounts persecutions of the Christians under nine emperors, and describes the Invention of the Cross by St. Helena, as he had heard it from Paulinus (see *Ep.* xxxi., *Pat. Lat.* lxi. 325 sqq.). His account of the Arian controversy (lib. ii. 35–45) is inaccurate, and of little value as a contribution to its history, but a more important portion of the work is the narrative contained in chapters 46–51 (supplemented by *Dial.* iii. 11–13) of the Priscillianist heresy, which had arisen in his own time, and with the details of which he was familiar.

The *Vita S. Martini*, the earliest in point of time of his writings, is very important as containing, with the Dialogues and three letters, practically everything that is authentic about, perhaps, the most popular saint of Western Christendom; the poem of Paulinus of Périgueux (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxi. 1009 sqq.) and the life by Venantius Fortunatus (*ibid.* lxxviii.

363 sqq.), deriving all the worth they possess from Sulpicius' narrative [MARTIN (1)]. He tells us that having long heard of the sanctity and miracles of Martin he undertook a journey to Tours to see him, and during his visit addressed to him all the questions he could, and got all the information he was able from eyewitnesses and those who knew (cap. 25). This visit, which probably took place about 394, was followed by many others. It was published during Martin's lifetime.

In the *Dialogi*, written about 405, the interlocutors are his friend Postumianus, who has just returned from a three years' stay in the East, Gallus, a disciple of St. Martin now dead, and Sulpicius himself. Twenty-two chapters of the first contain interesting pictures of the controversy at Alexandria between Theophilus, the archbishop, and the monks concerning the works of Origen, St. Jerome at his church in Bethlehem, and the monks and hermits of the Thebaid. His experiences concluded, Postumianus asks about St. Martin, and bears witness to the enormous popularity of the Life, which was known to almost every country of the world. Paulinus had introduced it at Rome, where the whole city had fought for it, and the booksellers were exultant. All Carthage was reading it, the Alexandrians knew its contents almost better than the author, and it had penetrated into Egypt, Nitria and the Thebaid.[a] All were clamouring for those further wonders which Sulpicius knew, but had omitted from the Life (Cap. 23, cf. *Vita, Prologus*). The remainder of the Dialogues is almost entirely occupied with a recital of these additional miracles of Martin, put into the mouth of his disciple Gallus, the audience in the third dialogue being swelled by some monks, clergy, and one or two laymen (cap. 1).

The Epistles to his mother-in-law, Bassula, Eusebius and Aurelius are also on the subject of St. Martin, the first giving the story of his death and burial. Seven more letters have been published under Sulpicius' name. Several of them have been generally suspected (Ceillier, 119–120), but they are all pronounced spurious by Halm (*Pref.* xi.–xiii.) though he prints them. Gennadius says he wrote many letters to his sister, exhorting to contempt of the world, two to Paulinus, and more to other people (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* xix.) It was perhaps this sentence which suggested the forgeries, if forgeries they are, two of them purporting to be addressed to his sister Claudia and one to Paulinus. Lastly, the life of St. Paulinus of Nola has been wrongly attributed to him by Honorius of Autun (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* ii. 19, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 92).

As to editions, the *Vita S. Martini*, as it was the first written, so it was the first printed, by Aldus Manutius in 1501, and again in the following year. The *Historia Sacra*, or *Chronica*, was first published at Basle in 1556. The collected works appear to have been printed at Basle in 1565 for the first time. The editions are very numerous, but the most noteworthy are those of Giselinus at Antwerp in 1574, of Sigonius at Bononia in 1581, of Drusius at Arnheim in 1607, of Hornius at Leyden in 1647, and the much superior one of Père Jérôme de Prato at Verona in 1741 and 1754. Galland reproduced this last in tom. viii. with the addition of the seven doubtful letters, and this version has been adopted in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* (xx. 95 sqq.) But the best edition is that of C. Halm (*Sulpicii Severi Libri qui supersunt*, Vindob. 1866), the preface to which gives some notes on the various MSS. See also Ceillier, viii. 122 sqq., *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 104 sqq., 742–3, and Bernays, *ibid.* pp. 71–2. His works have been several times translated into French, among others by M. Herbert (*Oeuvres de Sulp. Sev. Traduction nouvelle*, Paris, 1847).

Apart from the unique history of St. Martin, which, however, is the worst of his writings from a literary point of view, Sulpicius' chief title to fame rests on the beauty and purity of his style ('eloquia tua tam facunda quam casta,' Paulinus, *Ep.* xi. *Patr. Lat.* col. 197). He has successfully avoided that pitfall of his countrymen, the "ubertas gallici nitorque sermonis" of which Jerome speaks (*Epist.* cxxv. *ad Rusticum*, *Patr. Lat.* xxii. 1072), and it is not too much to say that in respect of style he is pre-eminent, if not unique, among ecclesiastical authors, and well merits his appellation of the 'Christian Sallust.' He seems to have taken this historian as his model, but his writings bear traces of familiarity with Virgil, Livy, Tacitus, and most of the classical authors. Perhaps, like other copies, his work is somewhat lacking in vigour. Nor is it entirely free from the affectations and bad taste of his time. The polish of the style moreover often contrasts strangely with the credulity and superstition of the narrative, which in the case of Martin's Miracles, had evidently excited scepticism even among the Christians in Sulpicius' own time (see *Dial.* iii. 6). For a discussion of the whole question of the supernatural in this connection see MARTIN (1), and for an estimate of Sulpicius' works see Ceillier, viii. 121–2.

[S. A. B.]

SEVERUS (19), bishop of Mileum or Mileus, a native of the same place as Augustine, and a fellow student, but probably older than he; also a member of the same monastic community with him and also Alypius and Evodius, and a friend of Augustine throughout his life. He became bishop of Mileum about the beginning of the 5th century, succeeding Honorius. Early in his episcopate, probably in A.D. 401, it became necessary for Augustine, together with Alypius and Samsucius, to explain their own conduct in the matter of Timotheus, and to call on Severus to accept their explanation (Aug. *Ep.* 62, 63), but this temporary misunderstanding by no means interrupted the friendship between him and Augustine, nor does it seem to have caused any ill-will on his part towards Timotheus (August. *En. Ps.* 95. 1; *De Civitate Dei*, lib. xxi. cap. 4). In a letter of somewhat later date, perhaps A.D. 406, addressed to Novatus, Augustine mentions with regret how seldom he was able to see his old friend, who wrote but seldom, and then chiefly on business, not from want of good will but from necessity (Aug. *Ep.* 84). Severus was also on friendly terms with Paulinus of Nola,

[a] This statement is curiously confirmed by the extraordinary number of the existing MSS. of the *Vita*, see Halm (*Sulp. Sev. Praefatio*, p. viii.)

with whom he exchanged letters and friendly messages (*ibid.* 31. 9, and 32. 1); and when Augustine wrote to Olympius, the bearer of the letter, a presbyter of Mileum, was desired by Severus, who joined in the request contained in it, to call at Hippo on his way, and to convey to him their joint salutations (*Ep.* 97.) [OLYMPIUS (10).] About A.D. 409 Severus wrote to Augustine a letter, conveyed by Quodvultdeus and Gaudentius, expressing the great delight which he took in his writings, and the benefit which he derived from them as leading him to greater love of God, and begging him to write to him in return (*Ep.* 109). To this Augustine with his monks replied, sending the letter by Timotheus, and in it disclaimed his friend's eulogies, and insisting that he himself is a debtor to him. He entreats him however to bear in mind his many pressing occupations, which leave him, as he says, little more than a few drops of time. He hopes that he will visit him, in which case he will see the truth of this statement, and that he will discourage others from writing to him (*Ep.* 110). An anonymous letter, of unknown date, supposed, formerly, but without good reason, to have come from St. Jerome, mentions to Augustine the writer's disappointment at not finding him at the place, Legis or Leges, where he expected to do so, but expressing his pleasure at finding his dear friend (partem animae) Severus (*Ep.* 270). He appears to have gone to Carthage, to attend the conference there, A.D. 411, but to have been obliged by infirmity to retire before the business had begun (*Carth. Coll.* i. 215). He appears however to have joined in the address to Innocentius concerning Pelagianism, A.D. 416 (Aug. *Ep.* 175, 176). He died probably about A.D. 426, for in his account of the appointment of Eraclius, his own successor, Augustine mentions what had taken place at Mileum after the death of Severus, then a recent event. Before his death he had nominated a successor, but made known the nomination to the clergy only and not to the laity, whose minds were much disturbed by the omission: and Augustine was obliged to make a journey to Mileum to settle the question, which he was able to do without change as to the nominee of Severus (*ibid.* 213). He appears to have been an amiable and pious man and a good preacher, but perhaps wanting in judgment. [H. W. P.]

SEVERUS (20), a blind deacon at Hippo, whose charity towards his mother and sister is praised by Augustine (*Serm.* 156 § 5 in *Pat. Lat.* xxxix. 1576; Tillem. xiii. 853). [C. H.]

SEVERUS (21), ST., Aug. 8 (cf. *D. C. A.*), a priest at Vienne, contemporary with St. Germanus of Auxerre, mentioned by Ado archbishop of Vienne (*Chron.* in *Pat. Lat.* cxxiii. 103). Ado calls him a native of India who quitted his country to preach the faith in various parts. Coming to Vienne he converted many pagans, destroyed an idol temple, and erected a church before the city gate. Germanus passed through Vienne on his way to Italy as the church was near its completion, and promised that he would attend the dedication. The day for this ceremony arrived, and just as the service was about to commence the corpse of Germanus on its way from Italy was borne in. Tillemont (xv. 23), mentions an inscription, but of no early authority, to the effect that Severus died in 430. [C. H.]

SEVERUS (22), bishop of Minorca, is known only by his encyclical letter referred to in the book *de Miraculis S. Stephani*, i. 2, composed by order of EVODIUS (3) of Uzalis, first published by Baronius (*Ann.* A.D. 418), and reprinted in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 731, and again in the Appendix—*de S. Stephani reliquiis*—to St. Augustine's *de Civitate Dei*, xli. 821. OROSIUS had brought some of the recently discovered relics of the saint to Minorca, and deposited them in the church at Magona (Port Mahon), where there were a large number of Jews, one of whom, the Rabbi Theodorus, was *defensor civitatis*. The arrival of the relics caused great religious excitement among the Christians, which led to constant arguments between them and Jews. A day was fixed for a conference, so as to allow time for the return of Theodorus from Majorca, and in the meantime the Jews placed in their synagogue stones and weapons to defend themselves, while Severus with a great number of the Christians of Jammona, the other town in the island, where he resided, proceeded to Magona. On his arrival he summoned the Jews to meet him at the church, and on their declining, on the ground that it was the Sabbath, and they would be polluted by entering it, he proposed meeting them at the synagogue. Again being met with a refusal, he demanded why they had collected arms in the synagogue, and on their denial marched thither at the head of the Christians. On the way stones were thrown at the procession by some persons, the Christians retaliated, and, though no one was hurt, the synagogue was set on fire, and nothing left but the bare walls. These events were followed by the conversion of a great number of the Jews, including Theodorus himself, and also including some who had fled the country but afterwards returned. In all about 540 were baptized, but it may be doubted whether in all cases the conversions were sincere or were caused by fear of violence. On the site of the destroyed synagogue the Jews erected a church. These events took place in the last week of January, A.D. 418. (Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (1) 406.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (23), thirteenth bishop of Trèves, and a man of singular sanctity, was disciple of St. Lupus of Troyes, and accompanied St. Germanus in his second missionary visit to Britain, A.D. 447. To this work Severus was invited when preaching to the tribes of Germania Prima: the same account of him is given by Bede (*H. E.* i. c. 21), and in the Lives of St. Lupus [LUPUS (2)] (Boil. *A. SS.* Jul. vii. 75, 81, 83, 93), and St. Germanus [GERMANUS (8)] (*Ib.* Jul. vii. 227; Surius, *Vit. SS.* vii. 421, 422). He died A.D. 455, and his feast is Oct. 15 (*Ib.* Oct. vii. 31–4; Fleury, *H. E.* xxvii. 7, xxix. 43; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 378). [J. G.]

SEVERUS (24), LIBIUS, emperor at Rome from A.D. 461–465. He died in Rome Aug. 15, 465. Some of his coins will be found in Eckhel, t. viii. p. 196, and some of his laws in Novell. v. i. p. 37, and ii. p. 38. Clinton's *Fasti;* DICT. GR. AND ROM. BIOG. [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (25), a bishop to whom pope Simplicius writes in November, A.D. 475, on the case of Gaudentius, bishop of Aufinium. [GAUDENTIUS (16)]. Gaudentius having been deprived of the power of ordaining, Severus was if necessary, to ordain in his stead. (Simplicii *Epp.* 3 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 37.) [F. D]

SEVERUS (26), ST., abbat, patron of Agde. His *Acta*, which were first published by Mabillon, and are also to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. v. 159, were apparently written by a monk of Agde, probably more than two centuries after his death (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 50, 682). They are of little value. Severus's day is Aug. 25, but he does not appear in the ancient martyrologies (Boll. *ibid.* p. 156). [S. A. B.]

SEVERUS (27), patriarch of Antioch, A.D. 512–519; a Monophysite, intruded into the see by Anastasius on the deposition of Flavian. Severus may be regarded as the true scientific head of the previously headless party of the Acephali, sharing with Philoxenus (Xenaias) the origination of the Jacobite form of Monophysitism, so long prevalent in Egypt, and still maintained by the Copts. The memory of Severus is still solemnly honoured in all the Jacobite communions, by whom he is regarded as only second to Cyril and Dioscorus (Neale, *Patr. of Alexandria*, ii. 28), and styled, *par excellence*, "the patriarch." His name is commemorated in several of the Jacobite liturgies with those of Dioscorus, Philoxenus, etc. (Renaudot, *Liturg.* 230, 260, 291, 481, 505.) It is unfortunate for a just estimate of Severus's character and work that we know him and his actions almost exclusively through the distorted medium of the testimony of his theological opponents, many of whose disparaging statements, dictated by a polemical rancour which, it must be confessed, his own violence and party bitterness did little to disarm, may be safely regarded as the exaggerations of those who desired to believe all that was ill of one whom they found to be so able and so powerful an antagonist. We learn from Evagrius (*H. E.* iii. 33) that Severus was a native of Sozopolis in Pisidia ("de Severo gloriatum Sozopolis," *Offic. Syr. Jacobit.*). By birth and education he was a heathen. He devoted himself to legal studies, and practised as an advocate at Berytus. In the memorial presented to Mennas by the monks of Jerusalem and Syria, he is accused of having practised magical arts. To escape the odium he had thus incurred, he is charged by the same suspicious authority with having feigned conversion to Christianity, being baptized in the martyry of Leontius at Tripolis (Evagr. *l. c.*; Labbe, v. 40, 120).

He had scarcely been admitted into the orthodox communion when he openly united himself to the Acephali, repudiating not only his own baptism and his baptizer, but the Catholic church itself as infected with Nestorianism, and denouncing the "holy houses of God as lodging places of heresy and impiety." (Labbe, *u. s.*) On embracing Monophysite doctrines, he assumed the monastic life in a monastery apparently belonging to that sect between Gaza and its port Majuma. Here he met with Peter the Iberian, a zealous Eutychian, who had been ordained bishop of Gaza by Theodosius, the fanatical Monophysite monk, during the time of his usurpation of the see of Jerusalem, and who had subsequently been one of the ordaining prelates of Timothy Aelurus, and had been banished together with him (Evagr. *l. c.*). About this time Severus seems to have joined a Eutychian brotherhood near Eleutheropolis under the Archimandrite Mamas [MAMAS (2)], by whom he was still further confirmed in his Monophysite opinions. (Liberat. *Brev.* c. xix.; Labbe, v. 762; Evagr. *l. c.*) These were of the most extreme character. He rejected the "Henoticon" of Zeno, to which he applied various contumelious epithets, such as κενωτικόν, "the annulling edict," and διαιρετικόν, "the disuniting edict" (Labbe, v. 121), and anathematized Peter Mongus, the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, for accepting it. We next hear of Severus in an Egyptian monastery, of which one Nephalius was abbat [NEPHALIUS], who, having been formerly a Monophysite, had embraced the orthodox faith as formulated at Chalcedon. Severus engaged in a controversy with Nephalius, with the view of bringing him back to his former opinions. His arguments may have proved too subtle for Nephalius to refute, or their frank heresy may have shocked his former sympathizer, who with his monks expelled Severus and his partizans from their monastery. (Evagr. *l. c.* cf. iii. 22.) Severus is charged with having stirred up a fierce religious war among the excitable population of Alexandria, resulting in bloodshed and conflagrations. (Labbe, v. 121.) To escape the punishment of his turbulence, Severus fled to Constantinople, supported by a band of 200 Monophysite monks. (Labbe, iv. 1419.) He appeared in the capacity of an "apocrisiarius," though whom he represented is somewhat doubtful. Liberatus's language, however, indicates that he was deputed by Peter Mongus (Labbe, v. 762), which is accepted by the cautious Tillemont. (*Mém. Eccles.* xvi. 684.) On being reproached with having previously anathematized Peter, Severus is said to have replied that it was true he had anathematized *a* Peter; but this was not Peter Mongus, but Peter of Apamea. (Liberat. *l. c.*) Anastasius, who had succeeded the author of the Henoticon in 491, was a declared favourer of the Eutychians. By him Severus was received with honour. His advent, however, was an unhappy one for the peace of Constantinople. The streets of the city were the scene of a sanguinary tumult stirred up by rival bands of monks, orthodox and Monophysite, chanting in their respective churches the opposing forms of the "Trisagion," to which sacred formula the obnoxious clause added by Peter the Fuller, "who wast crucified for us," imparted a heretical colour. There was a wild and fierce fray, resulting in the humiliation of Anastasius, the temporary triumph of the patriarch Macedonius, and the depression of the Monophysite cause. (Theophan. p. 132.) This took place A.D. 511. For the deposition of Macedonius, and subsequently of Flavian, patriarch of Antioch, the articles devoted to those two names may be consulted. [MACEDONIUS; FLAVIANUS.] Severus was eagerly despatched by Anastasius to occupy the vacant throne of Antioch A.D. 511. He was ordained, or, in the words of his adversaries, "received the shadow of ordination" (Labbe, v. 40), and enthroned on the same day in his patriarchal

city. (Labbe, iv. 1414; Theod. Lect. ii. 31, p. 563, 567; Theophan. p. 134.) The attempt of Timotheus to substitute Severus's name for that of Flavian in the Constantinopolitan diptychs was frustrated by the people. (Theoph. p. 135.) If the statement of the *Synodicon* is to be credited (Labbe, iv. 1414) that Anastasius had made him swear that he would never speak or act against the council of Chalcedon, Severus speedily showed how little store he set by the sanctity of an oath compared with the triumph of his theological dogmas, since on the very day of his enthronement he solemnly pronounced in his church an anathema on Chalcedon, and accepted the "Henoticon" which he had previously repudiated. He also caused the name of Peter Mongus to be inscribed in the diptychs; declared himself in communion with the Eutychian prelates, Timotheus of Constantinople and John Niciota of Alexandria; and received into communion Peter of Iberia and the other leading members of the Acephali. (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 33; Labbe, iv. 1414, v. 121, 762; Theod. Lect. *l. c.*) Eutychianism seemed now triumphant throughout the Christian world. Proud of his patriarchal dignity, and strong in the emperor's protection, Severus despatched his enthronistic and synodal letters to his brother prelates, announcing his elevation and demanding communion. In these he anathematized Chalcedon, and all who maintained the two natures. These letters met with a very varied reception. Many rejected them altogether. Among these were the metropolitans, Julian of Bostra and Epiphanius of Tyre, who presented a prolix memorial to the council under Mennas, A.D. 536, detailing his impieties and cruelties (Labbe, v. 194, 202), Theodorus of Antaradus, and the bishops of Tripolis and of Arce. (Labbe, v. 196.) Those of Eutychian proclivities received the letters gladly while they were accepted by not a few through fear of the consequences of refusal. These apprehensions were not unfounded. A fierce and sanguinary persecution of the adherents of the orthodox faith was set on foot in the patriarchate. In this Severus had Peter of Apamea as his zealous associate. In conjunction with him, Severus is charged with having planted in ambush a body of Jewish mercenaries, who fell upon a body of pilgrims to the mandra of St. Simeon, of whom they butchered 250, leaving their unburied corpses by the roadside, burned over their heads the monasteries in which the fugitives had taken refuge, and slaughtered their monastic inmates. (Evagr. iii. 33; Labbe, iv. 1462; v. 157, 194–202.) Not a few of the bishops and clergy of the patriarchate fled from their charge, among whom Evagrius particularizes Julian of Bostra, Peter of Damascus, and Severus's former instructor in Eutychian doctrine, the abbat Mamas. Others were deposed and banished. (Theophanes, p. 107.) The monasteries of Palestine, and Jerusalem itself remained steadfast to the orthodox faith, for which Elias, patriarch of Jerusalem, suffered deposition. (Evagr. *l. c.*) Two of Severus's own suffragans, Cosmas of Epiphania and Severian of Arethusa, had the hardihood to draw up a sentence of deposition against their patriarch, which they caused to be placed in his hands by the archdeacon Aurelian, disguised as a female, under colour of presenting a petition. (Evagr. iii. 34.) Anastasius commanded the deposition of the two remonstrants and of the others who refused communion with Severus; but, on learning that this edict could not be carried out without risk of riot and bloodshed, he allowed them to remain undisturbed. (Evagr. *l. c.*) John, appointed patriarch of Jerusalem in room of Elias, who, as the price of his elevation, had promised communion with Severus and acceptance of the Monophysite doctrines, when once firmly established turned round under the influence of St. Sabbas, and undeterred by the threats of fine and imprisonment, refused to communicate with him (Theophan. p. 136). But notwithstanding these defections, Monophysitism was everywhere in the ascendant in the East, and Severus was deservedly regarded as its chief champion and "a horn of salvation to the orthodox." (Severus of Ashmunain apud Neale, *Patr. Alex.* ii. 27.) Synodal letters were interchanged between John Niciota and Severus; the earliest examples of that intercommunication between the Jacobite sees of Alexandria and Antioch, which has been kept up to the present day. (Neale, *l. c.*) The triumph of Severus was however short. His sanguinary tyranny over the patriarchate of Antioch did not survive his imperial patron. Anastasius was succeeded in 518 by the rude Dacian peasant-soldier Justin, who at once declared for the orthodox faith. The Monophysite prelates were everywhere deposed to make room for orthodox successors. Severus was one of the first to fall. His deposition was hastened, it is said, by the urgency of the orthodox but dangerously powerful Scythian officer, Vitalian, who had been the object of attack in some of Severus's harangues. Irenaeus, the count of the East, was commissioned to arrest him and have his tongue cut out as a punishment for his blasphemies. Severus, however, managed to evade this edict, and after having been detained in Antioch for a while under the strictest surveillance he effected his escape, and in September 518, embarking at Seleuceia, the port of Antioch, by night, set sail for Alexandria, whither Julian of Halicarnassus had preceded him. (Liberat. *Brev. l. c.*; Theophan. 141; Evagr. *H. E.* iv. 4.) Paul was ordained in his room. His adherents seceded from the church, and Severus and his doctrines were anathematized in various councils. At Alexandria the reception of Severus by his fellow religionists was enthusiastic. He was gladly welcomed by the patriarch Timotheus, and generally hailed as the champion of the orthodox faith against the corruptions of Nestorianism. His learning and argumentative power established his authority as "os omnium doctorum," and the day of his entrance into Egypt was long celebrated as a Jacobite festival. (Neale, *u. s.* p. 30.) Alexandria speedily became the common home of Monophysites of every shade of opinion, who formed too powerful a body for the emperor to molest. The refugees were no sooner delivered from the apprehension of open persecution than fierce controversies arose among themselves on various subtle questions connected with Christ's nature and His human body. A vehement dispute arose between Severus and his fellow-exile, Julian of Halicarnassus, as to the corruptibility of our Lord's human body before His resurrection. The latter held that Christ's body was not only not

subject to corruption, but that it was also free from the transient character of ordinary human bodies, and elevated above the wear and tear and consequent necessity for reparation by food and sleep incident to them. Julius and his followers were therefore styled "Aphthartodocetae" and "Phantasiastae," as it was asserted that they made Christ's body a mere appearance, not a reality. Severus, and his adherents, who maintained the opposite view, received from their opponents the opprobrious epithets of "Phthartolatrae" or "Corrupticolae," and "Ktistolatrae." The controversy was a warm and protracted one, and no settlement was arrived at. The Jacobites, however, claim the victory for Severus, whom they commemorate with special honour for having "confounded the phantasiastic dreams of Julian." (Renaudot, p. 129.) After spending some years in Egypt in perpetual literary and polemical activity, Severus found himself unexpectedly summoned to Constantinople by Justin's successor, Justinian. Though himself an orthodox Christian, his empress Theodora warmly favoured the Eutychian party. The emperor himself had become utterly weary of the turmoil and confusion caused by the long continued theological discussions. Severus, he was told, was the master of the Monophysite party. If unity was to be regained it could only be by his influence. Letters passed between the emperor and empress, which Nicephorus speaks of as extant in his time (Nic. Callist. *H. E.* lib. xvii. c. 8). At this period, A.D. 535, Anthimus had been recently appointed to the see of Constantinople by Theodora's influence. He was a concealed Eutychian, who on his accession at once threw off the orthodox mask, and joined heartily with Severus and his associates, Peter of Apamea and Zoaras, in their endeavours to annul the Chalcedonian decrees and cause Monophysitism to be recognised as the orthodox faith. According to the memorial of the eastern monks, presented at the council under Mennas, this introduction of zealous and turbulent Monophysites threw the city into great religious disorder. The newcomers were active in propagating their tenets, establishing private conventicles of their co-religionists, baptizing privately and even in public, and leading large numbers to embrace their pernicious heresy. (Labbe, v. 124.) The further progress of this audacious attempt to establish Monophysitism in the imperial city is fully narrated in other articles, and need not be repeated here. (JUSTINIANUS I. *D. C. B.* iii. 545 B, 546 A; ANTHIMUS, AGAPETUS.) The result was that, at the instance of pope Agapetus, who happened to visit Constantinople on political business at this time, the Monophysites Anthimus and Timotheus were deposed, and Severus was again subjected to an anathema. The orthodox Mennas succeeded to Anthimus's vacated seat. (Liberat. *Breviar. c.* xxi.; Labbe, v. 774.) The new patriarch summoned a local synod, *συνόδος ἐνδημοῦσα*, in the months of May and June A.D. 536, to deal with the Monophysite question, and to consider the charges brought against Severus and his associates. The "Acta" of this council include a number of memorials presented by oriental prelates clergy and monks directed against the Monophysite leaders, in which Severus is accused of acts of the utmost impiety, blasphemy, violence and cruelty. (Labbe, v. 101–251.) Their condemnation was a foregone conclusion. Severus and his two companions were all pronounced to have wilfully chosen the "sin unto death," and therefore the previous sentences against them were confirmed, and they were cast out "as wolves" from the true fold, and anathematized. (Labbe, v. 253–255.) The sentence was ratified by Justinian (*ib.* 265). [MENNAS.] The writings of Severus were proscribed, and any one possessing them who failed to commit them to the flames was sentenced to lose his right hand. (Evagr. *H. E.* iv. 11; Novell. Justinian. no. 42; Matt. Blastar. p. 59.) Severus on this returned to Egypt, which he seems never again to have left. The date and place of his death are uncertain. It is fixed variously in A.D. 538, 539, and 542. Bar-Hebraeus (ed. Abbeloos. i. 212) says that he died at Alexandria in February, A.D. 543. According to John of Ephesus, he died in the Egyptian desert, to which he had retired on his return to Egypt. (ed. Payne Smith, i. 78.) Assemâni states that he had adopted a monastic disguise, and places his death Feb. 28, A.D. 539. (*Dissert. de Monophys.*)

Severus was a very copious writer. The catalogue of his writings occupies no fewer than eleven folio pages in Assemani's great work on the Monophysites, pp. 191–201, but of all his works we possess little more than fragments. An account of them, so far as they can be identified, is given by Cave (*Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 499 ff.) and Fabricius (*Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. 36, vol. x. p. 614 ff., ed. Harless). A very large number exist only in Syriac, for which may be consulted the catalogue of the Syriac MSS. by Professor Wright in the British Museum. The Greek works mentioned by Cave and Fabricius may be thus classified. (I.) *Works on the Holy Scriptures.* Commentaries on Job, Matthew, Luke, and John, are erroneously ascribed to Severus on the ground of very frequent quotations in the *Catenae.* These however are probably passages from his sermons or other works. A commentary on the Psalms is mentioned by Bar-Hebraeus or Abul Pharagius (Cave, *u. s.* p. 501), and a work on St. Luke is quoted in one of the Coislin MS. (Montf. *Bibl. Coislin*, p. 54). Cave also mentions "Answers to questions on Holy Scripture" proposed by the chamberlain Eupraxius, which however is doubtless only one of his innumerable letters (cf. Wright's *Catal.* p. 944, col. 2, No. xii.) One of these is probably cited by Anastasius Sinaita (*Quaest.* 152, p. 612), viz. "How the three days sepulture and the resurrection of Christ are to be understood?" The fragment of an attempt to harmonize the accounts of the Resurrection given by the Evangelists published by Montfaucon from one of the Coislin MSS. and ascribed to Severus (*Bibl. Coislin*, pp. 68–75) had previously appeared among the printed works of Gregory Nyssen (ed. Paris, 1615, 1638), but it has been more correctly assigned by Combefis (*Auctar. Nov.* 1648) to Hesychius of Jerusalem. (II.) *Sermons and Homilies.* As many as 160 of these are enumerated in the various Catenae. Montfaucon gives a list of the quotations given in the *Catenae* (*u. s.* p. 53, 61). Some of these sermons are described as *λόγοι ἐπιθρόνιοι*, or *ἐπιθρονιαστικοί*, *Homiliae Cathedrales*, so called, because they were delivered from the patri-

archal throne. They were delivered in the Church of St. Ignatius by Severus, who "took occasion from time to time to turn aside from his main text, and commemorate as a man of like spirit, the apostolic martyr whose reliques reposed in the building" (Lightfoot, *S. Ignatius* i. 48). The wide popularity of these epithroniastic orations is shewn by the fact that two Syriac versions of them, to the number of 125, are extant, the earlier by Paul of Callinicus (?), the later by Jacob of Edessa, A.D. 701 (Wright's *Catalogue of Syr. MSS.* pp. 534, 546). This later version (*MSS. Addit. Brit. Mus.* 12,159, is divided into three books, containing respectively Hom. 1–50, 57–89, 90–125 (Lightfoot, *u. s.* i. pp. 25, 48, 180, ii. 419). A fragment from one of these is given by Joannes Damascenus (ed. Le Quien, vol. i. p. 504). Another fragment of a homily on St. Euphemia, in which the writer anathematizes Chalcedon, the Tome of Leo, and all who deny the two natures and the two operations, is given in the Acts of the Lateran Council, A.D. 649 (Labbe, vi. 316). Fragments of sermons on Isaiah are mentioned by Cave (*l. c.*), "ap. Cl. Galeum." Of these, Cave remarks, "Dictio ejus splendida; modus interpretandi anagogicus." A large number of Severus's sermons exist in other Syriac MSS. besides those already specified. (III.) *Polemical.* As might be expected, it was in polemics that Severus manifested his chief activity. Among the polemical works cited or named, are: (1) Φιλαλήθης directed against John of Caesarea. In this Severus is said by Anastasius (*Hodegus*, c. 6) to have undertaken to destroy the alleged authority of the fathers in favour of the doctrine of the two natures, by repudiating as forgeries all such passages as he could not explain away, and only accepting those which he was able to interpret in favour of his own views. This work is stated to have been held in the highest esteem by the Monophysites, who placed it even above the Gospel of St. John, refusing to accept any statement of the fathers unless confirmed by Severus. Severus was also the author of an *Apologia* or "Defence" of the Φιλαλήθης (Wright, *Cat.* 1323, col. 1). (2.) *A Treatise addressed to Nephalius and Simplicius* in defence of the Monophysite doctrines. This is also quoted by Anastasius Sinaita, and in Syriac MSS. (Wright, *u. s.* 1323, col. 1). (3.) *Against Joannes Grammaticus* of Caesarea, in three books, written at Alexandria after his deposition, in reply to a book published by this John in defence of the council of Chalcedon, and directed against Timotheus. This is mentioned by Anastasius (*l. c.*), and is cited in the Acts of the Lateran Council (Labbe, vi. 308). There is also a Syriac translation (Wright, *u. s.* 1323, col. 1). (4.) *Against the Codicils of Alexander*, in several books. (5.) *Against the "Testamentum" of Lampetius*, a presbyter of the Euchites; written while still a presbyter to refute the errors of that sect (Phot. *cod.* 52). (6.) *A treatise* on ἅγιος ὁ θεός. (7.) Ὑπακοὴ εἰς τοὺς μάρτυρας. (8.) *Against Julian of Halicarnassus*, from which there is a short citation in Photius (*cod.* 225). For Syriac translations of these see Wright, *u. s.* 554, 555, 1323. (9.) *Against Felicissimus*, in four books at least. (10.) *A dialogue against Anastasius.* (IV.) *Epistolary.* Cave remarks, "epistolae Severi pene infinitae; synodicae, enthronisticae, familiares." Montfaucon (*u. s.* pp. 55–58) furnishes a long list of letters quoted or referred to in the Coislinian MSS. Fabricius also (*u. s.* pp. 346–348) gives the names of between fifty and sixty different persons to whom it is known Severus wrote. Quotations from letters to Eleusius, Oecumenius, and Sergius Grammaticus are found in the Acts of the Lateran Council (Labbe, vi. 316), and of those to Paulus Haereticus, Anthimus and Theodosius in the Acts of the Third Council of Constantinople, (*ib.* 834, 835). Large collections of translations of the letters of Severus into Syriac exist among the Nitrian MSS. in the British Museum (see Wright's *Catalogue*, pp. 558–569). One volume (*MSS. Add.* 17,200) contains the correspondence of Severus and Julian of Halicarnassus on the Corruptibility of the Body of Christ, translated by Paul of Callinicus (Wright's *Cat.* p. 554); another that of Severus and Sergius Grammaticus on the two natures (Wright, *u. s.* 557). Cave attributes to Severus a treatise on the Ritual of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper as observed in the Syrian churches, translated into Latin from the Syriac by Guido Fabricius Boderianus (Antwerp, 1572), and erroneously assigned by him, contrary to the evidence of the Codex itself (Fabr. *u. s.* 348, 9), to Severus patriarch of Alexandria: "qui nullus unquam fuit" (Renaudot, *Liturg.* ii. 330). The active genius of this remarkable man displayed itself also in sacred poetry. Among the Syriac MSS. of the British Museum (*MSS. Add.* 17,134, 18,816) is a collection of his Hymns, two hundred and ninety-five in number, translated from the original Greek, among them being one (fol. 48a) in honour of his great predecessor on the patriarchal throne, Ignatius (Lightfoot, *u. s.* i. 91, 185). "As the teaching of Ignatius seemed to favour Monophysite doctrine, he is frequently quoted by Severus" (*ib.* 169). The translator, according to Assemani (*B. O.* ii. 47), was Paul of Callinicus, who translated the Homilies and several other works of Severus at Edessa; but Wright has shewn (*Catal.* 330, 336) that the translator of the hymns was not this Paul but his contemporary, Paul bishop of Edessa, while residing in Cyprus.

One of the Jacobite Liturgies bears the name of Severus, exchanged in some codices for that of Timotheus of Alexandria. The invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements, Renaudot remarks is continuous with the words of institution, "uno tenore dicitur," which he says is no doubtful mark of antiquity (Renaudot, *Liturg.* p. 330).

The great object of Severus was to unite the Monophysites into one compact body, with a definitely formulated Creed. In this he may be pronounced to have been successful. For notwithstanding the numerous sects and parties into which the Monophysites were divided and subdivided, he was, in Dorner's words, "strictly speaking, the scientific leader of the most compact portion of the party," and was regarded as such both by the Monophysites themselves and their opponents. He was the chief object of attack in the long waged and fierce contest with the orthodox party, by whom he is always designated as the author and ringleader of the detestable heresy they were seeking to crush. Severus's opinions, however, were far from being consistent, and no little difficulty appears to have

been experienced by his opponents in arriving at a clear and definite view of them. That he contradicted himself is constantly asserted by them. This was to some extent forced upon him by the conciliatory position he aimed at occupying. With the view of embracing as many as he could of varying theological colour, he followed the traditional formulas of the Church as closely as possible, while he affixed his own sense upon them (Dorner, *Pers. of Christ*, div. ii. vol. i. p. 136, Clark's translation). His conception of the Incarnation was, that all the human qualities remained in Christ unchanged in their nature or essence, but that they were amalgamated with the totality of the hypostasis; that they had no longer a separate existence, and having no longer any kind of centre or focus of their own no longer constituted a distinct monad. "On the contrary, the foci had become one. The monads were conjoined; the substratum in which the qualities of both natures inhered no longer had an independent subsistence (*μονάδες ἰδιοσύστατοι*), but formed a synthesis, and all the *idiomata* or attributes subsisted in this composite hypostasis." "Through the humanification of God (*ἀνδρωθέντος θεοῦ*), there arose a theandric nature (*φύσις θεανδρική*) and hypostasis, which put forth a new and theandric activity (*θεανδρική ἐνέργεια*) (Dorner, *u. s.* p. 138). With regard to the weaknesses and sufferings incident to Christ, he asserted that the divine Logos appropriated the qualities and sufferings of human nature, according as His work demanded it of Him, and of His own free will either left the body subject to its physical laws and assumed human sufferings, or on the other hand displayed His divine energy and allowed His human body to share in it. With respect to the question of the will of Christ, Severus held "that the divine and human wills were one, not merely in virtue of the identity of their aim, but also in virtue of the identity of the willing principle." He was indisposed to admit the existence of any difference relatively to the soul between the human and the divine in the matter either of wisdom or knowledge. The words "not as I will, but as Thou wilt," indicating a struggle between the two wills of Christ, Severus explained away as being merely a word of instruction for us. "The Logos could neither have feared death nor have appropriated to itself the natural human unwillingness to die, but freely permitted the flesh to undergo the sufferings of which it was physically susceptible; so that here also no act can be said to be either solely human or solely divine, but all are alike divine and human" (Dorner, *u. s.* p. 140). For a more complete statement of Severus's opinions, the great work of Dorner may be consulted, and the article "*Monophysiten*," in Herzog's *Encyclopaedia*.

(Evagrius, *H. E.* iii. 33, iv. 4, 10; Theodorus Lector, ii. 31; Theophanes, *Chronogr.* pp. 132, 134, 135, 137, 141, 146; Bar-Hebraeus, ed. Abbeloos, i. 188, 190, 194, 212; John of Ephesus, ed. Payne Smith, pp. 78, 82; Liberatus, *Breviarum*, c. 19; Labbe, *Concilia*, iv. 1461; v. 105a. 263; Joann. Malal. lib. xvii., ii. 132, 133; Assemâni, *Bibl. Orient.* i.; 494, 570; ff. ii.; 54 ff.; Idem, *dissert. de Monophys.*; Ceillier, *Auteurs Eccl.* xvi. 192 ff.; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.* xvi. 682–720; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 730; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 499; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* (ed. Harless) viii. 679, 684, 695; x. 249, 569 614 (a list of Severus's works); Montfaucon, *Bibl. Coislin.* pp. 53, 68–75, passim; Ang. Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Collect.* vii. 136 ff.; 277–281; 283 ff.; 285–290; ix. 725 ff.; x. 408; Galland, *Bibl. Pat.* xii. 708–715; 719–750; Walch. *Ketzerhist.* viii. 520 ff.; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. ii. vol. i. pp. 133–141; Wright, Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, pp. 1322–1324.) [E. V.]

SEVERUS (28), a rhetorician of Constantinople, in cent. vi., to whom Ferrandus, deacon of Carthage, and disciple of Fulgentius, addressed a letter against the Sabellian, Arian, Nestorian and Eutychian heresies. [FULGENTIUS (3) FERRANDUS.] Ceillier, xi. 91. [G. T. S.]

SEVERUS (29), bishop of Avranches. The time when he flourished is uncertain, but probably in the 6th century. (An anonymous Life and accounts of three translations are given in Boll. *AA. SS.* 1 Feb. vii. 187 sq.; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 468.) [J. G.]

SEVERUS (30), priest, mentioned by Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Conf.* c. 50) as having built churches in two towns, twenty miles distant, and taken service in both every Sunday (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 376). [J. G.]

SEVERUS (31), patriarch of Aquileia, succeeded Elias about A.D. 586. Like his predecessors, he was a strenuous champion of the Three Chapters. Soon after his consecration the exarch Smaragdus seized him in his basilica at Grado, where the bishops of Aquileia had taken refuge [PAULINUS (14)], and carried him off to Ravenna with three other bishops—Severus of Trieste, John of Parenzo, and Vindemius of Ceneda. There he was imprisoned a whole year, and subjected to personal ill-treatment till he consented with his three above-mentioned suffragans, and two others, to communicate with John, the archbishop of Ravenna. He was then allowed to return to Grado, but the people refused to communicate with him till he had acknowledged his fault in communicating with those who condemned the Three Chapters, and had been received by a synod of ten bishops at Marano, in or about A.D. 589. (Paulus Diac. *Hist. Lang.* iii. 26.)

Gregory the Great, at the end of A.D. 590 or beginning of A.D. 591, wrote to Severus expressing his regret at his relapse into schism, and summoning him by the emperor's orders to Rome, with his followers, in order that a synod might be held to decide the question at issue (*Epp.* i. ind. ix. 17 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 461). Thereupon three separate appeals were presented to the emperor Maurice—the first by Severus alone; the second by him jointly with the bishops of Istria and the insular part of the province, which were still held by the Romans; the third by the bishops of the continental part which was in the hands of the Lombards. Only the third letter is extant. In it the bishops urge the injustice of the pope, from whose communion they had separated, being judge in his own cause. They profess their willingness, when peace is restored, to attend and accept the decisions of a free council at Constantinople, and point out that the clergy and people of the suf-

fragans of Aquileia are so zealous for the Three Chapters that, if the patriarch is compelled to submit by force, when future vacancies occur among his suffragans, the new bishops will be compelled to seek consecration from the bishops of Gaul, and the province of Aquileia will thus be broken up. (Mansi, x. 463.) Maurice accordingly wrote to the pope directing him to leave Severus and his suffragans alone for the present. Gregory submitted; but his letter, a year later, to the archbishop of Ravenna rebuking him for suggesting that alms should be sent to Grado, which had been burnt, shows how deeply he was annoyed (*Epp.* ii. ind. x. 46, in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 585). Severus maintained his position all through Gregory's life, though Firminus of Trieste and others returned to communion with Rome. [FIRMINUS (8)]. Severus died in A.D. 606 or 607 (Paulus Diac. iv. 33), after an episcopate of twenty-one years and a month. He bequeathed all his property to his cathedral at Grado. (*Chr. Patr. Grad.* in *Script. Rer. Lang.* 394.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (32), bishop of Ficulum (Cervia) between Ariminum and Ravenna, was appointed by Gregory the Great visitor of the former church in A.D. 591, and of the latter in A.D. 595, *sede vacante* (*Epp.* i. 57; v. 25, 26). [F. D.]

SEVERUS (33), priest of a church in the valley of Interocrina, near Tudertum, according to Gregory the Great (*Dial.* i. 12), was summoned, while pruning his vineyard, to the deathbed of one of his flock. Delaying a little to finish his work he found the man dead on his arrival. Being greatly grieved thereat, he was weeping and bitterly reproaching himself, when the dead man came to life again, his restoration being granted to the tears of Severus. He is commemorated on February 15 (*AA. SS.* Feb. ii. 826). [F. D.]

SEVERUS (34), scholasticus, or councillor to the exarch Romanus, addressed by Gregory the Great A.D. 595 (*Epp.* v. 36). [F. D.]

SEVERUS of Ancona. [SERENUS (6).]

SEVERUS (35), bishop of Malaga, towards the end of the 6th century, was the friend of LICINIANUS of Carthagena, and joint author with him of the letter to Epiphanius. He also wrote a treatise against the apostate VINCENTIUS of Saragossa, and another, *de Virginitate*, entitled *Annulus*, and dedicated to his sister, neither of which is extant. In his time Malaga was in the hands of the emperor, and his name, therefore, does not appear among the attendants at any of the councils then held in Gothic Spain. He died in the reign of the emperor Maurice, *i.e.* before A.D. 602. (Isidorus, *de Vir. Ill.* 43; *Esp. Sag.* xii. 303.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (36), vir magnificus, commended in A.D. 600, by Gregory the Great to Leo, bishop of Catana (*Epp.* xi. 9). [F. D.]

SEVERUS (37), surnamed Sabocht, Jacobite bishop of Kennesrin in Syria, flourished about A.D. 630, and was noted for his philosophical, mathematical, and ecclesiastical studies. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* i. 275: Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1509.) [J. G.]

SEVERUS (38), bishop of Barcelona, was represented by a priest at the fourth council of Toledo, A.D. 633 (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 317), and died soon afterwards, as his successor attended the fifth council in A.D. 636. (*Esp. Sag.* xxix. 51, 130, vii. 317; Gams, *Kircheng. von Spanien*, i. 305.) [F. D.]

SEVERUS (39), surnamed Bar-Maske, 9th Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, and contemporary there with Macarius the Monothelite, who had usurped the episcopate of the orthodox, was consecrated by John, Jacobite bishop of Tarsus, A.D. 668, and died A.D. 680. He had a lengthened contention with the Mesopotamian bishops who opposed his attempt to arrogate to Antioch all the ordinations or consecrations in the patriarchate, as the custom was in the patriarchate of Alexandria. The dispute lasted for four years, both sides appealing to authorities and to councils, and resorting to excommunications. At his death peace was restored by John, the maphrian of the East. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* i. 281 sq.; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1363.) [J. G.]

SEVERUS (40), 4th Jacobite bishop of Samosata, was opposed to the patriarch Cyriacus, but the latter in visiting Samosata to enforce his canons of reformation, A.D. 797, broke into the church and excommunicated the bishop. Severus afterwards submitted and was restored. (Greg. Barhebr. *Chron.* i. 334; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1463.) [J. G.]

SEWARD, king. [SAEWARD.]

SEXBURGA (1), queen of the West Saxons. This famous lady was the wife of Coinwalch, king of the West Saxons, and probably the second wife, married after he had repudiated the sister of Penda (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 7). On the death of Coinwalch, which the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle places in 672, the West Saxon dominion was, according to Bede, divided among the "subreguli" of the nation, a state of anarchy resulting, which lasted for ten years (*H. E.* iv. 12). The Chronicle names as rulers between 672 and 685, when Caedwalla got possession of the whole kingdom, first queen Sexburga, who reigned for a year (*M. H. B.* p. 318), then Escwine in 674, and Kentwine 676 (*ib.* 320). Florence of Worcester, however, cites the *dicta regis Alfredi* for the interposition of a king Cenfus, the father of Escwine, between the latter and Sexburga (*M. H. B.* 641), remarking, however, that he was omitted by the Chronicle. Ethelwerd (*M. H. B.*) omits Cenfus, and gives one year to Sexburga and two to Escwine (cf. Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 533; H. Hunt. *ib.* 717, 718). William of Malmesbury (*G. R.* i. § 32), who had special regard for Coinwalch, owing to the fact that the monasteries of Glastonbury and Malmesbury dated from his reign, describes Sexburga in glowing language, for which it is doubtful whether he can have had any authority; saying that Coinwalch left the government to her, that she undertook the task with spirit, levied armies, controlled her subjects, kept her enemies in awe, and behaved quite as well as a king could have done; her tenure of power was short, for she died after a year's reign. Matthew Paris, improving on this story, says that she was

deposed by the magnates of the kingdom, who objected to the rule of a woman, and banished (ed. Luard, i. 296). There seems to be no real authority for this statement, which is, in fact, contradictory to that of William of Malmesbury. Neither writer, however, appeals to any tradition of the events, and possibly both may have reflected the ideas of the age of the empress Matilda. There is no need to suppose that in the 7th century government by a queen would have been impossible in either England or France. [S.]

SEXBURGA (2), queen of Kent and abbess of Ely (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 8, iv. 19), was the eldest daughter of Anna, king of the East Angles, and wife of Earconbert, king of Kent. She was thus sister of Ethelburga, and half-sister of Saethryd, abbesses of Brie, and sister of S. Etheldreda, abbess of Ely, and Wihtburga, a nun of the same monastery (Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 636, *Liber Eliensis*, i. c. 2, ed. Stewart, p. 15). By Earconbert, who reigned from 640 to 664, and to whom, according to the Ely tradition, she was married at the beginning of his reign (*AA. SS.* Boll. Jul. ii. 348), Sexburga was mother of Egbert and Hlothere, afterwards kings of Kent, and of Earcongota and Eormenhilda, the wife of Wulfhere (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, p. 176; *Liber Eliensis*, p. 51; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 636). After the death of Earconbert Sexburga founded the monastery of Minster, in the Isle of Sheppey, for nuns, probably intending it as her own resting place. Florence says that she founded it for her husband, who was, however, buried at St. Augustine's (Thorn, c. 1769). She is said to have received the veil from archbishop Theodore (*Hist. Eliens.* lib. i. c. 36). After some time spent at Sheppey, Sexburga removed to Ely, where her sister Etheldreda presided as abbess; and where her grand-daughter Werburga also took refuge after the death of her father Wulfhere in 675 (*Lib. Eliens.* i. c. 18). As Eormenhilda succeeded Sexburga at Minster, her removal to Ely must have taken place soon after Wulfhere's death. The *Liber Eliensis* contains the farewell speech made to the nuns when Sexburga left Minster, and an account of her reception at Ely. On the death of Etheldreda Sexburga succeeded her as abbess. This was, according to the accepted date, in 679 (Flor. Wig. *ad ann.* *Lib. Eliens.* p. 58). Sixteen years after the death of Etheldreda Sexburga was still alive, and presided at the translation of her sister, which is thus referred to the year 695 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 19). Although in Bede's Martyrology eleven years are said to have elapsed, the number sixteen is given in both the Ecclesiastical History and the Chronicon. The historian tells us that she sent to Grantacaestir for a stone for the sarcophagus required, and that her messengers found a marble coffin with its covering ready to receive the body of St. Etheldreda, which was found incorrupt. Sexburga must have been advanced in years, and probably did not live long after the translation. The date of her death is unknown. The Bollandists adopt Alford's conclusion, that it occurred about 699; the day of her anniversary was July 6. She was buried at Ely, where her daughter Eormenhild succeeded her as abbess, making over Sheppey to her own daughter Werburga, who in turn succeeded her at Ely also. The life of Sexburga seems to have been written in the vernacular as well as in Latin, at the time of the revival of early hagiography in the eleventh century; and a fragment of the Anglo-Saxon Life is in the Lambeth MS. 427. The Latin biography (*MS. Cotton*, Caligula, A. 8) contains, according to Sir Thomas Hardy, little or nothing of importance that is not taken from Bede and from the English fragment. The life given in the Acta Sanctorum is by Capgrave, and contains nothing of value.

(See *AA. SS.* Boll. Jul. ii. 346–350; Hardy, *Catal. Mat.* i. 360–262.) [S.]

SEXRAED (SEXRED), king of the East Saxons. Sexraed, with his brother Saeward and a third brother, to whom Bromton, the 15th century compiler, gives the name of Sigebert (ap. Twysden, c. 743), succeeded their father Sebert in the kingdom of Essex about the year 616. They were still heathen, and very ignorant, even of the external signs of Christian worship. They applied to Mellitus, who was still bishop of London, for the white bread which they had seen him give to their father in the Eucharist. Mellitus told them that if they would be baptized as their father had been they might be partakers of the bread. They refused, as having no need of washing, but wanting refreshment. Offended at his refusal, they ordered him to leave their kingdom. Mellitus, accompanied by Justus, who was suffering from a like relapse of the Kentish men consequent on Ethelbert's death, fled to Gaul; the kings remained heathen, and the East Saxons relapsed or remained unconverted. The young kings all perished shortly after, in an invasion of the West Saxon territory. Henry of Huntingdon (*M. H. B.* 716) dates this event in 626, and makes Kynegils and Cwichelm the West Saxon rulers at the time. Sigebert the Little, the next East Saxon king, is said to have been the son of Saeward. (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 5.) [S.]

SEXTILIANUS, an African bishop, who, as deputy for Primosus of Carthage, in the fifth general council, Collat. 5, produced the authority of St. Augustine's letters for the practice of anathematizing the dead (Mansi, t. ix. p. 260–263). [G. T. S.]

SEXTUS, author of a treatise on the Resurrection. Eusebius who mentions it in that part of his history which treats of the beginning of the 3rd century (v. 27) owns that he has no certain knowledge of the time when this writer lived. [G. S.]

SIACRIUS (SYAGRIUS), seventh bishop of Nice, said to have been nephew of Charlemagne. When that monarch subdued the Cimellienses and Nicienses (but the expedition is doubtful), he gave them Siacrius as teacher, who built a monastery and instructed the people, not without miracles. In the fifth year of pope Adrian I. (A.D. 777) he became bishop of Nice, but the time of his decease is unknown (Boll. *AA. SS.* v. 257 sq.; (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, vi. 463; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 1274). [J. G.]

SIADHAL, Irish saint. [SEDULIUS.]

SIBYLLINE ORACLES, THE (Χρησμοὶ Σιβυλλιακοί). Before examining the collection of writings now bearing this title, it will be necessary to inquire into the origin and history of the name Sibyl in classical times.

1. The true derivation of the word Σίβυλλα is probably that given by Lactantius (*Div. Instit.* i. 6), on the authority of Varro; namely, from σιός = θεός, and βυλή = βουλή. "Omnes feminae vates," he says, "Sibyllae sunt a veteribus nuncupatae, vel ab unius Delphidis nomine, vel a consiliis Deorum denuntiandis; σιοὺς enim deos, non θεούς, et consilium non βουλὴν sed βυλὴν appellabant Aeolico genere sermonis. Itaque Sibyllam dictam esse quasi θεοβουλήν." The Doric form σιὸς for θεὸς is found in Thuc. v. 77, and in Aristophanes; while βόλλα for βουλή occurs in a Lesbian inscription in Böckh's *Corp. Inscript.* The further change of *o* to *υ* in Aeolic, as in στύμα, μύγις, for στόμα, μόγις, etc., is a familiar one. At the same time this etymology is not altogether free from objections. It would make the first part of the word Doric, the second Aeolic; and proof seems wanting of the existence of βόλλα as a separate word. But though disputed on this and other grounds, as by Salmasius (in a note on the above passage) and Perizonius (on Aelian, *Var. Hist.* xii. 35), it has more to recommend it than any of the derivations proposed in its stead. Maass (*De Sibyllarum Indicibus*, 1879, p. 16) endeavours to prove an eastern origin of the word, connecting it with Saba, or Sabaea; and Bang (*Voluspá und die Sibyllinischen Orakel*, tr. by Poestion, 1880, p. 40) still more fancifully connects it with the Volva and Voluspá of the old Norse Sagas.

2. The term Σίβυλλαι appears to have been attached to a class of prophetic women, as Βάκιδες was to prophetic men. Verses from a Boeotian Βάκις are cited by Herodotus (viii. 12, 77, 96), and two others bearing the same title are mentioned by Aelian (*loc. cit.*). Hence Aristotle (*Problemata*, § xxx. *Prob.* 1) speaks of Σίβυλλαι καὶ Βάκιδες as generic terms. The writer of the article DIVINATIO in the *Dict. of Antiqq.* thinks that the Βάκιδες and Σίβυλλαι were distinguished from the μάντεις, or seers, by the fact of their professing to derive their knowledge from sacred books, χρησμοί, which they consulted. But the description given by Pausanias of the Boeotian Βάκις as uttering his oracular sayings when "inspired by the Nymphs" (μανέντι ἐκ Νυμφῶν, iv. 27), and "possessed by the Nymphs" (κατάσχετον ἄνδρα ἐκ Νυμφῶν, x. 12), seems rather to harmonize with Virgil's description of the Cumaean Sibyl, Deiphobe (*Aen.* iii. 443):—

> Insanam vatem adspicies, quae rupe sub ima
> Fata canit foliisque notas et carmina mandat.

The number of such Sibyls, as is natural, is variously stated by various writers. Aristophanes (*Pax.* 1095, 1116) and Plato (*Phaedr.* xxii.) employ the word Σίβυλλα in the singular number only. But until it can be shown that they do not use it generically, but only as a proper name, we cannot assent to Alexandre's inference, that in Greece, or at least at Athens, down to the time of Alexander the Great, one Sibyl only was recognized. Tacitus (*Ann.* vi. 12) was uncertain whether there were one or more: "una seu plures fuere." Pausanias and Aelian, in the passages above cited, specify four. Varro, as quoted by Lactantius, gives a list of ten; of whom the most famous was Herophile, the Sibyl of Erythrae in Ionia. To enter into further details on this part of the subject would be trenching on the province of the *Dict. of Mythology*; and therefore, after a short notice of the Libri Sibyllini of Roman history, we will pass to the collection now extant.

3. The story of the appearance of a Sibyl to king Tarquin, with the offer of certain prophetic books for him to purchase; of his refusal; of her return with a diminished number, but still at the same price; of his declining the purchase a second time; of her return once more with a number still further diminished; of the king's becoming disturbed by her persistence, and, finally, hastening to secure what still remained; is one of the most familiar in Roman history. But it has to be related in vague outlines, such as the above; for when we strive to grasp the details they elude us on all sides. Which of the Tarquins was it? Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Antiqq.* iv. 62) implies Superbus. Lactantius (*loc. citat.*), avowedly on the authority of Varro, says it was Priscus. In like manner, there is a divergence as to the name of the Sibyl, and the number of the books. The common account is, that three remained out of nine. But Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xiii. 13) gives it as one out of three. Whichever it was, the remnant of the prophetic writings was carefully preserved in a *sacrarium* (Aul. Gell. *Noct. Attic.* i. 19) in a vault beneath the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, under the charge, first of two men (duumviri), afterwards of ten, and finally of fifteen (the "lecti viri" of Virg. *Aen.* vi. 73). The existence of such a deposit, down to the burning of the Capitol in B.C. 83, admits of no reasonable doubt. One fragment of seventy lines from this collection has been preserved by Phlegon, in his treatise περὶ θαυμασίων. It is a response given in B.C. 124, when the oracular books were consulted on the birth of an hermaphrodite; and, like all the rest, is in Greek hexameters. A list of the various occasions on which any record of the consultation of them has been preserved, has been drawn up by Alexandre (*Excursus*, iii. p. 198); and he is able to trace upwards of sixty such, previous to the destruction of the capitol in B.C. 83.

In this conflagration the old Sibylline books appear to have perished. When the rebuilding of the capitol was undertaken by Sulla, he made it part of his care to replace them, as far as was possible, by collecting from all quarters such lines or passages as might be found treasured up. As a freedman of Sulla's is said to have traced the name Sulla to Sibylla (Charis. *Instit. Gramm.* i. p. 110, quoted by Maass, *ubi sup.* p. 32), perhaps the great dictator had a special interest in the subject. At any rate, a commission of three persons was charged to visit the principal cities of Italy, Greece, Sicily, and Libya, and collect such scattered relics as might be found. Samos and the Asiatic Erythrae would seem to have been the most profitable fields for their quest. As a result of their labours, about a thousand lines (according to Fenestella, a writer of the age of Augustus) were brought back to Rome; the comparative smallness of the number indicating perhaps that no more had stood the test of investigation. By the year

B.C. 75 the new collection appears to have been stored up in the same custody as before. And it is only natural to surmise that the increased attention which for seven or eight years had thus been drawn to the Sibylline verses, may have quickened the interest of Lentulus and others like him in predictions supposed to affect them, and helped to foment the disorders in store for the twentieth year after the burning of the capitol (Voss. *Tractatus de Sibyllinis*, p. 20). It is also reasonable to conjecture, as Alexandre does (*Exc.* iii. p. 177), that this search for Sibylline oracles may have stimulated the inventive faculty of Egyptian Jews and others; and, on the principle of the supply answering to the demand, have prompted the composition of such verses as were in request.

What remains to be told concerning this second recension at Rome may be despatched in few words. Augustus, finding that the writing of the leaves had faded from age (ἐξίτηλα ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου γεγονότα, Dion Cass. liv. 17), or rather, we may suppose, from damp, as it was but some sixty years since they had been deposited in their new resting-place, caused official copies to be made of them. A few years later, on assuming the title of Pontifex Maximus, in B.C. 12, he had a fresh scrutiny held of the floating prophecies which claimed a Sibylline or quasi-Sibylline character; and, after burning more than 2000 manuscripts thus called in, he transferred the collection, supplemented by such verses or poems as had stood the test, to a new depository at the foot of the statue of the Palatine Apollo. (Suet. ii. 31; Tac. *Ann.* vi. 12.) Here they remained in comparative obscurity. In the reign of Tiberius, Asinius Gallus proposed to consult them about an inundation of the Tiber, but the emperor forbade it (Tac. *Ann.* i. 76). In Nero's reign, as Alexandre points out, they are recorded to have been consulted once; and a few times under the Gordians and Gallienus. Aurelian, and still later Julian (Ammian. Marcell. xxiii.), tried to revive the honour once paid to them, but in vain. Finally, in the reign of Honorius, the books were publicly burnt by the order of Stilicho, at some period between A.D. 404 and 408.

4. Long before this final disappearance of the collection at Rome, there had been growing up, from an origin almost equally obscure, a series of so-called Sibylline oracles, resembling the earlier ones in outward form, but in subject and purpose very different. These, or at least such portions of them as have come down to us, it is now our task to examine. When it is mentioned that we possess more than four thousand lines in Greek hexameter verse, or about as much as the first six books of the Iliad would amount to, it will be seen that, in mere quantity alone, a not inconsiderable legacy has been bequeathed us. One important section of these writings, and that the oldest of them, probably had its origin in the Jewish quarter of Alexandria, in the time of Judas Maccabaeus, or a little later. The reciprocal influence of Greek and Judaic thought, quickened into fresh activity by the translation of the Septuagint, is very marked in the Alexandrian literature of this period, and several instances are given by Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, Eng. tr. v. p. 255) of the way in which the rising Hellenists strove to compete with their Greek models. One such composition in particular, in which the Messianic hopes of the Jews found utterance, the apocryphal *Book of Enoch*, is referred by Ewald to the time we are considering (*Abhandlung*, *infr. cit.* p. 23); and between it and the oldest of the extant Sibylline writings he traces many points of resemblance.

While the earliest portion of the series we now possess thus originated as far back as the reign of Ptolemaeus Physcon, or even, as others think, in the preceding reign of Philometor (B.C. 181–146), the latest did not appear till after the death of Odenathus (A.D. 267). There is thus an interval of more than four centuries between the limits of composition. Indeed, if we accept the opinion of Ewald that the xivth Book is as late as the reign of Justinian, we extend this interval by three centuries more. The range being so wide, it is only reasonable to expect that there should be differences of opinion as to the date of the several poems of which the collection consists. The following is a digest of the chronological order in which Alexandre would arrange them:—

(1.) Bk. III. 97–294, 489–828; *circa* B.C. 168; author an Alexandrian Jew.
(2.) Bk. IV. c. A.D. 79; author a Judaizing Christian, or perhaps a Therapeute of Alexandria.
(3.) The Prooemium; about the same time, and from the same school as the preceding.
(4.) Bk. VIII. 217–429; ditto.
(5.) Bk. III. 295–488; age of the Antonines; Jewish authorship.
(6.) Bk. V.; about same period; author an Alexandrian Jew.
(7.) Bk. VIII. 1–429; same period, or a little later, under Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138–161).
(8.) Bk. VI.; reign of Alexander Severus (c. 234); author a Judaizing Christian.
(9.) Bk. VII.; ditto.
(10.) Bks. I. II.; perhaps the third century, but doubtful, being much altered and interpolated of Christian origin.
(11.) Bk. VIII. 430–480, 481–501; middle or end of third century; of Christian origin.
(12.) Bks. XI.–XIV.; c. A.D. 267; author an Alexandrian Jew.
(13.) The Anonymous Preface and Bk. III. 1–96; reign of Justinian; author, an unknown monk.

Other critics dissent from this arrangement. Ewald and Friedlieb would make the Prooemium contemporary with the oldest portions of the Third Book; the latter referring it to B.C. 170–160. Both dissent from Alexandre's opinion as to the Christian origin of the Fourth Book. Ewald regards Bk. iii. 295–488 as of equal age with the sections immediately preceding and following it. He agrees with Alexandre as to the date of the Eleventh Book, which Friedlieb (*Einleitung*, p. lxxi.) would place as early as the end of Trajan's reign (A.D. 115–118); while Dechent (*infr. cit.* p. 486) goes so far as to make the author to have lived not long after the death of Virgil (B.C. 19).

Such are a few of the chief points in dispute. A bare outline of the reasons in support of each view must suffice.

To begin with the *Prooemium*. This really consists of two fragments, of 35 and 49 lines each respectively. They are linked together, in Alexandre's edition, by another short fragment of three lines; all being taken from the *ad Autolycum Libri* of Theophilus (A.D. 180).

Friedlieb prints them as detached fragments. Alexandre's opinion that they are of Christian origin rests mainly on the lines (5, 6):—

"Παντοτρόφον κτίστην, ὅστις γλυκὺ Πνεῦμ' ἐν ἅπασι
κάθετο, χἠγητῆρα βροτῶν πάντων ἐποίησεν."

and on the passage at the end, in which occur such expressions as ζωὴν κληρονομοῦσι, Παραδείσου, and δαινύμενοι γλυκὺν ἄρτον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος. The Johannine tone of vv. 5, 6 is no doubt noticeable; but Badt (*De Orac. Sibyll.* p. 12) thinks that it need be no more than a product of Alexandrian thought, and maintains its ante-Christian origin. In like manner the resemblance of ζωὴν κληρονομοῦσι to St. Matth. xix. 29, and of ἄρτον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ to Rev. ii. 17, while at first sight suggestive of Christian authorship, are not of themselves sufficient to establish it.

The age of iii. 295–488 is vigorously disputed between Ewald and Alexandre. Ewald would assign it to the latter part of the reign of Ptolemaeus Physcon, or about B.C. 124; Alexandre to the age of the Antonines. The mention of the conquest of Babylon (ver. 384), and the death of a great conqueror, whose successors should fall before the posterity of those whom he had sought to destroy (ver. 393, sqq.) are points in favour of the former hypothesis. For the reference seems more naturally to be to the conquests of Macedonia than of Rome; to Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors, rather than to Hadrian (*Abhandlung*, p. 14). On the other hand, the frequent mention of Rome in this section of the poem; the different tone used in speaking of it, when compared with the allusions in the other sections; and the difficulty of adequately interpreting such passages as (464 sqq.):—

"Ἰταλίη, σοὶ δ' οὔτις Ἄρης ἀλλότριος ἥξει,
ἀλλ' ἐμφύλιον αἷμα πολύστονον, κ.τ.λ."

of the dissensions of the Gracchi, or of the civil wars of Marius and Sulla, foreseen by one writing in B.C. 124, lend weight to the arguments in favour of a later date.

The date of the Fourth Book will be discussed presently, when an outline of its contents is given. The ground on which Friedlieb (*Einleitung*, p. lxiii.) rests for assigning the Eleventh Book (in his reckoning, the Ninth) to an earlier period than the three concluding ones, namely, to the end of Trajan's reign or the beginning of Hadrian's, is a little precarious. He argues that the author of the lines (159, sq.):—

"Ἄρξει γὰρ γενεὴ τούτου μετόπισθεν ἁπάντων,
ἄχρις ἐπ' Εὐφράτου Τίγριος ποταμῶν ἀνὰ μέσσον,"

must have lived before Hadrian relinquished the conquests made by his predecessor east of the Euphrates. But, while this might be conclusive, if the question of date were limited to a single decade, it can scarcely apply, if there is reason for thinking that the author lived when the conquests of Septimius Severus, in 198, had again brought Mesopotamia under Roman dominion. The bold hypothesis of Dechent that the author wrote soon after the death of Virgil in B.C. 19, rests mainly on the assumption that the passage xi. 163 sqq., while imitated, as all admit, from iii. 419 sqq., refers, not to Homer, as that manifestly does, but to Virgil; and that, to give effect to the author's design in introducing it, it was necessary that no long interval should have elapsed since Virgil wrote his description of the Battle of Actium.

Dechent argues strongly against the classification of the eleventh Book with the three which follow. But the literary history of these four Books is unfavourable to such a view. Their very existence was unknown to any of the older editors. They were first discovered by Angelo Mai, and published by him—the xivth Book in 1817, from a MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan; and again Bks. xi.–xiv. in 1828, from a MS. in the Vatican. The numbers by which they are uniformly denoted in the MSS. seem to indicate that the original collection was in ten books; these being a later and inferior addition. The intrinsic merits of Bk. xi., apart from the question of its date, are not in fact thought more highly of by Dr. Dechent himself than by other critics.

5. The chief interest will naturally attach, in the first place, to those sections of the poems which are confessedly the most ancient, and, in the next place, to the earliest ones of Christian origin. As our space does not admit of an analysis of all the books, we will give an epitome of two only; the Third (or, at least, such parts of it as are admitted by all alike to be among the most ancient), and the Fourth. The Christian origin of the Fourth, as was said above, has indeed been disputed; but the comparative certainty of its date (A.D. 79 or 80), and other circumstances, would render it, even apart from that claim to consideration, one of the most interesting and important.

Bk. iii. (97 sqq.) begins abruptly with the destruction of the Tower of Babel by the agency of the winds,—an aftergrowth on the narrative in Genesis. The peopling of the earth is then described (105 sqq.), and in due course the reign of Cronos, and the birth of his offspring. The rebellion of the Titans and the imprisonment of Cronos (147 sqq.) were the beginning of their woes to mortals. Then rose in succession the great kingdoms of the earth: Egypt, Persia, Media, Aethiopia, Assyria, Macedonia, Egypt a second time, and Rome (162). At this point the Sibyl breaks off in her retrospect, and taking her stand in imagination near the beginnings of time, sees the history of the future unfolding itself before her gaze. In this way she foretells the rise of various kingdoms, the Jewish, Macedonian, and Roman (167–193). After pausing to recount the judgments of God in the world, especially as affecting the Jews (196–212), she proceeds to her chief topic, the praise of the Jewish nation (218 sqq.), and the great events of their story. Their departure from Egypt, the giving of the Law, the Assyrian captivity, are passed in review (248–268); and their deliverance foretold. The section closes with the rise of the heaven-sent king (Cyrus) who was to restore them, and with the work of rebuilding the temple.

In iii. 489–828, the Sibyl begins with the divine prompting that urged her to resume her task. Then follow the prophetic burdens of Phoenicia, Crete, Thrace, Gog and Magog (the Getae and Massagetae?) and other nations. Most dreadful of all will be the devastation of Greece and other countries by Rome (520 sqq.)

Hence should the Gentiles learn to desist from idolatry. One race of men would arise, who would fulfil the duty of worshipping the true God (573 sqq.). When the seventh king of a Grecian dynasty should reign in Egypt, there would come a mighty invader from Asia (Antiochus Epiphanes), swooping like an eagle upon the land (611 sqq.). Then in sooth would it be time for the pious to betake themselves to supplication; for terrible things were coming upon the earth (633 sqq.) But in due time there should arise a king sent from God, under whom the chosen people should flourish again. He should take vengeance on his enemies, and all that opposed him should be destroyed (675 sqq.) The prosperity of the Jewish race is then set forth at length (714 sqq.), with a passing admonition to the Gentiles not to hinder the Jews living in their midst from going forth to succour their countrymen at home (in the wars of the Maccabees? 732–735). The signs that were to herald the consummation of all things are then foretold (795–807); and the prophetess ends with declaring that she herself is neither the Erythraean Sibyl of the east, nor the Cumaean Sibyl of the west (808–817), but a daughter-in-law of Noah (if lines 818–820 are genuine), shut up with him in the ark

From the abruptness of the beginning at iii. 97, it is not unlikely that the fragments now put together to form the Prooemium may have constituted the real beginning of this book.

In Bk. iv. the Sibyl takes at the outset a tone not unlike that of St. Paul, when addressing the men of Athens on Mars' Hill. The nature of the one true God was such that He could not be like the mute images of marble fashioned by the hand of man (1–17). As prophesying by His inspiration, the Sibyl (so naming herself, as in iii. 814) claimed attention to her words (18–23). Happiness was the portion of the good; of those who were careful to pray before eating and drinking, who avoided the sight of heathen temples, and endured persecution in their observance of the moral law of God (24–39). Their righteousness would be vindicated at the last. But before the coming of that closing age, see what things must happen upon the earth (40–48). Then, in rapid succession, the rise of various nations, Assyrians, Medes, Greeks, and others, is touched upon, along with their wars, the Trojan war being noticed among the rest (49–114). Last of all, the Romans would invade Syria, and Jerusalem itself should be destroyed (115–127). Cyprus should feel the shock of earthquakes, and many cities of Italy perish in an eruption (of Vesuvius) 130–134. Other visitations should follow, a warning to men to repent of their evil ways. Let them "wash their bodies wholly in flowing rivers, and lifting up their hands to heaven, ask pardon for their former deeds" (160–162). If they would not, they should perish in a universal conflagration; the advent of which would be foretold by many signs and tokens (170–177). Then should the just rise again to a new life, and the wicked be shut up in Gehenna (178–185). Happy those who should attain to this new and better life (186–191).

In this abstract, prominence has been given to the two passages (24–39; 160–162), on which the argument for the Christian authorship of the Fourth Book mainly rests. The latter of them, in particular, is thought by Alexandre to point conclusively to Christian baptism. But the vagueness of the language will not fail to be remarked; and Friedlieb (*Einleit.* p. xlii.) denies that anything expressly Christian can be found in the book. The precept *ἐν ποταμοῖς λούσασθε ὅλον δέμας ἀενάοισι* is considered by him to signify no more than Isaiah's "Wash you, make you clean" (i. 16). The author may possibly have been one of the Essenes, as is suggested by the writer of an article in the *Edinb. Rev.* (*infra cit.* p. 55). But against this view must be set, as Dechent points out, the acquaintance with Greek literature and history, not likely to betoken an Essene; and, on the other hand, the absence of any special commendation of the Essenian virtues of asceticism and virginity. While admitting that the question is a hard one to solve, Dechent inclines to the assumption of a Jewish-Christian authorship. In any case, the exactness with which the date can be fixed (Badt, *infra cit.*, p. 13), and the certainty that we are thus reading what was penned before the Fourth Gospel or the Apocalypse had seen the light, make it an interesting and valuable relic. As we compare it, moreover, with the still older Bk. iii., we may gain a deeper insight into the origin of Sibylline verse. Like the *De Civitate* of St. Augustine, each of these poems had its birth beneath the shadow of a great visitation. The earlier Sibyllist might well feel moved to prophesy of the end of all things, when the hosts of Epiphanes were invading his country, and their commander was boasting that he would for ever exterminate both the Judeans and their God (Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, v. pp. 299, 310). And in like manner, one who had witnessed, in the space of a single decade, the fall of Jerusalem and the overwhelming of Herculaneum and Pompeii, might well feel the prophetic fire burn within him, till at the last his words found utterance.

As the interest of these two books exceeds that of the rest, for the reasons just mentioned, so the first of them (the oldest portion of Bk. iii.) is conspicuous by its purely literary merit. There is a real Homeric vigour in many of the lines; and the difference between the earlier and later versification is palpable even in the opening lines of the two sections. Compare, for instance, the run of

> "Ἀλλ' ὁπόταν μεγάλοιο Θεοῦ τελέωνται ἀπειλαί,
> ἃς ποτ' ἐπηπείλησε βροτοῖς, κ.τ.λ." (iii. 97 sq.)

with the limping rhythm of

> "Οὐράνι' ὑψιβρεμέτα μάκαρ, ὃς ἔχεις τὸ Χερουβὶμ
> ἱδρυμένον, λίτομαι, παναληθέα, φημίξασαν
> παῦσον βαιόν με. κ.τ.λ." (iii. 1, sqq.)

and the inferiority of the latter is obvious. In connection with this imitation of Homer, it is curious to observe that Homer is charged in two places (iii. 419 sqq., xi. 163 sqq.), with borrowing from the Sibyl:—

> "Καί τις ψευδογράφος πρέσβυς βροτὸς ἔσσεται αὖθις,
> . . . . γράψει τὰ κατ' Ἴλιον, οὐ μὲν ἀληθῶς,
> ἀλλὰ σοφῶς, ἔπεσι γὰρ ἐμοῖς, μέτρων τε κρατήσει."

The true explanation may probably be found in the similar charge brought in Suidas against Phocylides. In fact, the history of the *Ποίημα*

νουθετικὸν itself is no bad commentary on that of the Sibylline Oracles.

6. A very few points only can be noticed in the remaining books. The Fifth, which Ewald places next in order of time, but which Alexandre refers to the age of Antoninus Pius, professes to be the utterance of an Egyptian Sibyl, sister of Isis (Ἴσιδος ἡ γνώστη, ver. 53). The first 52 lines give a series of Roman emperors, the first letters of their names being indicated by the numbers corresponding to those letters; and as the rest of the book is occupied with Egyptian affairs, this portion should probably be detached from it. One passage would seem to denote that the author was conversant with Christianity (255 sqq.):—

"Εἰς δέ τις ἔσσεται αὖθις ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἔξοχος ἀνήρ,
ὃς παλάμας ἤπλωσεν ἐπὶ ξύλου πολυκάρπου
Ἑβραίων ὁ ἄριστος, ὃς ἠελιόν ποτε στῆσε."

But the strange blending of Gibeon with Calvary leaves all in uncertainty. Very different is the remarkable line near the end of Bk. vi.:—

"Ὦ ξύλον, ὦ μακαριστόν, ἐφ' ᾧ Θεὸς ἐξετανύσθη."

The most memorable passage of all is perhaps that in the Eighth Book (217–250), in acrostichal verse, the initial letters of which form the words ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ. This peculiar form of composition would alone make it noticeable, being the only passage of that kind in the whole series. And this fact is the more striking, when we remember that the Sibylline verses of Rome are all said to have been of this description; Cicero (*De Divin.* ii. § 112) making this artificiality of construction an argument to prove that the lines never could have been uttered in the heat of sudden inspiration. But of far greater moment than any peculiarity of external form is the enduring impression this passage has produced upon the mind of Christendom. A translation of it is found in the *De Civitate* of Augustine, and its echo is heard in the famous sequence of Thomas of Celano:—

"Dies irae, dies illa,
Solvet saeclum in favilla,
Teste David cum Sibylla."

7. For many topics of interest, on which these poems might be cited as an authority, a mere reference must suffice. Their ethical teaching is throughout good. (Cf. iii. 584 sqq.) The corruption of manners among the clergy in the 3rd century may be studied in ii. 264 sqq. Indications of ritual are few and simple (v. 266; viii. 497 sqq.) Baptism is alluded to in viii. 271, *ὕδατι φωτίζων διὰ πρεσβυτέρων ἅμα χειρῶν*, and perhaps in the disputed line iv. 160. If the genuineness of vii. 87 were not suspected, it would be a witness for baptism by sprinkling: *ἀλλὰ λαβὼν κεφαλὴν τοῦδ' ἄνερος, ὕδατι ῥαίνας εὖξαι τρίς.* Allusions to the Holy Eucharist are uncertain, the nearest approach to them being in viii. 403, 408. Citations from the canonical Scriptures are frequent in the books of later origin; Bk. i. especially being full of references to the Old Testament, not always correctly made. In the older portions, the Apocalypse appears most frequently referred to. On this subject see Alexandre's *Excursus*, vi. pp. 554–6.

The peculiarities of metre and syntax, as well as the late forms of words, to be found in these poems, are very numerous. A collection of them has been made by Alexandre in his *Excursus* vii., and the more prominent ones are also noticed by Friedlieb at the end of his account of each book, in his *Einleitung*. The following are a few specimens, noted independently in reading:—

κρῖταί (iii. 781), *τύχη* (viii. 202), *Λᾶτίνων* (xiv. 244, 280), *Λατῖνων* (viii. 131), *δεδιότες* (viii. 183), *ῥᾶπίσματα* (viii. 288), *πρῶτὸν* (xiv. 248). Late forms of words are: *βοληθεῖς* (xiv. 75), *θάνεται* (xiv. 91), *φολίσι* (xiv. 326), *Θύμβριδος* = Tibridis (viii. 64), *ἐκπορθηθήση* (viii. 128), *ἀνάσταμα* (viii. 268), *μαστιζόμενοι* (viii. 281). As peculiarities of construction, we find (1) the opt. for fut. indic. (iii. 521, viii. 273, etc.); fut. ind. after *ἵνα* (viii. 293), *ὁπόταν* (xiv. 69), *ἐπὰν* (xiv. 317), *ὅταν* (xiv. 348); subj. aft. *ἤνικα* (xiv. 293), *ὅτε* (viii. 50); the particles *τέ*, *καί*, otiose, as also the pronouns *μίν* and *οἱ* (iii. 735, iii. 1, xiv. 232, etc.)

The frequent paronomasiae, or plays on words, should also be noticed, as Ἔσται καὶ Σάμος ἄμμος, ἐσεῖται Δῆλος ἄδηλος, καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη (iii. 364). Many proverbial sayings are introduced; some, perhaps, which cannot now be recognized as such, besides familiar ones like

Μὴ κίνει Καμάριναν, ἀκίνητος γὰρ ἀμείνων (iii. 736).
Ὀψὲ θεοῦ μῦλοι ἀλέουσι τὸ λεπτὸν ἄλευρον (viii. 14).
Ὄλβιος ὃς τέθνηκε καὶ ὄλβιος ὅστις ἄτεκνος (xiv. 307).

8. *Bibliography.*—The first edition of the Sibyllina was that of Xystus Betuleius (Birken), Basil. 1545, in 8vo, without any Latin version. The metrical Latin version, still retained in a corrected form, was by Castalio (Châteillon), and appeared in 1546. The text and Latin version appeared together in the next edition of 1555, also published at Basle. A fourth edition, by Joannes Opsopoeus (Koch), was published in Paris in 1599; and a fifth at Amsterdam in 1687–8, under the superintendence of Servatius Gallaeus (Gallé), in 2 vols. 4to. These were all superseded by the exhaustive edition of C. Alexandre, of which the first volume, in two parts, appeared in 1841 and 1853, at Paris, in 8vo., and the second, containing a copious Latin commentary in the form of *Excursus*, followed in 1856. These were condensed into one volume by the same editor in 1869, Paris, 8vo. The only other edition that need be specified is that by Dr. J. H. Friedlieb, of Breslau, published at Leipzig in 1852, 8vo. Besides a valuable introduction, this has a translation of the Greek into German hexameters. An exhaustive list of works bearing on the Sibylline literature will be found at the end of Alexandre's second volume (1856), with a continuation at the end of his smaller edition.

Authorities.—Many of these have been already specified in the course of the article. For the classical oracles, Klausen's *Aeneas und die Penaten*, 1839, tom. i. p. 245 sqq., and Sir G. C. Lewis's *Credibility of the Early Roman History*, 1855, vol. i. p. 514 sqq., are worth consulting. For the extant collection, nearly all the materials that can be desired have been amassed by Alexandre, in his laborious volumes. The patience with which he has collected everything bearing on his subject is only equalled by his candour, and his courtesy towards opponents. His col-

clusions may not always be regarded as sound; and here the edition of Friedlieb, mentioned above, and the *Abhandlung über Entstehung Inhalt und Werth der Sibyllischen Bücher*, of Heinrich Ewald, Götting. 4to, 1858, may be studied as a useful corrective. Dr. Badt, of Breslau, published an edition of Bk. iv. in 1878, with some ingenious emendations; and his notes to this, as well as his earlier *Dissertatio inauguralis*, Breslau, 1869, on the Jewish element in the Sibylline poems, are valuable. A good list of German works on the subject is given by Badt, at the beginning of his *Dissertatio*, including Friedlieb's *Commentatio de Codicibus Sibyll. manuscriptis*, Breslau, 1847, and Volkmann's *De Oraculis Sibyllinis Dissertatio*, Lipsiae, 1853. In the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.* Gotha, 1878, 481–509, is an essay by Dr. Dechent, embodying the result of more lengthy investigations, on the *Charakter und Geschichte der altchrist. Sibyllenschriften*, in which some fresh theories are ably supported. One or two of these, as to the early authorship of Book xi., and the Jewish-Christian origin of Book iv., have been briefly noticed above. His general conclusion is, that all the Sibylline writings which have come from Christian sources, are to be traced to writers in whom heretical or heterodox influences were predominant. For English readers, no better résumé of the entire subject could be found, than an article which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1877. [J. H. L.]

SIBYLLISTAE. So Celsus nicknamed the Christians who attached weight to the prophecies of the Sibyl (Orig. *adv. Cels.* v. 61). [G. S.]

SIDERIUS, bishop of Palaebisca, in Egypt. From the epistles of Synesius, Num. 67, we learn that Athanasius sanctioned his consecration, though it was performed contrary to the canons by one bishop (Philo) alone, and not by three. It was irregular also from the Egyptian point of view, as not having been performed at Alexandria. Athanasius condoned the defects on account of the Arian troubles, and afterwards procured his translation to the metropolitical see of Ptolemais (cf. Bingham's *Antiq.* lib. ii. cap. xi. sec. 4, 5). [G. T. S.]

SIDONIUS (1), Roman confessor (note the Punic name), A.D. 250. See MOSES, MAXIMUS (20), and CELERINUS. [E. W. B.]

SIDONIUS (2) APOLLINARIS, SAINT (CAIUS SOLLIUS APOLLINARIS SIDONIUS). The name appears thus, but without APOLLINARIS in the dedication to him by Claudianus Mamertus of his book on the Soul, and without CAIUS in his own title to the poem addressed by Sidonius to Magnus Felix. One MS. adds MODESTUS, but as it seems without good authority (*Carm.* ix.; Germain, *Sid. Apoll.* p. 180). His grandfather Apollinaris had been praefectus praetorio of Gaul under the rival emperor Constantine, A.D. 408 (Zos. vi. 4; Olympiodorus, ap. Phot. *Bibl.* p. 57, ed. Bekker), and was the first of the family who became a Christian. In an epitaph written by his grandson for his tomb near Lyons he speaks of him in the highest terms, especially on this account. He also tells us that his great grandfather held a high official situation (Sid. *Ep.* iii. 12. i. 3). His father, of whose name no special mention is made, was a tribune, and also a notary or secretary, under Honorius, thus combining a military with a civil office, and under Valentinian III. became praefectus praetorio of Aquitania I. A.D. 449 (Sid. *Ep.* iii. 1. v. 9, viii. 6). This date is fixed by that of the consulship of Asterius, at whose inauguration at Arles C. Sollius, the subject of this article, was present, at a time in his life when he was entering youth (adolescens nuper ex puero), *i.e.* probably about 17 or 18 years old (see Cic. *pro Arch.* 3, Gell. x. 28). In a letter of later life he mentions his pleasure at a speech made by Nicetius on this occasion (*Ep.* viii. 6).

First period, 431–471.—His mother's name is not known, but he was born Nov. 5, A.D. 431 or 432, probably at Lyons (*Carm.* xx. 1). He appears to have been educated at the same place, then famous as a seat of education, in the same school as his cousin Avitus, and his friends Aquilinus and Probus. Among his teachers were Eusebius in philosophy, Hoenus, and perhaps Victor, in poetry. He appears also frequently to have consulted Claudianus Mamertus at Vienne (Vol. III. 791), of whose multifarious ability, acuteness, patience, and kindness towards those who consulted him, and also his devout respect for his brother, the bishop of that see, he speaks with the warmest affection (*Ep.* iii. 1. iv. 1. 3. v. 9; *Carm.* i. 25. ix. 314, 334). From the title "frater," with which he more than once addressed a friend named Volusianus, he has been thought to have had a brother of that name, but as it seems without good reason (*Ep.* iv. 18; vii. 17). Soon after he reached the age of 20, he married Papianilla, only daughter of Flavius Eparchius Avitus, a native of Auvergne, who had held the office of praefectus praetorio, of which the seat was at Arles from A.D. 439 to 443, and who ten years later assisted in persuading Theodoric, king of the Visigoths, the seat of whose government was at Toulouse, to join the Romans under Aetius, and enable them to inflict on Attila and the Huns that great defeat on the plains of Châlons, in which Theodoric himself was slain, but which retarded for a time the decline of Roman power in Gaul, A.D. 451. After the battle, Avitus, who was not only a soldier and a diplomatist, but also a lover of nature and of literature, retired to his own house and patrimonial estate at Avitacum, Aydac or Aydat, near the city, probably Augustonemetum, which answers to the modern Clermont (*Carm.* vii. 230, 316, 339, 460, etc.). Besides Papianilla, Avitus had two sons, Ecdicius, whom Gibbon suggests, but without giving any reason, to have been only his stepson (vol. iv. p. 287, ed. Smith), and Agricola, with whom, after his marriage, Sidonius lived on the most friendly and affectionate terms, and with each of whom he exchanged letters. The marriage appears to have been blessed with a son, Apollinaris, and two daughters, Roscia, who was brought up by her aunts and grandmother, and Severiana. That there was another son, twin with Apollinaris, and named Heliodorus, and another daughter, named Alchima, has been thought by some writers, but does not seem probable (*Ep.* iv. 10, v. 16; Greg. Tur. iii. 2; Tillemont, xvi. note, p. 748; Germain, p. 6). A letter of later date is extant, addressed to his son Apollinaris, then almost sixteen years old, commending

him for his blameless behaviour, and warning him against the bad example and vicious society of some profligate scamps at Lyons, where he was studying (*Ep.* iii. 13). There is also a letter to Agricola, in which tender feeling is mixed with some quiet humour, and in which he excuses himself from joining him on a fishing excursion on account of the alarming illness of his daughter Severiana, on whose behalf, as well as his own, he begs his prayers. He speaks also of his general distrust of doctors, one alone, named Justus, being excepted, and expresses his firm trust in Christ as his best support (*Ep.* ii. 12). In a letter to the same, probably of the date 454 or thereabouts, he describes minutely the person and mode of life of king Theodoric II., successor to his brother Thorismund, whom he had murdered, particulars gathered in a visit to the court of Toulouse in company with Avitus, who having been called, as Sidonius says, like Cincinnatus, from his country retreat, to take the command of the Roman army (magister militum) by Maximus, checked the incursions of the Saxon pirates, and the threatened invasion of the Alemanni, and was engaged in negotiating with the Visigoth king an alliance with the Romans, when on the death of Maximus, at the demand, according to Sidonius, of Theodoric, as a condition of his alliance, or perhaps at his suggestion and with his support, Avitus was raised to the imperial dignity, and proclaimed emperor, first at Toulouse and afterwards at Ugernum (Beaucaire), A.D. 455, and was followed to Rome by his son-in-law, who pronounced a panegyric on him in a poem of 602 hexameter lines with an introduction of thirty-six elegiacs on Jan. 1, 456 (*Carm.* vii. 369–404; 510–572). By way of reward for this panegyric on his father-in-law, Sidonius received the honour of a brazen statue in the Basilica of Trajan, in a space between the two libraries. The opinion of the writers of Gallia Christiana, that this statue is of later date, appears to be erroneous (*Ep.* ix. 16; *Carm.* viii.). The reign of Avitus came to an end in 456, and after an ineffectual attempt in Gaul to set up Marcellinus, in which Sidonius took part, and a man named Poeonius assumed the office of praefect (*Ep.* i. 11), Majorian became emperor, and having crossed the Alps, defeated the Burgundian invaders, and after a stout resistance captured the city of Lyons. He imposed hard conditions and heavy taxes on the citizens, but was induced to remit them by the compliment of a florid panegyric in 603 hexameters, pronounced by Sidonius, and by some elegiac verses addressed both to himself and to his principal secretary Peter, a man fond of literature and ambitious of literary renown, whom Sidonius calls his Maecenas. We are indebted to this panegyric and to the previous one on Avitus for many details of historical events not recorded elsewhere. This took place in March 459. He obtained not only the desired remission, but also, perhaps somewhat later, the office of Count of the palace for himself (*Ep.* i. 11; *Carm.* iii, iv, v, xiii). Coupling the statement of Idatius as to a peace concluded between Majorian and Theodoric, A.D. 459, with some lines in the epitaph on Sidonius, we may perhaps infer that he was employed in negotiating it. Idat. *Chr.* v. 17; Epitaph in Sid. ap. Sirmon. *Vit. Sid.* Two years later, A.D. 460, when the emperor was holding his court at Arles, and had gathered round him, besides Sidonius, the most eminent literary men of Gaul, Domnulus, Lampridius, and Severianus, Sidonius distinguished himself, as he tells us in a letter, twenty years later, to his friend Tonantius Ferreolus, both by an improvised poem in praise of a book by secretary Peter, delivered at a dinner given by a citizen of Arles, and also at the emperor's table by his skilful and ready wit in clearing himself of a charge insinuated against him of being the author of a scurrilous attack by name on many well-known persons including Poeonius, already mentioned. The story is too long for insertion here, but is told by him in a lively manner and with much humour, especially as regards the way in which in an improvised epigram he turned the tables on Poeonius, who had suggested the charge against him. The prose letter is better than the verses, but both bear witness to his good temper, prudence and ready facility of composition (*Ep.* i. 11, ix. 13). From 461 to 465, during which period Severus, the puppet of Ricimer, occupied the imperial throne, Sidonius appears to have passed the time in retirement from public business, but fulfilling his part as a great landed proprietor, at Avitacum, into possession of which he came in right of his wife, on the death of Avitus, and which he describes at great length, and with much enthusiasm, in a letter written in the style of Pliny to his friend Domitius. His description of the house and grounds is very pleasing and picturesque, its trees and underwood, its lake, its fountains, its cascade, the sounds of the various persons and creatures inhabiting the neighbourhood, nightingales, swallows, geese, swans, frogs, cicadae, the bells of the cattle, the strains of the shepherds' and cowherds' pipes, the ball-court in which he played with Ecdicius when he stayed with him, and the whole closed with a pressing invitation to his friend to pay him a visit in the autumn (*Ep.* ii. 2). Living the life of a country gentleman in a country in whose beauty he delighted (see *Ep.* iv. 21), he was fond of field-sports, hunting and fishing, and not forgetting his literary taste, wrote verses on his fish-pond, and on fish caught in it, of which he sent some as a present to a friend, probably Ecdicius (*Carm.* xix. xxi.). It was on one of his journeys to this residence, but at an earlier period, and before he had quitted Lyons altogether, that not far from that city he detected, and in the high Roman fashion of a patrician, punished summarily some robbers who were violating the tomb of his grandfather, Apollinaris, perhaps A.D. 452. He describes the exploit in a letter to his nephew Secundus, and includes an epitaph in hendecasyllables on Apollinaris written on the following evening (*Ep.* iii. 12).

Several letters to friends belong to this period, among which may specially be mentioned one to Eriphius, a citizen of Lyons, perhaps A.D. 461, describing a church gathering which took place in commemoration of St. Justus at Lyons on Sept. 2, the procession before daybreak, the large congregation of both sexes, the psalms sung antiphonally by monks and clerks, the Eucharistic celebration, the great heat caused by the crowd and the number of lights, cooled after a time by the autumnal morning. The

principal citizens then met by agreement at the tomb of Afranius Syagrius, who had been consul A.D. 381. Pleasant conversation took place in which no one talked politics, till by general consent the company divided itself according to age and taste, for active or sedentary amusements, ball play, chess or draughts. Sidonius describes his own vigorous activity and that of Philimatius, father of Philimatia, wife of Eriphius, now an elderly man, his frequent falls, and presently his retirement from the game in pain and disorder, his own consequent cessation in order to assist Philimatius, and at last an elegiac quatrain improvised on the jack-towel used to wipe off his perspiration. The whole proceedings were brought to an end by a summons to the reception at the episcopal palace (*Ep.* v. 17). Another pleasant gossiping letter to Donidius, an Auvergnat friend, describes a visit made to his friends Tonantius Ferreolus, formerly praefectus praetorio of Gaul, and his kinsman, and Apollinaris his relative, at their houses, Prusianum (Bresis), and Voruangus (Beringueri), not far distant from each other on the banks of the Gardon near Nimes (*Ep.* ii. 9). He also probably visited his friend Consentius, himself a poet, at Narbonne, whose hospitality, and the praises of the city, and of his friends whom he met there, Magnus Felix, Lampidius, Marinus, Marcellinus, and others, and also the defence of the city during its recent siege, he celebrates in a poem of 512 hendecasyllabic verses (quingenti hendecasyllabi) (*Carm.* xxii. xxiii.; *Ep.* vii. 12). It may have been also during the same journey that he visited Faustus, bishop of Riez, who had succeeded Maximus in that see, as he had also done before in the abbey of Lerins, heard him preach, and was introduced by him to his mother, whom he describes as a Rebecca or a Hannah. This visit, made during very hot weather and his other obligations to Faustus, especially for his careful protection of his brother in his youth, he celebrates in a poem of thanks (eucharisticum), sent probably after no great interval of time (pridem) (*Carm.* xvi.).

When Anthemius became emperor, A.D. 467, he sent for Sidonius to Rome, on business which the people of Auvergne deputed him to manage on their behalf. Under the favour of Christ, as he says in a letter to Eutropius, whom he begged to accompany him, but with what success does not appear, he undertook the mission, of which his expenses, under a recent regulation, were provided by the imperial treasury. His friends crowded round him at his departure from foggy Lyons, and in letters to Heronius and Candidianus he describes pleasantly his easy and rapid ascent of the Alps, and no less easy descent by a path cut through the snow, his journey by the rivers Ticino, Po, Adda and Adige to Cremona and Ravenna, of which city he describes the situation, its fogs, bad drainage and mosquitos, and its social degradation, also the pestilential region, as he calls it, of Tuscany, which brought on an aguish fever, which, however, disappeared as he reached the outskirts of the apostolic city. The preparations for the marriage of Ricimer with Euphemia, the daughter of Anthemius, were in progress at the time of his arrival, and the wedding took place shortly afterwards. At Rome he took up his residence at the house of Paulus, a man of praefectorian rank, and possessing literary and scientific ability and attainments, and who was able to assist him by canvassing some of the senators in favour of his application, especially Gennadius Avienus and Caecina Basilius, who exhorted him, as a likely way of promoting his own interests, to celebrate the inauguration of Anthemius the new Consul by a poem. Sidonius consented, and the result was a panegyric in 548 hexameters, with a preface of thirty elegiacs, on Anthemius, his warlike achievements and literary attainments, and including some felicitations on his daughter's marriage. This complimentary address was rewarded with a gift of the high office of praefect of the senate and of the city of Rome, of which he speaks in a tone of gratified ambition in a letter to Philimatius. The office thus conferred on him, which he hoped by the help of Christ to fulfil, was not merely titular. Part of his duty as praefect of the city was to superintend the supply of corn for the food of the citizens, and while preparations for the war with Genseric and the Vandals were going on, Sidonius was in great fear lest this supply should be cut off by the Vandal fleet, A.D. 468, and that he himself should thus incur the displeasure of the Roman people, and be hissed in the theatre. But his apprehensions were relieved by the opportune arrival at Ostia of five ships laden with corn and honey, cargoes which the *praefectus annonae*, a zealous and diligent man, would soon cause to be distributed among the people. In the midst of his successes at Rome the interests of his friends in Auvergne were probably not forgotten, as some words used by Sidonius seem to shew. He remained at Rome until 469, and during that time was compelled to be a spectator of the trial and condemnation of Arvandus, prefect of Gaul, which he describes in a letter to Vincentius. Arvandus, whom he could not help calling his friend, was a man of no steady principle of character, vain and frivolous, and Sidonius wondered not that he had fallen, but that he had stood so long as he did. His debts, his arrogance, and above all his treasonable correspondence with Euric, the king of the Visigoths, who had become so in 466 or 467 by the murder of his elder brother Theodoric, correspondence revealed by his secretary, made an appeal to Rome inevitable, and it was conducted by the most eminent men of the province, Tonantius Ferreolus, Thaumastus and Petronius. Of every instance of his folly and ostentatious affectation of candour in respect of the treasonable letters Sidonius was not a witness, for he was absent, no doubt purposely, from the senate on the day on which he appeared there, but he did not desert his friend in distress, for he engaged the most eminent lawyer of the day, Auxanius, to defend him. His own perverse infatuation, however, led necessarily to his condemnation, at first to death, a sentence which was probably commuted to one of confiscation and banishment (*Ep.* i. 3. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10; *Carm.* i. ii.). He was followed, perhaps in the same office, certainly in one of great authority, by Seronatus, a brutal, corrupt, tyrannical, treacherous man, the Catiline of his age, as Sidonius calls him, in league with Euric against the Romans, and whose conviction and condemnation to death, obtained with great

difficulty, was one of the last acts of justice performed by the expiring empire (*Ep.* ii. 1, v. 13, vii. 7), "quem convictum vix res publica praesumpsit occidere." On leaving Rome Sidonius retired to Gaul, and resided partly at Lyons and partly at Avitacum. Towards the end of the year or the beginning of the next, the province of Lugdunensis I. was surrendered by Anthemius to the Burgundians as the price of their assistance against the Visigoths (Tillemont, *Emp.* vi. p. 357). Against these barbarians, whom, however, he describes as less ferocious than other German races, Sidonius pours forth his complaints, describing their perverse ways, revolting and odious to those over whom they domineered, but of their ruler (tetrarches) Chilperic II., and of his wife Agrippina, he speaks more favourably. (*Ep.* v. 7; *Carm.* xii.) But he describes with much admiration the marriage ceremonies of a Burgundian chief, Sigismer, and regrets the absence of a friend to whom he wrote on the subject (*Ep.* iv. 20). About this time a new church was erected at Lyons through the exertions of Patiens, the bishop, for whom Sidonius entertained the most affectionate reverence. He was present at the dedication, which he describes in hendecasyllables, and for which the poets Constantius and Secundinus had written inscriptions in hexameters, placed near the altar of the church (*Ep.* ii. 10). So also at the request of Perpetuus, bishop of Tours, he wrote an elegiac inscription for the church of St. Martin, of that city, which Perpetuus had enlarged. (*Ep.* iv. 18.) Always fond of writing verses, and having obtained a wide reputation as a writer of complimentary poems, he frequently employed his pen in this way, and some of his compositions of this kind probably belong to this period, *e.g.* 1. An inscription of twelve elegiacs for a silver bowl, to be presented by his friend Evodius to Ragnahilda, the wife of Euric, a gift plainly of a propitiatory character, to be presented at a time when her husband's friendship was particularly desirable. It was composed at his friend's request, who was then on his way to Toulouse, at the command of Euric, during a halt on one of his journeys from Lyons to Avitacum (*Ep.* iv. 8). 2. A poem of 133 hexameters, with a preface of twenty-two elegiacs, on the marriage of Ruricius and Iberia, daughter of Ommatius (*Carm.* x. xi. 52). 3. One of 222 turgid and jejune hexameters, with a preface of thirty hendecasyllables on the marriage of Polemius and Araneola (Ărănčōla) (*Carm.* xiv. xv.). Polemius appears to have studied, or at any rate dabbled in, philosophy, especially that of Plato, and the poet expresses the fond hope that his union with Araneola may bear fruit in a young Plato (v. 191). 4. Among poems of this kind is one apologising for absence of an expected Epithalamium on account of the presence of the Burgundians, whose great stature and their gross and barbarous habits he describes with all the contemptuous disgust of a highly civilised patrician (*Ep.* v. 5; *Carm.* xii.). About this time he appears to have visited Bordeaux, and writes to his friend Trygetius, urging him to come thither, and meet their mutual friends Leontius, Paulinus, perhaps a member of the same family as Paulinus of Nola, Rusticus and others, and endeavouring to attract him both by this prospect, and also by one of a luxurious voyage on the river, and of dainties of various kinds, cockles, oysters, and fish (*Ep.* viii. 12; *Carm.* xxii. 117). It was, perhaps, also on this occasion that he wrote his poem on the town of Burgus, itself connected with the harbour of Bordeaux (*Carm.* xxii.) It must have been before the time when the Visigoths openly attacked Auvergne, and while the Roman Empire still retained its hold on some portion of S.E. Gaul, that Sidonius sent forth his poems collected in a volume, addressed to his various friends, and circulated among them in succession, beginning with the house of Domitius, and ending at Narbonne. They are preceded by an address in verse by way of introduction, *propempticon* or *envoi* (*Carm.* xxiv.). About the time when Lyons was transferred to the Burgundians, Sidonius left it and took up his residence permanently at Avitacum, which the friendship of Ommatius made particularly agreeable to him (*Carm.* xvii.).

Second period, 471–475. — Surrounded by dangers from threatened invasions, and enemies not only political but religious, for Euric was a zealous supporter of Arian doctrine, and persecuted the Catholics with great severity, the people of Clermont, when Eparchius their bishop died, A.D. 471, united in a clamorous demand that Sidonius should become their bishop. He was not in holy orders, but, as we have seen, had shown himself to be without ostentation a devout Christian, though somewhat flexible and elastic as a politician. His ability was beyond question, as a man of letters he stood in the foremost rank of his time, he held a high place, probably the highest, among the landed proprietors of his province whose interests he was firm and patriotic in upholding, and had taken an active part on more than one occasion on behalf of its inhabitants, in which also he had been ably and zealously supported by his friends, of whom both in military and in civil affairs, Ecdicius held the chief place in the district. (Greg. Tur. ii. 21). Fully aware of his own deficiencies he accepted unwillingly the office thrust upon him, deploring his unfitness to pray for the people committed to his charge, and dreading its responsibility he begs his friends, among them Fonteius, bishop of Vaison, Euphronius, bishop of Autun, Leontius, bishop of Arles, and Lupus, bishop of Troyes, who wrote to congratulate him on his appointment, to pray for him that his sins may be forgiven, and that in approaching to the altar he may not pollute it with strange fire (*Ep.* v. 3, vi. 1, 3, 7, vii. 8, 9, ix. 2). His feeling in this matter appears to be thoroughly genuine, for it brought on an illness (*Ep.* v. 3), and the notion of Ampère, of Guizot, and of Ozanam, that he accepted the office because all hope of advancement in any other line was cut off by the collapse of the empire, appears to be without solid foundation. (Ampère, *Litt. de la France*, vol. ii. p. 230; Baret, *Sid. Ap.* p. 29.) In the same spirit he declines on the ground of conscious incompetence to accede to the request of Euphronius to write something for him (*Ep.* ix. 2), and at a later time to a similar one from Arbogastes, afterwards probably bishop of Chartres, referring him to bishops nearer and more competent than himself, as Lupus of

Troyes, or Auspicius of Toul (*Ep.* iv. 17). From this time he gave up writing verses of a light kind, as an occupation ill-suited both to his time of life and the gravity of his office, and declined to resume it even at the request of his friends (*Ep.* ix. 12). But he did not refuse at their request to criticise compositions nor to write hymns in honour of martyrs, among which was, according to the writers of *Histoire littéraire*, one in honour of St. Saturninus of Toulouse, and another on St. Anianus, both of which are lost (*Ep.* viii. 4, ix. 16). As regards his wife Papianilla, though there is no doubt of his undiminished affection for her, it is probable, as is assumed by Sirmond, Tillemont, the Abbé Chaix, and others, that like Paulinus, Reticius and others, he lived with her on terms not of connubial but of fraternal intimacy, but no evidence of this appears from his own writings. That they continued to live together is plain from the story told of them by Gregory of Tours, that having parted with his plate in order to give to the poor, she like the wife of Paulinus found fault with him for so doing (Greg. Tur. ii. 22). He also speaks with the greatest affection of their young daughter, Roscia, who was being brought up carefully by her grandmother and aunts at Lyons (*Ep.* v. 16). He became abstemious in his diet, observing alternate days as fasts, yet not wanting in hospitality (*Ep.* vii. 14). In describing the mode of life of his friend Maximus who like himself had been forced into the office of a priest, perhaps bishop of Toulouse, he may be supposed to describe in some measure his own (*Ep.* iv. 24). He became a diligent student of Scripture, though disclaiming earnestly any ability as a commentator, and also of ecclesiastical writers, as Augustine, Jerome, Origen, and others (*Ep.* viii. 4, ix. 2).

Among his acts about this time may be reckoned an endeavour through Pragmatius (bishop of Bourges, as Tillemont conjectures, or according to Chaix, of Autun), perhaps the same man as the one mentioned in *Ep.* v. 10, to bring about a reconciliation between a presbyter Agrippinus and a widow named Eutropia, whose son had married his daughter, in a matter of inheritance in which Sidonius thought that he had behaved ill towards her (*Ep.* vi. 2; Tillemont, xvi. p. 227, 238).

It was probably before he became a bishop that in a journey to Toulouse he was able to perform an act of great service to an old friend. Turpio, a man of Tribunitian rank, had borrowed a sum of money from Maximus Palatinus, also a friend of Sidonius, and the only security that he gave for it was his bond to pay interest at 12 per cent. For ten years no interest had been paid, and Turpio, now extremely ill, besought Sidonius to obtain for him more delay. Sidonius dined and slept at the house of Maximus, and noticed a great change in his dress and appearance, and found that he had adopted a monastic or at least a clerical mode of life. Next morning, as he was departing, he laid the case before his friend, urging him to grant his request on the ground not only of kindness but of prudence, for if Turpio died his heirs would be entitled by law to a year's immunity. Maximus, as a friend, and particularly as a clerical person, granted the request, postponed the payment of the debt for a year, and remitted all the interest. In his letter to Turnus, son of Turpio, in which he relates the whole transaction, Sidonius urges him on his own behalf and on that of his co-heirs to express the utmost gratitude to Maximus, and to use his best endeavours to pay off the principal of the debt (*Ep.* iv. 24).

From the time of his acceptance of the bishopric in 471 until A.D. 474, when Auvergne was first attacked formally by the Visigoth, its is not easy to fix accurately all the dates of events or of letters, but the following are probably included within that period.

From the time of his accession to the throne of Toulouse in 466, Euric lost no opportunity of strengthening himself and increasing his own dominions by aggression upon the Roman. In 470, in compliance with the treacherous suggestions by Arvandus, and in contravention of the existing treaty under Riothamus, he attacked and defeated a Breton force in alliance with Rome, and probably intended to act against him, but shortly after received a check from the Romans under Paulus, which with the unwelcome support of the Burgundians served to maintain their supremacy for a time in Berry (*Ep.* i. 7, vii. 6; Greg. Turon. ii. 18). With Riothamus Sidonius appears to have been on friendly terms, and exerted his influence with him to obtain redress for an Arvernian, whose slaves had been carried off by some of his disorderly Bretons (*Ep.* iii. 9).

Not long after his acceptance of the episcopate, the archiepiscopal see of Bourges became vacant on the death probably of Eulalius or Eulodius, and the people agreed to request Sidonius to undertake the duty of appointing a successor. Before accepting this office he consulted Euphronius, bishop of Autun, who had been concerned together with Patiens, bishop of Lyons, in appointing John, an archdeacon, to be bishop of Chalons, A.D. 469, and also Agroecius, bishop of Sens, whom he pressed to attend if possible and preside as metropolitan, though from the disturbed state of the country other bishops would be unable to attend. There were many candidates, of whom the principal were Eucherius, Pannychius, and Simplicius, all of them laymen, but of whom the last was distinctly the favourite, and the first two were disqualified by having married a second time. So numerous, however, were they as to fill two benches in the cathedral, and while all were opposed to each other, many obtruded themselves, and some even offered money for the office, putting it up, as it were, to auction, for the highest bidder. Amidst this confusion and difficulty, the only safe course to be taken was that which the people chose, with some little objection on the part of some presbyters, viz., to commit the selection to a single person. Accordingly Sidonius delivered an address in the presence of the archbishop of Sens, in which he describes with modesty and good judgment his great difficulty in making choice of a fit person. Many were fit, but only one could be chosen. Some disliked a monk, some a man of learning, some a strict man, and others, one who was lax and easy. If he were to choose a military man, a cry would be raised against himself because he had been engaged in secular affairs and might be thought to despise the poor

in Christ. But after weighing carefully the whole question he had resolved to name Simplicius, as having a sacerdotal origin, being the son of Eulodius, probably the last bishop, and also son-in-law of Palladius who, unless the conjecture of Tillemont be correct, preceded Eulalius. He then describes his character and merits, among which one was that he had built a church at a time when he was young, his family were increasing, and his means restricted. If any asked him how he came to know all this, he replies that he had known the people of Bourges before he had made acquaintance with the town, had conversed with many and heard their opinions, and therefore in the name of the Trinity he pronounced Simplicius to be the metropolitan of the province, and chief priest of the city. At the request of Perpetuus, bishop of Tours, he sends him the discourse which he had composed or at least dictated to a copyist in two watches of a summer night, without ornament, or grace of oratory, but which answered the purpose for which it was intended. (*Ep.* iv. 25, vii. 5, 8, 9.) At some time shortly after he became a bishop, Mamertus Claudianus, already mentioned, sent him his treatise in three books on the condition of the soul (de statu animae) of whose receipt Sidonius took no notice until Mamertus wrote to him to complain of his silence and of his retention of his book. This appeal drew forth a reply, in which Sidonius, who had lent the book to Nymphidius, pours forth an overflowing torrent in eulogy both upon the treatise and also on a hymn which he had lent at the same time, which Gennadius says was the one so well known by its opening words, "Pange lingua," commonly attributed to Venantius Fortunatus (Vol. III. p. 791; *Ep.* iv. 2, 3, v. 2; Chaix, ii. 55). In the following year 473, or early in 474, Claudian died, to the great grief of his two friends, and of the diocese of Vienne. His death was deplored deeply by Sidonius, who, in a letter to his nephew Petreius, describes his character and abilities, and his affectionate deference to his brother the bishop, and also the valuable assistance rendered by him to his flock. He adds also a funeral elegy to his memory in hendecasyllabic verse, which he says in that letter he wrote at the grave when he visited Vienne late in the summer of 474 (*Ep.* iv. 11. v. 6).

The following letters between the dates mentioned above may be mentioned as illustrating in one way or another the character of the writer. (1) To Ambrosius, a bishop, perhaps of Sens, about a young man who had led a dissolute life, but mended his ways by marriage, over which he expresses his pleasure, but recommends behaviour in the use of it in accordance with the opinion much in favour at this time, and with which his own conduct in this respect most probably agreed (*Ep.* ix. 6). (2) To a friend named Aper, a man of property in Auvergne, whom he entreats to return to his patrimonial estate, extolling the beauties of the country, the attractions of the town, and representing the advantage to himself of a speedy return (*Ep.* iv. 21). (3) To Aprunculus, bishop of Langres, about a clerical person, named Injuriosus, whom he was willing to release from his obligation to the church of Clermont, and whose services he wished his friend to enjoy, on condition that he treated him with kindness (*Ep.* ix. 10). (4) To Auspicius, bishop of Toul, recommending to his notice the bearer of his letter, Peter, a man of Tribunitian rank (*Ep.* vii. 10). (5) To Censorius, bishop, probably of Auxerre, about a "Levite" who had taken refuge in his diocese from the threatened attacks of the Visigoths, and who, he begs, may be relieved from the payment due from him as a stranger on the produce of a small piece of church land, which he occupied, so that he might return home with a grateful heart (*Ep.* vi. 10). (6) To Eleutherius, bishop of Tournay, recommending a Jew to him for protection (*Ep.* vi. 11). (7) To Fonteius, bishop of Vaison, expressing his thanks for his kind reception of Vindicius, a deacon of Auvergne, and also his kindness and protection afforded to his intimate friends, Apollinaris, his kinsman, and Simplicius, suspected by Chilperic II., the Burgundian tetrarch, who, bearing the Roman title of *magister militum*, was jealous of Roman influence, and suspected them of a plot for transferring Vaison to the Roman emperor (*Ep.* v. 6, vii. 4). (8) In a letter to Graecus, bishop of Marseilles, he relates the story of Amantius, a native of Auvergne, and employed as a reader in the service of the church, born of parents of good character and moderate means. He went to Marseilles to seek his fortune, and by his industry and good conduct obtained the favour of Eustachius, the bishop, predecessor of Graecus, of the count and of many citizens. Having gained the affections of a young lady of equal rank at least with his own, and possessing a good fortune, he married her without precaution on the part of her mother, who appears to have been a widow, to secure her own property. But as soon as this was accomplished, the gay deceiver (praestigiator invictus), having averted by a timely present the suspicions of his mother-in-law, laid hands on as much property as he could, and beat a retreat to Auvergne. She threatened him with an action for damages, but having obtained from Sidonius, on grounds which must have been fictitious, a letter of recommendation to Graecus, he returned to Marseilles in hope of pacifying her anger. Notwithstanding what had taken place, the affair was somehow made up, and Sidonius, who treats the whole rather as a comedy than a moral offence, did not withdraw his favour from Amantius, whom he employed frequently as his letter-carrier to Graecus (*Ep.* vii. 2, 7, 11; ix. 4). (9) To Leontius, bishop of Arles, recommending the bearer of the letter, who had some business to transact there in reference to a will (*Ep.* vi. 3). (10) To Lupus, bishop of Troyes, with whom he carried on frequent correspondence, about a man named Gallus, who had left his wife and removed to Auvergne, and to whom Lupus sent a letter exhorting him to return to her. The success of this letter is related by Sidonius (*Ep.* vi. 9). (11) To Nonnechius, or Nunechius, bishop of Nantes, recommending to him a converted Jew named Promotus (*Ep.* viii. 13). (12) To Philagrius, a friend, on metaphysical subjects (*Ep.* vii. 11). (13) To Pragmatius, bishop, perhaps of Autun, though Tillemont thinks of Bourges, requesting him to reconcile two persons who were at variance, Agrippinus, a priest, whose daughter had married the son of Eutropia, a widow devoted to a holy life. The son was

now dead, and also their child, and Agrippinus, who was plainly endeavouring to secure a pecuniary benefit for his daughter, persecuted his mother-in-law in an ungenerous manner, though she was well disposed to a reconciliation, which Sidonius had endeavoured vainly, as an old friend of Eutropia, to bring about, and for which, he says with some surprise, there was more inclination on the female than on the male side of the quarrel (*Ep.* vi. 2). (14) To Principius, bishop of Soissons, there are two letters, one acknowledging the receipt of a letter, and regretting deeply that he is separated so far from him by distance, the other describing the pleasure which he had received from a visit paid to him by Antiolius, a bishop, though of what see is unknown, who had been a member of the monastic community of Lerins, and a friend of Lupus, bishop of Troyes, and Maximus of Riez, predecessor of Faustus. Antiolius had visited Principius, and also his brother Remigius, and delighted Sidonius with his account of them, on which Sidonius indites a rhetorical panegyric, in the midst of which a letter was brought to him from Principius by Megethius, by whom in reply he sends his respects (obsequia), requesting him to favour him with letters as frequently as he can, at all events with his prayers, and deploring the distance which separates them (*Ep.* viii. 14, ix. 8). (15) To Proculus, a friend whose son had left his home and taken refuge in Auvergne, and whom he implores him to receive again with lenity, especially as he had himself rebuked him severely and brought him to repentance (*Ep.* iv. 23). (16) To Remigius, bishop of Rheims, brother of Principius, relating how a native of Auvergne having gone to Rheims, obtained clandestinely from his secretary or bookseller a collection of his discourses, and presented them to him, though he was willing to purchase them. Sidonius immediately had them all copied out, and in his letter to Remigius expresses his admiration of them, especially their style, on which he pronounces an inflated panegyric, and hints that if he neglects to favour him with more of his compositions, he shall watch the sales of travellers and plunder his bookshelves with the connivance and assistance of the numerous admirers who have read his works in Auvergne (*Ep.* ix. 7). (17) To Apollinaris, at the time when the siege was impending, approving of his determination to postpone a meditated pilgrimage to the tomb of the martyr, perhaps St. Julian, and mentioning a complaint by the bearer of the letter against a servant of his, named Genesius. (*Ep.* iv. 6).

In the course of the year A.D. 473, or early in 474, the province of Berry became a prey to the Visigoth king, who took advantage of the weakness of the Roman empire after the death of Anthemius to extend his dominion towards the Rhone and the Loire, and Auvergne was now the only province remaining to the Romans west of the Rhone, and this also was in constant danger of invasion. No formal attack, however, took place until the autumn of 474. In June of that year Julius Nepos, nephew of Marcellinus mentioned above, became emperor, and held that office until August 475 (Jornandes, *Get.* 45). A friend of Sidonius, Castalius Innocentius Audax, was appointed by him to the office of *praefectus urbi* early in his reign, an appointment on which Sidonius wrote to congratulate him, adding some judicious compliments to the new emperor (*Ep.* viii. 7). In this letter no mention is made of any alarm of invasion, and late in the summer of the same year, when the fear of siege had for the present subsided at Clermont, Sidonius took the journey to Vienne already mentioned, in which he paid a visit of condolence to his friend Thaumastus, who had lately become a widower, but who had exerted himself to refute the suspicion raised against Apollinaris and Simplicius respecting the city of Vaison (*Ep.* v. 6; vii. 4). He seems on this journey, either first or last, to have visited Lyons, and there to have met with the quaestor Licinianus, who bore with him from the emperor Nepos at Ravenna a formal appointment of Ecdicius to the dignity of a patrician. Of this he writes with great pleasure to Papianilla, as the payment of a debt long due, promised by Anthemius, and now fulfilled by Nepos, and looks forward to higher honours still to be conferred upon her brother. He concludes his letter with salutations from their daughter Roscia, who was being brought up with tender care by her aunts and grandmother (*Ep.* v. 16). At some time in this year, as it seems, Avitus, brother-in-law of Sidonius, endowed the see of Clermont with a farm called Cuticiacum (Cunhiae), not far from the city, and in the letter mentioning this Sidonius speaks also of the threatened invasion and of his confidence in Avitus in case of negotiation (*Ep.* iii. 1). Meanwhile, as the autumn advanced, the danger became nearer, the Visigoths entered the territory of Auvergne, and communication with distant places became more difficult. For the purpose of conveying letters, Sidonius employed a Jew named Gozolas (Gedaliah?), of whom he expresses the hope that he may become a Christian (*Ep.* iii. 4, iv. 5), and in writing to Graecus, Amantius (*Ep.* vi. 11). In preparations to resist the enemy Sidonius exerted himself not so much as a bishop as a leader of the people, and was greatly assisted by his brother-in-law Ecdicius, who, on one occasion, with a handful of cavalry attacked and defeated a large force of the enemy. They retired at the end of 474 or beginning of 475, but not so completely as to remove either the apprehension of future attack or the necessity for watch and ward to be kept on the walls during the snowy days and dark nights of winter (*Ep.* iii. 7). Among the vexations incidental to the state of affairs, one appears in a letter to Calminius, a friend serving, but whether under compulsion is not quite clear, in the ranks of the enemy; but in this he speaks of the prospects, if not of peace, yet at least of a truce (*Ep.* v. 12). The blockade had not been maintained so strictly as entirely to prevent communication from without, for in a letter to Faustus, bishop of Riez, he speaks of a monk named Riochatus, who was also a bishop and a Briton by birth, the bearer of some books of his, who on his way to Bretagne, if not to Britain, came to Clermont, and being prevented from further progress by the siege was entertained hospitably there for more than two months. During his stay he had made known some scattered portions of his freight, but took his departure hastily, and was suspected by some of the people who were travelling of having

carried off not literary but pecuniary treasure. Sidonius accordingly mounted his horse, rode off in pursuit, and overtook him on the following day. He saluted him with a mixture of severity and cordiality, but with the greatest show of respect took from him the book which he had concealed, and which he devoured, he says, with eagerness, and from which he caused large extracts to be made. He then proceeds to give his opinion concerning them, in which he compares his friend to the captor of a foreign woman suggested in the book of Deuteronomy. Like him he has taken captive heathen Philosophy, whom he has deprived of her superfluous ornaments and joined in marriage with himself (Deut. xxi. 10, 13). On this theme he proceeds in his usual eulogistic style to enlarge in detail, and to show how the doctrines of the various schools have been made, by his friend, with due regard to Christian doctrine, subservient to his own purpose, and he foretells with confidence the future fame of the book, which, however, unfortunately has not been preserved (*Ep.* ix. 9). That the enemy had departed by this time is evident both from this story and from a letter to Eutropius, bishop of Orange, recommending the bearer to his notice (*Ep.* vi. 6). The siege was now over, and immediate danger from the enemy removed, but the troubles from without were succeeded by other troubles not less perplexing. Ecdicius had left Clermont and taken up his abode for the present among the Burgundians, and much strife and dissension prevailed in Clermont. In this state of affairs Sidonius entreated his friend Constantius, a priest of Lyons, to visit him and use his influence with the people in restoring peace. He obeyed the call, notwithstanding the winter season, the difficulties of travelling, the length of the journey, and his own feeble health, was received with the utmost respect and cordiality, and his mission was crowned with success (*Ep.* iii. 2). Ecdicius also was entreated by his brother-in-law to return, and not to trust to the uncertain favour of kings, a remark which seems to refer to the Burgundian tetrarchs, whose favour he was enjoying. The loose narrative of Jornandes seems to show that he returned for a time, but there is no evidence of this from Sidonius (Jornandes, *Get.* 45, Sid. *Ep.* iii. 3). Besides the trouble already mentioned, the siege and its attendant devastations had caused much distress among the inhabitants of Clermont, which however Patiens, bishop of Lyons, of whose munificent liberality Sidonius had been a witness in the region bordering on the Rhône, contributed largely to relieve. In his letter to him of thanks and encomium, Sidonius compares him to Triptolemus and also to Joseph (*Ep.* vi. 12). In this work of relief Ecdicius appears to have joined very heartily, but the account given of his share in it by Gregory of Tours appears to be much exaggerated (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 24; Ecdicius, Vol. II. 33). A truce, not destined to be of long duration, appears to have been arranged in the early part of A.D. 475, perhaps through the agency of Epiphanius, bishop of Pavia, who appears to have gone alone to Toulouse, but who may have conferred on his way with Licinianus, of whom Sidonius, who does not mention Epiphanius, speaks in high terms, and also with others (Baronius, *Ann.* 474, xvi.–xx.). He mentions a treaty, perhaps this one, in a letter to Julianus, a bishop in the province either of Bourges or Narbonne (*Ep.* ix. 5; Tillemont, xvi. p. 249), and uses his interest with Hypatius to induce him to consent to the sale of the remainder of a property called Eborolacum (Ebreuil) to Donidius, of which he already possessed the moiety. He also wrote to Theoplastus, a bishop, perhaps of Geneva, to assist Donidius in some matter, perhaps the same as the one just mentioned, on which he had applied to him (*Ep.* iii. 5, vi. 5). In the midst of this temporary cessation of hostilities a report became current that Euric had again made a movement of aggression and invaded the Roman territory of Auvergne, and Sidonius thought it to be his duty to summon his people to join in acts of fasting and prayer to be conducted in the same way as the Rogations instituted, or rather revived and re-organised, some years previously by Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, and of which, in a letter to him, he recounts the history. In the same letter he begs for the prayers of the bishop and of his flock on behalf of the people of Auvergne, and as a claim upon their attention, mentions the transfer to Vienne at some previous time of the remains of Ferreolus and the head of Julian, both of them martyrs and natives of Auvergne. He also wrote to his friend Aper, entreating him as a citizen of Clermont to leave his warm baths at Aquae Calidae, and come to Clermont to take part in the solemn service (*Ep.* v. 14, vii. 1, Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 11 *de Mirac.* ii. 1, 2; ROGATION DAYS, *Dict. Chr. Ant.* Vol. II. p. 1809; Baronius, *Ann.* 475, xii.–xxi.; Tillemont, vol. xvi. p. 247, 248). No actual invasion of Auvergne appears to have taken place, but in the meantime negotiations were being carried on in which the bishops Basilius, of Aix, Faustus, of Riez, Graecus, of Marseilles, and Leontius, of Arles, were among the acting counsellors, and of which the ultimate result was the surrender of Auvergne to the Visigoths.

It was probably at this time, after his repulse from Clermont and while negotiations were going on, that Euric, who was not only a determined enemy of Rome but a zealous partisan of the Arian heresy, and whose hostility in this direction Sidonius says that he feared more than his attacks on Roman fortifications, deprived of their sees and in many cases put to death or banished many bishops in the regions subject to his dominion, whose places he would allow no successors to fill, and thus the number of the clergy was in danger of being diminished. Churches were overthrown, and their sites overrun by animals. Christian discipline was destroyed, and in a letter to Basilius, probably archbishop of Aix in Provence, one of the negotiators above mentioned, Sidonius implores him, as placed in a region which was the passage ground of political negotiators, to exert himself to obtain permission for the exercise of episcopal ordination (*Ep.* vii. 6). Assuming this to be the true date of this letter, which seems to be corroborated by a letter to Felix (*Ep.* iv. 10), and in some degree by the narrative of Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Fr.* ii. 25), it was perhaps at this time, while Sidonius was master of his own movements, that he accepted a request made to him by Elaphius, a country

gentleman of Rouergue (Ruteni), in which region Euric was predominant, to consecrate a baptistery, of which he remarks that his friend had built a church at a time when few would have dared to repair an old one. Though the season was unfavourable for travelling, and the road dangerous from Alpine precipices, he consented cheerfully to go, but warned his friend that he must bring a long train of attendants (*Ep.* iv. 5). Probably also at this time he visited the church of Chantelle (Cantillensem) about twenty-six miles south-west of Moulins, at the request of a friend named Germanicus, on whose bodily vigour at the age of sixty he enlarges with pleasure in a letter to another friend, Vectius, whose own person and habits he describes with no less pleasure and admiration in one to his nephew Secundus (*Ep.* iv. 9, 13).

The news of the surrender of Auvergne, proclaiming as it did the utter prostration of Roman influence, was a heavy blow to Sidonius, and he wrote to Graecus to complain bitterly of what had taken place, recounting the unswerving loyalty of the Arvernians, their exertion on behalf of the state in the matter of Seronatus, and their sufferings during the siege; and inveighing with vehement severity against the selfish policy by which, for the sake of securing for a time but for future slavery the districts in which the negotiators were interested, the faithful province of Auvergne was to be handed over for punishment to the enemy. If this is to be the case, the friends to whom they have been betrayed ought at least to be prepared to receive them as exiled refugees. The letter is a manly and patriotic remonstrance, free from artificial pedantry, in a style which exhibits the character of the writer in its genuine colours, and in the honesty of its scornful indignation rises into real eloquence (*Ep.* vii. 7; GRAECUS, Vol. II. p. 720). But the remonstrance was fruitless, and Auvergne passed from the Roman to the Visigoth dominion. It was placed under a governor named Victorius, with the title of Count, who appears at first to have behaved with real or affected moderation (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 20; Sid. *Ep.* vii. 17; Chaix, ii. 290).

Third Period, A.D. 475–489. — Sidonius was soon banished for a time to a fort named Livia, probably Capendu, about ten miles from Carcassonne, on the road to Narbonne (*Ep.* viii. 3; ix. 3; Vaissette, *Hist. de Languedoc*, V. vol. i. p. 501). Some of the inconveniences which he suffered there are described by him in letters to Faustus, bishop of Riez, and to Leo, a native of Narbonne and of Roman origin, but filling a high office under Euric. They consisted chiefly in the annoyance caused by his neighbours, two quarrelsome drunken old Gothic women (*Ep.* viii. 3). Leo was a friend to Sidonius, who at his request wrote a life of Apollonius of Tyana, and on whom in a letter to Leo he pronounces, not a critical description of the man and his works, but an indiscriminating panegyric (*ib.*). Through Leo's influence he obtained release from his confinement, which was not of long duration, but his return to Clermont was delayed by an enforced sojourn at Bordeaux, whither he went in order to obtain from Euric authority for recovering the inheritance belonging to him in right of his mother-in-law. But two months were allowed by Euric to pass before he would grant him an interview, nor have we any information as to the result, but his visit drew forth a letter in verse from Lampridius, a professor of literature there, but who was absent at the time, urging him to write some verses, a request with which, though not in the mood for writing, and somewhat in the condition, as he says, of a dying swan, he nevertheless complied, and sent his friend a poem in hendecasyllables, describing the various signs of the power of Euric, to be seen at Bordeaux, perhaps hoping that through Lampridius, and also through Leo, this little stroke of indirect flattery for the king might be of service to him in attaining his object (*Ep.* viii. 3. 9). On his return to Clermont, though not under close restraint, his movements beyond his diocese were controlled by the governor, whose leave he says that he was obliged to obtain, when he wished to take a journey to visit his friend Felix (*Ep.* iv. 10). But in general he seems to have been well satisfied with his treatment, unless indeed some part of the praise which he bestows on his custodian, be due to the inveterate spirit of eulogy, for Victorius ostentatiously promoted church building in Clermont, and undertook the charge of the funeral of Abraham, a monk of Eastern origin, who having been imprisoned for five years in Persia, had latterly been abbat of the monastery of St. Cyricus, near Clermont. Victorinus visited him on his death-bed. His life is related by Gregory of Tours, and Sidonius wrote, A.D. 477, a somewhat turgid epitaph on him in elegiacs, at the request of a friend named Volusianus, said to be his brother, whom Baronius calls a bishop, perhaps the successor of Perpetuus at Tours. Sidonius recommended that a monk named Auxanius should be chosen to succeed Abraham, but that as his health was weak and his temper easy, Volusianus should take the lead in the government of the monastery. According to Gregory of Tours, the conduct of Victorius became at a later time oppressive and tyrannical. He was forced to take flight and seek refuge at Rome, whither he persuaded Apollinaris, son of Sidonius, to accompany him. Showing there similar insolence as he had shown in Auvergne, he was stoned to death by the populace. Apollinaris was taken with him, and kept for a time in confinement at Milan, but was enabled to make his escape and return home, where, so far as we can judge, he seems to have been received kindly. (*Ep.* vii. 17; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 20, 21, 26; *de Mirac.* i. 45; *Vit. Patr.* c. iii.; Baronius, ann. 480, xiv.–xviii.; Chaix, ii. 289–292; Ruricius, *Ep.* ii. 25.)

Sidonius had already, at the request of Magnus Felix, published the twenty-four poems which, as well as two letters in prose to Leontius and Polemius, appear in a collected form. This was probably about A.D. 468 (*Carm.* ix. 8; Germain, p. 38). At a time much later than this, which there are no definite data to fix, but which may probably be placed at about 477 or 478, the time at which he would have reached the age of forty-six or forty-seven, the commencement of "seniority," according to Gellius, Censorinus, and others (Censorinus, *de die Nat.* xii.; Gell. x. 28), his friend, Constantius of Lyons, urged him to publish his letters, a request to which he acceded. The reason for assigning this date is that in the first book he

speaks of himself as advancing in years, and in one of the fifth book, published somewhat later, which is addressed to Aquilinus, as knocking at the threshold of old age. Born A.D. 432, he would be fifty years old in 482, an age which the words just quoted would sufficiently describe (*Ep.* i. 1, 11, v. 9). Of the first book as it now stands, all the letters belong to the earlier period of his public life. It was not long after this that he published six more books, as he implies in the last letter of the seventh book addressed to the same Constantius (*Ep.* iv. 10, vii. 18). Of the letters in these five books most of those which possess special interest have been noticed already, but a few remain to be mentioned. (1) To Placidus, a citizen of Grenoble, unknown as it seems to himself personally, but who had read and admired his works both in verse and in prose, i.e., the first volume of his letters (*Ep.* iii. 14). (2) To Chariobaudes, an abbat, thanking him for his sympathy in his trouble, and sending him by his messengers a warm cowl to wear during night Services (*Ep.* vii. 16). (3, 4) A friendly correspondence between Sidonius and Ruricius, afterwards, but not at that time, bishop of Limoges, on whose marriage with Iberia Sidonius had written a poem in former days. Sidonius had lent to Leontius, bishop of Arles, a book, one of his own composition, which Ruricius, who had great admiration for its author, wished to see, and which by direction of Sidonius he had obtained from him. But he was so much pleased with it that he ventured without leave to have it copied, a pious fraud for which upon confession of the deed he asked Sidonius to grant him absolution, which was willingly and gracefully accorded (Ruric, *Ep.* i. 8; Sid. *Ep.* iv. 16). In another letter to the same, Sidonius speaks of having sent by the bearer a copy made by his scribe of the volume of the Heptateuch, i.e., the Pentateuch, together with the books of Joshua and of Judges+Ruth, regarded as one book, which he had himself examined and ascertained its correctness; also one of the Prophets, written during his own absence, and also that of the promised corrector, but with great care, and freed from superfluous additions. For this work the scribe, in his opinion, deserves his master's best thanks (*Ep.* v. 15). (5) To Sapaudus, a professor of rhetoric, at Vienne, to whom he pays an adroit compliment by expressing the admiration with which Pragmatius regarded him, himself an eminent orator. He speaks of Sapaudus and Pragmatius as the two most distinguished scholars of the day (*Ep.* v. 10). (6) To Pastor, a citizen of Clermont, chosen by his fellow citizens to represent them at a provincial council at Arles, probably in the time of Majorian, but who failed to appear on the day appointed. Sidonius commends his modesty if that had been the cause of his absence, and makes some good remarks on canvassing, but warning him that if he stays away again his absence will be imputed to idleness (*Ep.* v. 20). (7) To Leo, the minister of Euric, who had exhorted him, now that he had published his letters, i.e., the first book of them, to take up the composition of history, but Sidonius excuses himself from the task on various accounts, his disinclination to work, his dislike of travelling, his want of practice in reading old books, and his clerical condition, in which the utterance of strict truth, which that condition imposes on him, is likely to be inconvenient and dangerous (*Ep.* iv. 22). Having published seven books of letters, he was urged by his friend Petronius to ransack his stores and publish another book, a request with which he complied by publishing an eighth book, and at the request of Firminus a ninth and last, which he says that he completed after a visitation of his diocese during a winter so severe that he was obliged to break the frozen ink which he had to use in writing. By this time he says that he had completed three Olympiads in his office of bishop, a calculation which would bring the date of this work to A.D. 483 (*Ep.* viii. 1, ix. 1, 12).

Of the letters contained in the eighth book the following, which have not been mentioned before, may be mentioned here: (1) To Consentius, probably the son of Consentius to whom the poem on Narbonne was addressed A.D. 465. He expresses a great desire to see again his house and estate called Octaviana, its chapel, library, baths, and other arrangements, praises the verses which his friend sends him from time to time, and speaks of himself as being now a better critic than poet, for he has given up verse-making and devotes himself to graver studies, to which also he exhorts his friend to pay attention, and especially to be liberal in alms-giving, for what is given to the church is laid up in store for himself. The date of this letter may probably be put at about A.D. 485 (*Ep.* viii. 4). (2) To a friend named Fortunalis, a Spaniard, whose firmness in difficulties he extols, and whose fame he predicts will be universal (*Ep.* viii. 5). (3) A long letter to Nammatius, a friend employed in naval affairs by Euric, and now stationed at the island of Oleron, where he found much amusement in hunting, in which also he implies that his son Apollinaris, who was more fond of hunting than of study, took great delight. He speaks of the great pleasure which he had received from the praise bestowed on his published works by Nicetius, whom as a young man he remembers making a speech on the day when his own father presided at the inauguration of the consul Asterius at Lyons. Also of the attacks of the Saxon pirates on the coast, their nautical skill, and their cruelty, and his anxiety for him on this account. He sends him the copies of Varro and the Chronicle of Eusebius, for which he had asked. The letter is written in a cheerful tone, with scarcely any reference to his own condition. Nammatius may have been the same person as he to whom with Ceraunia, his wife, some letters are addressed by Ruricius (Sid. *Ep.* viii. 6; Ruric. *Ep.* ii. 1–5). (4) A long letter to Lupus. professor of rhetoric at Perigueux, mentioning the murder by his slaves of Lampridius, to whom at Bordeaux he had sent a poem, which he now transcribes, with much praise of his literary abilities, but regret that he should have been deluded into the folly and impiety of consulting African diviners. He expresses great regard for the man and deep sorrow for his loss (*Ep.* viii. 11). (5) To Prosper, bishop of Auxerre, undertaking at his request to write a panegyric on Anianus, bishop of Orleans, but declining to complete the history of the war with Attila, which he had begun (*Ep.* viii. 15). (6) To Constantius,

committing to him the care of publishing the volume which he had undertaken to compile at the request of Petronius. He apologises for the old-fashioned and rough style of the language, but justifies it as founded on ancient and good authority (*Ep.* viii. 16).

To the eight volumes already published, he added at the request of Firminus a ninth, a step justified, he says, by the precedent of Pliny, the younger. He asks him to let him know what criticisms are passed on the former volumes, and if he finds any letters that are worth publishing he will write them on the margin of the eighth volume, for his son Apollinaris is not to be trusted in literary matters (*Ep.* ix. 1). Mention may be made of the following: (1) To Faustus, bishop of Riez, written from his prison at Livia. He thinks it expedient in the present state of affairs not to write too often, for nothing can be more inconsistent than a cheerful style and a mind depressed. He speaks with admiration of his friend's ascetic life, and of the pleasure and advantage which in former days he had derived from his sermons, both extemporaneous and such as were carefully prepared, which he had applauded vehemently, when they were preached in the church at Lyons. Begs him to pray for him, and hopes that he will, if necessary, find fault with him (*Ep.* ix. 3). (2) To Graecus, plainly of an earlier date than the one about the surrender, speaking of him in terms of the highest respect and affection, and bidding him not to take too much to heart the pain caused by the death (necessitas) of some of his clergy, because they who would follow Christ must drink of His cup (*Ep.* ix. 4). (3) To Lupus, bishop of Troyes, now in his 50th year of episcopate, to apologise for sending him a volume, probably of his letters, which he was not to keep for himself, but to transmit it to some one else. Lupus had written to complain of this neglect, as it seemed to be, on his part, for which Sidonius entreats him earnestly to pardon him, and to attribute it not to want of friendship, but to doubt as to its being likely to please him (*Ep.* ix. 11). (4) To Oresius, who seems to have been either a Spaniard or familiar with Spain. He asked Sidonius for some verses, but he replies not only that he gave up verse-making when he became a bishop 3 Olympiads ago, but that he is now out of practice; but that if he can find any letters previous to that time containing verses, he will send them to him (*Ep.* ix. 12). (5) To Tonantius, son of Tonantius Ferreolus mentioned in ii. 9, who also asked him for some verses in Asclepiadean metre suitable for recitation at a dinner-party. With this request he complies, though with an apology for his want of practice. We may suppose that in this case the claim of old friendship was strong enough to overcome the objection mentioned just now, but he exhorts his young friend to fill up the vacant moments at an entertainment with religious stories rather than verses, or with questions provoking discussion after the manner of Apuleius, the Plato of Madaura (of which Macrobius gives some instances, *Sat.* vii. 3, 24). He adds the story of what passed at the table of Majorian 20 years ago, already mentioned above (*Ep.* ix. 13). (6) To Burgundio, probably a young Burgundian, one of the garrison of Clermont during the siege, who as well as himself is ill and in bed, for which he expresses his regret, but is glad to hear that he is better and preparing to get up. He mentions with praise a speech lately delivered by him, but would prefer to commend it in his absence rather than directly. Burgundio had asked him what was meant by "recurring" verses, a question which he answers by giving instances

1. Roma tibi subito motibus ibit amor
Sole medere pede, ede perede melos.

in which the lines may be read backwards by inverting the letters of each word.

2. Praecipiti modo quod decurrit tramite flumen
Tempore consumptum tam cito deficiet.

in which the words of an elegiac distich being read backwards, express the same sense as when read forwards, but in a different order of words. He then exhorts his young friend to take up some great subject, in treating which he has no doubt that he will surpass himself, but while some will praise his eloquence, some his intellectual power, all will praise his modesty. It is a great thing when one who is only just past boyhood has obtained so much praise for literary excellence, that so many should be found to praise him on moral grounds (*Ep.* ix. 14). (7) To Gelasius, sending him some senarian iambics in reply to an appeal to him for some verses, but complaining that he was too fond of hendecasyllabics. (8) To Firminus, on completion of his collection, of which the previous eight books were dedicated to Constantius, accomplished after visiting his parishes during the winter, having ransacked his shelves and cupboards for letters to include in it. As the iambic poem sent to Gelasius had given him much pleasure, he now sends to Firminus a concluding one in Sapphic metre, in which, now that old age is at hand, he expresses his intention of devoting himself to sacred subjects and of writing a hymn in praise of Saturninus, bishop of Toulouse (*Ep.* ix. 16). The date of this is probably 483 (see No. 4) or 484.

In none of these letters does he speak of opposition or personal ill-treatment: on the contrary, the tone of his later letters is cheerful, and he appears from the last of them to have met with no hindrance except from weather in fulfilling his episcopal duties. But Gregory of Tours relates that, in the later years of his life, he was much annoyed by two priests, probably of Arian opinions, whose names he does not mention, but which are said by Chaix, though without citing any authority, to have been Honorius and Hermanchius. These men, Gregory says, succeeded in preventing him from exercising his episcopal functions, and even in reducing him to extreme poverty; but after the death of the one called Honorius, who died from a disease resembling that which caused the death of Arius, he was restored to his office, but being attacked by fever he desired that he might be carried into the church of St. Mary, and there, after speaking some words of love to his people, and pointing out Aprunculus, bishop of Langres, as fit to be his successor, he died, though not, as it appears, in the church, August A.D. 489. Upon his death the other priest, Hermanchius, seized on the property of the see, but at a banquet, to which he invited the principal citizens, a dream was related by the butler representing him as called

to account for his behaviour, and he soon afterwards died in a manner resembling the death of Simon Magus (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 23; Tillemont, xvi. 273–277; Chaix, ii. 366, 371). He was buried in the chapel of St. Saturninus, in the centre of the city of Clermont, by the side of his predecessor Eparchius, and an epitaph in hendecasyllabic verse by an unknown author was placed near his tomb with the date, "XII. Kal. Sept. Zenone imperatore." This has disappeared, but a copy of it has been preserved in a MS. of the Abbey of Cluny. The church of Saturninus is said by Savaron to have existed as late as the 10th century, after which it was destroyed, but the relics of Sidonius were transferred to the basilica of St. Genesius, which also has been destroyed, and thus the remains of Sidonius have probably been dispersed, but his memory is venerated at Clermont as that of a saint, and commemorated formerly on Aug. 23, the day of his death, but in later times on July 11, the day of the translation of his remains.

Sidonius may be said to present himself to us in four capacities: As 1. a country gentleman. 2. a politician. 3. a literary man. 4. a bishop. A gentleman of easy fortune living in the country, he entered eagerly into its employments and active amusements, but was also keenly sensible of the more refined and tranquil pleasures, derived from natural objects. Possessing and exerting without scruple a lordly influence over his own dependants and people of inferior rank in the province, he sometimes exercised it in a high-handed and peremptory manner, but usually with kindness and consideration. Affectionate and constant to his friends, he loved both to give and to receive from them hospitality, and some of his most agreeable letters are those which describe social gatherings in which he took part. His conduct as a politician was doubtless much influenced by his literary character. In the age of imperial decadence, the weakness of rulers and men in authority seems to have sought compensation in the fulness of panegyric, of which a copious stream was ever ready to flow from the facile pen of Sidonius. His eulogies were poured forth without stint or discrimination, alike on Avitus, Majorian, and Anthemius, and even Nepos did not fail to obtain a small share. He has compliments at fitting seasons, direct or indirect, for Euric and his wife. A poet laureate by nature, he must be regarded as a pliant politician, but though in this respect he cannot be ranked very high, he never forgot his duty as a patriotic citizen. Faithful to his countrymen, whether by birth as of Lyons, or of adoption as in Auvergne, he never failed to plead their cause, to uphold their interests, to denounce their oppressors, and to stand by them against injustice or hostile invasion, nor need we wonder that his memory should be revered by them as that of a saint. Invested against his will, and without previous preparation, with the office of a bishop, he laboured hard to repair the deficiencies under which he felt himself to labour. He neglected no duty, shrank from no personal trouble or responsibility, and in times of extreme difficulty shewed not only courage, but prudence and discretion. His character, no less than his abilities, commanded the respect and cordial affection of the best men of his time, both near at hand, and those who were more distant, as Basilius, Felix, Graecus, Lupus, Patiens, Principius, Remigius, as well as Leo and Arbogastes, and many others; and though, as we have seen, he did not shrink from remonstrating gravely and even bitterly with some of them, especially Graecus, he does not appear to have forfeited their esteem and affection. A man of kindly disposition, though like most, if not all proprietors of his time, a slave-owner, he treated his own slaves with kindness and took pains to induce others to shew similar conduct. He was friendly to Jews, employed them, and recommended them to the good offices of his friends.

Literary character.—But though he shewed himself to be a sincere and devout Christian, both before and after his elevation to the episcopate, it is as a man of letters that he will always be best known in modern times, for as it has been observed, his writings are the best furnished storehouse that we possess of information as to the domestic life, the manners and habits of public men, and in some points the public events of his period. Though not a voluminous writer, he has left behind him 147 separate letters, besides two included in poems, and 24 poems besides verses included in the letters. Besides these he is said to have written some epigrams, a panegyric on St. Anianus, a hymn on St. Saturninus, and a work called *Contestatiunculae*, and also according to Gennadius, other smaller works containing sound doctrine (Gennadius, *de Scr. Eccl.* 92). Gifted with a fatal facility of composition, and yielding readily both to the fascination which it exerts on the mind of its possessor and to the importunity of friends eager to enjoy its fruits, his longer poems are remarkable more for adroit handling of unpoetical material, than for poetry in its true sense, and must be said to deserve to a great extent the contemptuous sentence passed on them by Gibbon. Yet some of the shorter compositions, especially those in hendecasyllabic metre, are more successful, and touch with a light and discerning hand the scenes and characters which they describe. But of his letters we may speak with less sparing praise, for though their style is often turgid and pedantic, defaced by an artificial phraseology, frequently tainted with the heresy of self-invented words, and abounding in passages of great obscurity, they often describe in a very lively and picturesque manner the persons, objects, and transactions recorded in them. An inveterate panegyrist both in politics and in literature, he is more given to bless than to blame, to extol than to criticise, and sometimes wearies his reader by accumulation of indiscriminate praise gathered from various sources often incongruous, and seldom well selected, a fault incidental perhaps to an amiable man living in dangerous times, and during the decay of literature; yet sometimes, as in the case of Graecus, he shews that he knows how to blame as well as to applaud, and to lay on, when the occasion called it forth, a heavy weight of just and honest condemnation, expressed in nervous and for the most part simple language. Indisposed by habit of mind to searching criticism or solid investigation, he is inclined to regard the outward forms of language more than the substance clothed in them, to shew acquaintance more with the names of writers than the contents of their works, and with the metres employed by his poetic models in their compo-

sitions, than with their thoughts. Hating barbarians in general and their ways with all his heart, and jealous for the purity of the Latin tongue, a purity however framed on a standard lower than that of the best age, his style nevertheless exhibits in a remarkable manner the transition through which the language was passing, especially in the change from the synthetic to the analytic principle in grammatical formation (see Hallam, *Lit. Hist.* i. 1). A copious list of illustrations of these changes, too numerous to be noticed here, will be found in the edition of his works by M. Baret, Paris 1879, and may be consulted with great advantage by students. We may notice in passing his disposition to play on words, *e. g.* the name of a place "Apta" (*Ep.* ix. 9), "telas" and "tela" (*Carm.* xv. 148), and the pun on Tacitus already mentioned (*Ep.* iv. 22.) We have already had occasion to notice his facility of composition and his reputation for this among his contemporaries. Gregory of Tours gives an instance either of this or of retentive memory on the occasion of a festival of the church, at which the Office book having been removed or mislaid he was able either to compose at the moment or to recite from memory all that was required for the purpose of the Service (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Fr.* ii. 22). The machinery of his poems is almost entirely mythological, so much so that what Ampère says of them is not far from the truth, viz. that if one-tenth of his writings be deducted, the remainder would leave us in doubt whether he were a Christian or not. As regards his poems this estimate is probably correct, but there is abundant evidence of Christian thought in his letters, even before his episcopate, to shew the truth and sincerity of his Christian faith, though even in these he now and then turns aside into the mythological channel (Ampère, *Hist. de la Litt.* ii. 216). Petrarch says of him that he cannot forgive his presumption in speaking disrespectfully of Cicero, but this opinion seems to be founded on a single passage in which he uses an epithet applying not to the writings of Cicero, but to his person. (*Ep.* v. 5. Petrarch, *Op. Ep. praef.* p. 569.) Accounts of his life and writings are given by Baronius under the years already referred to; Cave (*Hist. Lit.* vol. i. p. 453); in *Gallia Christiana*, vol. ii. 231–234; in *Histoire Littéraire de France*, vol. ii. 550–573; Ceillier, vol. x. p. 579–599; Tillemont (vol. xvi. p. 195–284); M. Guizot, *Hist. de la Civilisation en France*, vol. i.; F. Ozanam, *Hist. of Civilisation in the 5th cent.* tr. London 1868, pp. 267, 273. But the fullest account that we have of him is the one by the abbé Chaix, curé of the church of St. Genesius at Clermont, *Sidoine Apollinaire et son siècle*, 2 vols. Clermont 1866. M. Chaix has omitted nothing which can illustrate his subject, of which he has treated for the most part with great fairness, and has translated many passages, both of the letters and the poems. Dr. Michael Fertig has published some very valuable academical essays on his life and times, including also some translations, in three parts, of which two were published at Würzburg in 1845, 1846, and the third at Passau 1848. Mr. Hodgkin has given an excellent account of him, and translated well some of his letters in his *Conquerors of Italy*, book iii. vol. ii. He gives an unfavourable opinion as to his honesty of purpose, for he says, "it is difficult to resist the conviction that he was playing a part," p. 311. There is also a good article on him in *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*, vol. iii. p. 817.

The latest edition up to the present time (1886) is by M. Eugène Baret, Paris, 1879. It has an extremely valuable Introduction, containing remarks on the times and state of society, and lists of grammatical forms, words and phrases used by Sidonius, illustrating the transition state of the Latin language, and some peculiar to himself; also an attempt to settle the chronology of the letters, a task of great difficulty, the result of which would be more satisfactory, if the numeration of the letters themselves as given in the body of the work corresponded with that of the list in the Introduction, which is frequently not the case. There are also a good many misprints and the index is meagre. [H. W. P.]

SIDONIUS (3) II., thirty-third bishop of Mainz, about the middle of the 6th century, was one of those prelates who, as representatives of Roman culture amid the storms of the Frankish invasion, compelled the respect of the conquerors, and exerted a beneficent influence for the conquered (Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, i. 571). Mainz had suffered terribly, and from the eulogies of Venantius Fortunatus we learn the part Sidonius took in repairing the ravages of these wars. He rebuilt ruined churches, restored public edifices, and liberally relieved the numerous prisoners and exiles (*Misc.* ix. 9, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxviii. 308–9). In particular, with the aid of a Frankish princess, Berthoara, daughter of Theodebert I., he erected a baptistery (ibid. ii. 15, col. 105), a church in honour of St. George the Martyr (ii. 16, col. 107) and works at the junction of the Main and Rhine, to confine the streams (ix. 9). See also *Gall. Christ.* v. 436 and Rettberg, i. 290, 570. [S. A. B.]

SIDONIUS (4), eighteenth bishop of Constance, succeeded Ernfridus A.D. 748, whom he had also succeeded as monk and abbat of Augia Dives (Reichenau). When abbat Othmar of St. Gall was being oppressed by the counts Warin and Ruodhard, Sidonius joined them in the condemnation and banishment of Othmar [OTHMARUS] (Hepidanus, *Ann. Alem.* A.D. 746, 758). He then administered the affairs of the abbey with his bishopric, distributing its churches and endowments, and enriching the friends of Warin and Ruodhard. He died in the monastery of Augia, c. A.D. 759 (Ratpertus, *De Cas. Mon. S. Gall.* i. c. 2; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxvi. 1060–1; Herman. Contract. *Chron.* Saec. viii. A.D. 746, 759; *Gall. Christ.* v. 895; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 759, c. 8, 10 with Pagi's critical notes). [J. G.]

SIGANTIUS. [GIGANTIUS.]

SIGBALD, the fourth abbat of a monastery or cell dependent upon Lindisfarne, which has found a metrical chronicler in Ethelwulf. To this cell Sigbald was a generous benefactor, building a chapel dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, and giving to it, among other things, a jewelled chalice of gold.

Mr. T. Arnold, who has edited this poem in the Appendix to the Works of Symeon of Durham, considers that the cell was at Crayke, near York, an ancient possession of St. Cuthbert. I

cannot agree with him. If Crayke had been intended, the abbat would never have sent an altar to the borders of Scotland to be consecrated, when York with its archbishop was only twelve miles distant. The messenger is said also to have returned by sea, a fact which by no means agrees with the position of Crayke. A sea-voyage would not be an easy route to or from Crayke. Probably the cell mentioned is not Crayke, but some other place in the northern part of the present county of Northumberland, where there was more than one "urbs," alluded to by Ethelwulf, who was, it is to be observed, a monk of Lindisfarne.

Sigbald is, possibly, the 'Sibald abbas' whose death is said by Symeon (*H. R.*) to have occurred in A.D. 771. [J. R.]

SIGE. In the system of Valentinus, as expounded by Irenaeus (i. 1), the origin of things was traced to two eternal co-existent principles, a male and a female. The male was called Bythus or Proarche, or Propator, &c.; the female had the names ENNOEA, CHARIS and SIGE. The whole Aeonology of Valentinus was based on a theory of syzygies, or pairs of Aeons, each Aeon being provided with a consort; and the supposed need of the co-operation of a male and female principle for the generation of new ones, was common to Valentinus and some earlier Gnostic systems. But it was a disputed point in these systems whether the First Principle of all was thus twofold as has been described. There were those, both in earlier systems, and even among the Valentinians who held, that the origin of things was to be traced to a single Principle, which some described as bisexual or hermaphrodite; others said was above all sex. And among the Valentinians who counted thirty Aeons, there were those who counted Bythus and Sige, as the first pair: while others who asserted the Single Principle excluded Bythus from the number, and made out the number of thirty without reckoning him. Thus Irenaeus says of the Valentinians (I. ii. 4. p. 10), Τὸν γὰρ Πατέρα ποτὲ μὲν μετὰ συζυγίας τῆς Σιγῆς, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ ὑπέραρρεν καὶ ὑπέρθηλυ εἶναι θέλουσι. And (I. xi. 5, p. 56) Οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἄζυγον λέγουσι, μήτε ἄρρενα, μήτε θήλειαν, μήτε ὅλως ὄντα τι. Ἄλλοι δὲ ἀρρενόθηλυν αὐτὸν λέγουσιν εἶναι, ἑρμαφροδίτου φύσιν αὐτῷ περιάπτοντες. Σιγὴν δὲ πάλιν ἄλλοι συνευνέτιν αὐτῷ προσάπτουσιν, ἵνα γένηται πρώτη συζυγία. And so Hippolytus (*Ref.* vi. 29) οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν, ἵν' ᾖ παντάπασι καθαρὸν τὸ δόγμα τοῦ Οὐαλεντίνου πυθαγορικὸν, ἄθηλυ καὶ ἄζυγον καὶ μόνον, τὸν πατέρα νομίζουσιν εἶναι· οἱ δὲ ἀδύνατον νομίζοντες δύνασθαι ἐξ ἄρρενος μόνου γένεσιν ὅλως τῶν γεγενημένων γένεσθαι τινὸς, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, ἵνα γένηται πατήρ, σιγὴν ἐξ ἀνάγκης συναριθμοῦσι τὴν σύζυγον. Hippolytus supposes Valentinus to have derived his system from that of Simon; and in that as expounded in the μεγάλη ἀπόφασις, from which he gives extracts, the origin of things is derived from six roots, divided into three pairs; but all these roots spring from a single independent Principle, which is without consort. The name Sige occurs in the description which Hippolytus (vi. 18) quotes from the *Apophasis*, how from the supreme Principle there arise the male and female off-shoots νοῦς and ἐπίνοια. The name Sige is there given not to either of the off-shoots but to the supreme Principle itself: however, in the description, these off-shoots appear less as distinct entities than as different aspects of the same Being.

Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* vi. 17) makes Sige the daughter of Bythus and by him the mother of Logos, a fable which he classes with the incests which heathen mythology attributed to Jupiter. Irenaeus (II. xii. p. 129) ridicules the absurdity of the later form of Valentinian theory, in which Sige and Logos are represented as coexistent Aeons in the same Pleroma. "Ubi est Sige" he says, "non erit Logos; et ubi Logos non utique Sige." He goes on (ii. 14) to trace the invention of Sige to the heathen poets, quoting Antiphates, who in his Theogony makes Chaos the offspring of Night and Silence. Probably this passage of Irenaeus suggested to Hippolytus his phrase (vi. 22), τῆς ὑμνουμένης ἐκείνης παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι Σιγῆς.

Sige has been the subject of more discussion than any other of the Valentinian Aeons, because a phrase in the received text of the Ignatian Epistle to the Magnesians (8) (λόγος ἀΐδιος οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών) had seemed to prove that this letter was later than Valentinus, and therefore could not be the genuine work of the martyr Ignatius. This argument is dealt with at great length by Pearson, *Vindiciae Ignatianae* (II. cc. 3–7); and by Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* sect. iii. cap. 1. But the discovery, since the time of these writers, of new authorities for the text of Ignatius, has given a solution of the difficulty of which they were not aware; namely, that the words ἀΐδιος οὐκ must be struck out, as not genuine. The passage then becomes an argument for the early date of the Epistles, since a writer, of later date than Valentinus, would have avoided the use of language to which that writer had given a heretical complexion. See Lightfoot's Ignatius, i. 371–4, ii. 126. [G. S.]

SIGEBED, bishop. [SIGGA.]

SIGEBERT (1) I., King of the Austrasian Franks (561–75), was one of the sons of Clotaire I. by Ingundis (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iv. 1). Scarcely had the four brothers buried their father at Soissons, the only act in which they ever united, when Chilperic the youngest began the civil wars which henceforth desolated France. Seizing the royal treasure deposited at Braine, near Soissons, and purchasing by its means the support of the Franks, he occupied Paris. His three half-brothers, however, leagued together and compelled him to make a fair division, probably upon lines settled by Clotaire before his death (Richter, *Annalen* 65). To Sigebert fell the kingdom which had belonged to Theodoricus I., i.e. the country occupied by the Ripuarian Franks and a part of Champagne, with Rheims for his capital, which division was now beginning to be known as Austrasia (Greg. Tur. iv. 21, 22; *Hist. Epitom.* lv.; Marius Aventic. ann. 560. For the details of this partition see Bonnell, *Anfänge des Karolingischen Hauses, Beilage*, p. 206 ff.; Richter, 65–6; Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 169 sqq.). The year following his accession, Sigebert's kingdom, owing to its eastern position, had to bear the brunt of an invasion by a body of Avars or Huns, which had become detached from the mass of the nation, and, perhaps with the connivance of the

Eastern emperor, made its way to the Rhine. On their first appearance they were defeated and driven back, but renewing the attack later, probably in 565 or 566, they put to flight Sigebert's army, took him prisoner, and had to be bought off (Greg. Tur. iv. 23, 29; Paulus Diac. ii. 10; Mascou, xiv. 4, 5; Richter, 66–67; Fauriel, ii. 164 seqq.). It may be that the embassy which Sigebert sent to Justin II. at Constantinople about 566 was connected with this barbarian inroad, though possibly it had reference to Italian affairs (Greg. Tur. iv. 39; Richter, 68). In 567 Charibert I. died, and the division of his kingdom proved another source of discord. (For the chronology see Richter, p. 68 n.). To Sigebert fell, as far as can be gathered from later events (see Greg. Tur. ix. 20), a third share of the city of Paris, the coast of Provence with Avignon, the former possessions of Theodoricus I. in Aquitaine, the northern part of Brie, Beauce, Touraine and Poitou (Richter, 68; Bonnell, *ibid.*; Fauriel, ii. 175–7). About this time Sigebert married the famous Brunechilde (Brunehaut), a daughter of Athanagild the Visigothic king, in Spain, she having first renounced Arianism, and made profession of orthodoxy. (Greg. Tur. iv. 27; Venant. Fort. vi. 2, 3, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 204–9. For the character and accomplishments of this queen, who in later life became almost supreme in France, see Greg. Tur. *ibid.*; Venant. Fort. *ibid.*; Fauriel, ii. 166 sqq.) Sigebert's motive was disgust at the unworthy marriages of his brothers (Greg. Tur. iv. 27). The remainder of the reign was taken up with miserable civil wars between the brothers, in which Chilperic strove to possess himself of parts of Sigebert's dominion, while the weak Guntram vacillated between the two. The occasion of these wars was no doubt in part the desire of Brunechilde to avenge the murder of her sister Galsuintha (cf. the letter of St. Germanus of Paris in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 77; Ceillier, xi. 307); but the main cause seems to have lain in the fact that Chilperic the youngest obtained, both at the first division after their father's death, and at the second, when Charibert died, a less share than those of his half-brothers (see Bonnell, *ibid.* 206), and urged on by his wife, the able and unscrupulous Fredegund, was ever wading through seas of blood in his efforts to right himself. Sigebert's territory of Tours and Poitiers, with their respective districts, was his principal object of attack. Two years running (A.D. 574–5) his armies overran those ill-fated countries (Greg. Tur. iv. 46, 48). On the second occasion Gregory, after depicting the churches burnt and plundered, clergy killed, monasteries in ruins, and nuns outraged, uses these memorable words—"fuitque illo in tempore pejor in ecclesiis gemitus quam tempore persecutionis Diocletiani" (iv. 48. See too his outburst of indignation in cap. 49). To meet these attempts Sigebert recruited his forces with pagan Germans from beyond the Rhine (iv. 50, 51), and finally in 575, with the assistance of Guntram carried his arms to Paris and Rouen, and while Chilperic was shut up in Tournay, was raised by his subjects on the shield and declared king in his place. At the very moment, however, of his elevation he was struck down by assassins, probably emissaries of Fredegund. (Greg. Tur. iv. 52; Marius Avent. *Chronicon*; Venant. Fort. *Miscell.* ix. 2, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 298 sqq.). The crime saved Chilperic He issued from his retreat, and, whether out of generosity or policy, had his brother's body buried at Lambres, whence it was afterwards transported to the church of Saint Médard at Soissons, which Sigebert himself had built (Greg. Tur. *ibid.*). He left a son of five years, Childebert II.

Sigebert was much the best of the sons of Clotaire. In happier circumstances he might have been a humane and enlightened king, but his misfortune was to reign at perhaps the darkest period of French history. His clemency towards Chilperic's son Theodebert, who had invaded his territory (Greg. Tur. iv. 23), his motives in seeking Brunechilde's hand in marriage, as described by Gregory (iv. 27), and his intrepid attempts to restrain his barbarian Trans-Rhenish allies from plundering (iv. 30), throw light upon his character. He was true to the orthodoxy of his race (iv. 27), and it was he who recalled St. Nicetius of Trèves from exile and appointed Gregory to Tours. [S. A. B.]

SIGEBERT (2) II., eldest of the sons of Theodoricus II., was but eleven years old at his father's death in 613 (cf. Fredegarius, *Chronicon*, xxi.). His great-grandmother Brunechilde strove to place him on his father's throne (*ibid.* xxxix.), but the hatred of the Austrasian and Burgundian nobles for their ambitious queen led them to prefer the dominion of the Neustrian king Clotaire II. After a few months of vain effort, deserted and betrayed by his late father's subjects, he fell into Clotaire's hands, and was put to death (*ibid.* xl.-xlii.). [S. A. B.]

SIGEBERT (3) III. ST., king of Austrasia (A.D. 632–656), was the eldest son of Dagobert I. At five years of age his father raised him to the throne of Austrasia under the tutelage of Cunibertus, archbishop of Cologne, and with Adalgiselus for Mayor of the Palace (Fredegarius, *Chronicon*, lxxv.). In the following year he solemnly confirmed him in this dignity, Neustria and Burgundy being at the same time assigned to the newly-born Clovis II., and exacted an oath from the Austrasian bishops and nobles to observe this disposition of the realm after his own death (Fredegarius lxxvi.). Dagobert died in 638 (*ibid.* lxxix.). The history of the Merovingian kings now came to be little else than the history of the Mayors of the Palace. On Dagobert's death, Pippin I. or the elder, the founder of the Carlovingian family, repaired to Metz and virtually assumed the government. He died, however, the following year (Fredegar. lxxxv.); and the next three years of the reign were occupied with a struggle between his son Grimoald and one Otto, who had been Sigebert's tutor, for the Mayordom, in which the former proved the victor. [GRIMOALDUS (1).] The only external event of importance in Sigebert's reign was a campaign against the Thuringians in 640, in which that nation won a victory over the Franks on the Unstrut, and achieved virtual independence (Fredegarius, lxxxvii.), a result that probably hastened Otto's fall. The most important matter, from an ecclesiastical point of view, was the prohibition, probably at the instance of Grimoald (see

Gérard, *Hist. des Francs d'Austrasie*, i. 359), issued to the bishops of his realm against the holding or taking part in any council without the king's consent (see Sigebert's letter to Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1175). It was probably part of Grimoald's policy of strengthening the central authority The clergy, however, found in Sigebert a munificent patron, and he was duly rewarded by canonization. Encouraged apparently by Grimoald, whose family, both before and after him, owed much to the church, he is said to have founded twelve monasteries, a great number of churches, and some hospitals for the poor. Migne assigns to him four *diplomata* (*Patrologia Latina*, lxxxvii. 319 sqq.), but the third is said to be spurious (Ceillier, xi. 733 n.). The first is a charter of the monastery of Cougnon (Casagonguidinense) dated in 644, the second for those of Stavelo and Malmédy in the Ardennes, in 651, and the fourth confers certain tithes on the church of Spires about 653. He also founded the monastery of St. Martin at Metz, where he was himself buried.

The main authority for Sigebert's life is the Chronicle of Fredegarius, but his biography was written by Sigebert of Gemblours about four centuries after his death, possibly upon the occasion of the first translation of his remains in 1063. This work which is of course only valuable so far as it is derived from earlier sources, may be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 303, seqq., and Boll. *Acta SS.*, Feb. 1, 227. (An abbreviated life by the same author is found in *Patr. Lat.* clx. 725 sqq.) His relics were translated several times (Boll. *ibid.* p. 236 sqq.) His day is Feb. 1, on which he is commemorated at Metz (*ibid.* p. 206, sqq.). [S. A. B.]

SIGEBERT (4), king of the East Angles, brother and successor of Earpwald. The pedigrees do not place him as the son of Redwald, who certainly drove him into exile, from which it may be inferred that he was only a stepson (Will. Malmesb. *G. R.* i. § 97; Flor. Wig. *M. H. B.* 636). He was however the brother of Earpwald, whom he succeeded, after a three years' interregnum or relapse, about the year 631. During the reign of Earpwald Sigebert had lived in exile in Gaul, where he had been baptized and become a scholar. On his accession he determined to devote himself to the conversion of his people, in which he was assisted by bishop Felix, whom archbishop Honorius dispatched as an apostle into East Anglia (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 15), and by Fursey, who came on the same errand from Ireland. Sigebert laboured likewise for the education of his people, instituted a school such as he had seen in France, the legendary precursor of the University of Cambridge, for which also he procured teachers from Canterbury. After a few years he made over his kingdom to his kinsman Egric, and took the tonsure; but, on war being declared by Penda against the East Angles, he left his monastery at the prayers of his people, and, going to battle armed only with a rod, was slain, together with Egric and his army. (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 18, 19.) According to the Ely tradition, the monastery into which Sigebert retired was at Bedrichsworth, now Bury St. Edmund's. That in which abbat Fursey was settled was at Cnobsheresburg, or Burgh Castle (*Lib. Eliens.* i. 1; Bede, *H. E.* iii. 19). The date of Sigebert's death is probably about 637. He is said by Pits (*ad ann.* 650) to have corresponded with Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, by letters which were preserved at St. Gallen. (See Smith's note on Bede, *H. E.* iii. 18; and *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 190.) [S.]

SIGEBERT (5), surnamed Parvus (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 22), was king of the East Saxons during the obscurest part of their always obscure history. He is made in the pedigrees (*M. H. B.* 629) the son of Saeward, one of the three sons of Sebert, the first Christian king of Essex, who continued heathen and survived their father only a short time. If Sigebert succeeded his father, he must have reigned from about 617 (cf. Bede, *H. E.* ii. 5) or 626 (H. Hunt. *M. H. B.* 716) onwards; but the date of his death is unknown. His cousin Sigebert the Good being found on the East Saxon throne as soon as any new light is shed on the state of the nation, Sigebert the Little must have finished his reign before 653. It is probable that the West Saxon dominion, advanced by Cynegils and Cwichelm, and afterwards the aggressive kingdom of Mercia under Penda, kept the East Saxon kings in the same dependent relation in which Sebert had stood to Ethelbert. Sigebert the Little was succeeded by Sigebert the Good, who represented another branch of the family. Sigebert the Good was followed by his brother Suithelm, on whose death the family of Saeward recovered the throne in the persons of Sebbi, a brother, and Sighere, a son, of Sigebert the Little. (*M. H. B.* 629, 637.) [S.]

SIGEBERT (6), surnamed the Good, king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sigebald, son of Seleferth son of Saexa, the brother of Sebert, the first Christian king of the East Saxons (*M. H. B.* 629, 637), and succeeded on the throne his kinsman Sigebert the Little, about the middle of the 7th century. At the time of his accession his people were still heathen, having not yet recovered from the relapse which followed the death of Sebert. The date is undetermined, but Sigebert must have ascended the throne some years before the death of Penda, king of Mercia, and possibly by the support of Oswy, king of Northumbria, the leader of the tribes which were Christianised and opposed to Penda. According to Bede, Sigebert received Christianity by the persuasion of Oswy, and was baptized by Finan, the Northumbrian bishop, at a station on the Roman wall called "Ad Murum" (*H. E.* iii. 22). This was in or about the year 653. Oswy, at Sigebert's request, sent with him Cedd, the brother of Chad, to attempt the conversion of his subjects; and Cedd, having returned to Lindisfarne with a report of his success, was consecrated by Finan as bishop for the East Saxons. It is very questionable whether Cedd, or Sigebert either, obtained any hold on London; Ythancaestir and Tilaburg, two villages in Essex, are mentioned as the centres of the bishop's work, and London, as we learn from the adventures of bishop Wina, Cedd's successor, was in Mercian hands a few years later. Sigebert's acts are otherwise unrecorded, and he seems to have perished in a family quarrel

One of his kinsmen, having contracted an unlawful marriage, was excommunicated by Cedd. Sigebert neglected to obey the sentence, and actually went to banquet with the guilty man. As he was leaving the house Cedd met him, and, on his dismounting from his horse, leaped from his own horse and upbraided him. Sigebert begged for forgiveness; Cedd replied with a prophecy that he should die in the house where he had sinned. The guilty kinsman, aided by his brother, and possibly exasperated by the king's humble attitude towards Cedd, afterwards murdered the king, alleging as a reason his leniency towards his enemies and his too great readiness to forgive. The date of this event is uncertain, but from the way in which Bede tells the story, although he says that no short time intervened between the conversion and the murder, it most probably occurred before the battle of Winwaed and the death of Penda. The editors of the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, however, adopt the year 660 as most probable. Sigebert was succeeded by Suidhelm, or Swithelm. [SWITHELM.] [S.]

SIGEBERT (7), king of the West Saxons. He was son of Sigeric (*M. H. B.* 641) who is described by Florence of Worcester as a "subregulus," and has an unascertained place in the pedigree of the West Saxon kings (ib. p. 633). On the death of Cuthred, probably in 755 (Sim. Dun. *M. H. B.* 662; *Chr. S. M. H. B.* 330), Sigebert ascended the throne which he held for one year. His unrighteous doings provoked his people against him, and in the next year the Witan of Wessex, with Cynewulf at their head, deposed him. (Chr. S. *M. H. B.* 330.) There must have been either a strong party in favour of Sigebert, or some redeeming circumstances in the case, as Hampshire, the best province of the West Saxon dominion, was left as provision for him, and he was allowed to retain it until, having murdered Cumbra, the last ealdorman who adhered to him, he was driven into the forest of Andred by Cynewulf, and was killed by a swineherd at Privet's-flood. The date of this event is not given, but when Cynewulf had reigned thirty-one years, in 786, Cynehard, the brother of Sigebert, avenged his death and seized the throne. The history of Sigebert is of importance as illustrating the constitutional power of the Witan to remove a bad ruler, a power which however is scarcely ever exerted except when it is directed by some competitor for royalty. Cumbra, whose murder was avenged by the swineherd, is found as praefectus regis in a questionable charter of Cuthred (K. *C. D.* 93). [S.]

SIGERAED (1), the last king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sigeric, and must have succeeded him when in 797 or 799 he went to Rome (*Chr. Sax. M. H. B.* 340). In him the pedigree of the East Saxon kings comes to an end, and, if he were the last of his race, he must have survived until the year 824, when his kingdom fell, together with those of Kent and Sussex, into the hands of Egbert, king of the West Saxons (Flor. Wig. App. M. *H. B.* 637). It is probable that the attestation of a Rochester charter of Kenulf in 811 (K. *C. D.* No. 198), 'Ego Sigired rex' belongs to this Sigeraed, whether he is identical with No. 2 or not. [S.]

SIGERAED (2) (SIGERED, SIGIRAED), king of Kent. Two grants of Sigiraed, king of half Kent to Eardulf, bishop of Rochester, appear in the Textus Roffensis (Kemble, *C. D.* Nos. 110, 114), one of them with a date 762. He does not occur in the pedigree of the Kentish kings. One charter is marked by Kemble as doubtful or spurious; but the signer may be the Sigeraed who is said to have been the last king of the East Saxons, and whose date may require readjustment. The attestation of a Sigired is attached to a charter of Egbert of Kent in 778 (K. *C. D.* 132). The Sigeraed who attests the charter of 811 (K. *C. D.* 198) is most probably the East Saxon king. A Sigired dux attests in 814 (K. *C. D.* No. 207), in 816 (*ib.* 209, 210), and in 822 (*ib.* 216); and in 823, two of the name attest a charter of Ceolwulf (*ib.* n. 217), one as *subregulus*, who may be the East Saxon king, and one as *dux*, who continues to appear in charters some years later. It is probable that the East Saxon kings, either as descended from an early divisional dynasty, or as viceroys under Mercian authority, claimed some portion of Kent during the 7th and 8th centuries; but there are no coins of the dynasty either in Essex or Kent; the Mercian kings seem to have maintained a steady hold on London, and there is nothing after the beginning of the 8th century in either kingdom that deserves the name of history. See KENT, EAST SAXONS, kings of. [S.]

SIGERIC (1), king of the Goths, seized on the throne on the murder of Ataulf, at Barcelona in A.D. 415. He was brother of Sarus, the enemy of Alaric and Ataulf, who had been put to death by the latter. In revenge he murdered the children of Ataulf by his first wife, tearing them from the embrace of bishop Sigesarius, and compelled Placidia to walk twelve miles before his horse, with the rest of the prisoners. He is said to have been inclined, notwithstanding this insult to the emperor's sister, to make peace with the Romans, but he was murdered after a reign of seven days. (Orosius, viii. 43; Olympiodorus, Bonn edition 459; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 65.) [F. D.]

SIGERIC (2), the eldest son of St. Sigismund, fifth king of the Burgundians, by Amelberga, daughter of Theodoric the Ostrogoth, was, like his father, converted from Arianism by Avitus, archbishop of Vienne, who preached a homily on the occasion (Avitus, *Titulus Homiliae*, viii.; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 294). He fell a victim to the jealousy of his stepmother, who, by falsely accusing him of treasonable designs, induced Sigismund to have him put to death (Marius Avent. *Chronicon*, Symmacho et Boet. Coss., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 796; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iii. 5). [S. A. B.]

SIGERIC (3) (SIRIC), king of the East Saxons. He is placed in the pedigree (M. *H. B.* 629) as son of Swithaed or Swithred, who was king of the East Saxons in 758, and is said in the Chronicle to have gone to Rome in the year 797, for which probably we should substitute 799 (M. *H. B.* 340). Sigeraed, the last king named in the pedigree, appears to have been his son. [S.]

SIGERIUS, presbyter, disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra (Epiph. *Haer.* lxxii. 11). [G. S.]

SIGESARIUS, a bishop of the Goths, an Arian, who baptized the emperor Attalus (Soz. ix. 9) in 409 (Gibbon, *D. & F.* vol. iv. p. 99, ed. Smith). [C. H.]

SIGEWARD, king. [SAEWARD.]

SIGFRID, bishop. [SIGGA.]

SIGFRID (1), a priest, who is mentioned by Beda in his life of Cuthbert as one of his authorities. Sigfrid was educated and trained in his religious profession by Boisil, abbat of Melrose, and was there in A.D. 651, when the youthful Cuthbert first entered that monastery. When Beda was writing Cuthbert's life, Sigfrid was an honoured inmate of Jarrow, although very old, and in the extremity of weakness and decay (*Vita S. Cuth.* c. 6). This was in the beginning of the eighth century. We must not, therefore, confound this Sigfrid with his namesake, abbat of Jarrow and Wearmouth, who died in A.D. 688. [J. R.]

SIGFRID (2), coadjutor abbat of Wearmouth, A.D. 686–88, of whom Beda has given us one of his life-like pictures. Easterwine, his immediate predecessor, died of the plague, and when Benedict-Biscop, the abbat, returned from one of his many journeys to Italy, he found that the monks and Ceolfrid had appointed Sigfrid in the room of Easterwine. Beda describes him as a person of sufficient learning in the Scriptures, as a lover of abstinence and godly living, but afflicted with an incurable wasting away of the lungs. Sigfrid was only in deacon's orders. We are induced therefore to think that the ravages of the plague had limited the choice to a small number, when it fell upon a young man labouring under a mortal disease. Soon after his return Benedict himself was smitten with a creeping palsy, so that the hand of death was laid at the same time upon the two abbats. They were placed in different rooms, and an earnest desire seized them to see each other once more in this world, and to hear once more the sound of each other's voice. Sigfrid was carried into Benedict's room, and was laid by his side on his bed. Although their heads were resting on the same pillow, they were so weak that it was only by the brethren drawing their faces together that they were able to give each other the kiss of charity. They then joined the monks in appointing Ceolfrid to succeed them. Sigfrid lingered for two months after this touching scene, dying on the 22nd of August, 688. (Beda, *Hist. Abb. Wirem.* etc.) [J. R.]

SIGGA (1), a deacon of John of Beverley, bishop of York (A.D. 705–18), who is said to have witnessed in the church of St. Michael at York a spiritual manifestation vouchsafed to his master. His face became wrinkled in consequence until John restored it to its former condition. (*Vita S. Joh.* ed. Folcard in *Historians of York*, i. 258.) (Leland, *Collect.* t. iii. p. 154, in Hearne, t. iv. p. 100; *Mon. Angl.* ii. 128.) [J. R.]

SIGGA (2) (SIGFRITH), the fourth bishop of Selsey (M. *H. B.* 618). His full name was Sigfrid, as given by the continuator of Bede (*ib.* 288), who states that he was consecrated by archbishop Tatwin as soon as he received his pall, in the year 733. He appears at the council of Clovesho in 747 as "Sicga Australium Saxonum episcopus" (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 360, 362). His name appears among the attestations of the privilege of Ethelbald of 742 (*ib.* 342), but the attestations themselves are conjectural or fabricated; and he may be the person described as 'Sigibed episcopus' in another act of Ethelbald (Kemble, *C. D.* n. 90). He is named in one of the very suspicious Selsey charters, but without date; and nothing is known of the termination of his episcopate. The career of Aluberht, his successor, is a blank, and Osa, the next bishop of Selsey, appears first in genuine charters in 772. [S.]

SIGHARD (SIGEHEARD, SIGIHEARD), king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sebbi, and about the year 695 succeeded his father conjointly with his brother Suefred. He is mentioned as having been present at the miracle which took place when his father was put in his coffin (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 11). [SEBBI.] It is possible that he shared the kingdom not only with Suefred but with his cousin Offa, the son of Sighere, or with Sighere himself. [OFFA.] Nothing is known of his history or end, but he must have ceased to reign some time before the year 709 in which Offa, who succeeded him on the throne, made his pilgrimage to Rome. Sighard's name is attached to the charter of Oedilraed to the abbess Ethelburga (Kemble, *C. D.* 35; *Mon. Angl.* i. 439), together with those of his father and brother; each of the three has the title of king, so the names may have been added after the execution of the grant, supposing it to be genuine. They are attached in a similar way to the charter of Erkenwald to the same abbess (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 38; *Mon. Angl.* i. 438). [S.]

SIGHERI (SIGHERE), king of the East Saxons. He was the son of Sigebert the Little, and in conjunction with his uncle Sebbi acquired the sovereignty over the East Saxons, under the supreme influence of Wulfhere, king of the Mercians about the year 665 (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 30; *Mon. Hist. Brit.* pp. 629, 637). The beginning of their reign coincided in time with the prevalence of the great plague, one result of which seems to have been the relapse of the nation, or a part of it, into paganism. Sighere unfortunately placed himself at the head of the relapsed, and began the restoration of the idolatrous temples in his dominions. Sebbi continued faithful, and Wulfhere also interfered. By the mission of the Mercian bishop Jaruman into Essex, he recovered Sighere and his adherents to the faith. Cedd was now dead, and Wina the West Saxon bishop, to whom Wulfhere sold the bishopric of London, does not seem to have taken much pains with the country people. The conversion of the nation was left to be accomplished by Erkenwald who, before his appointment to the bishopric, had laboured in both Essex and Surrey. Sighere and Sebbi were still reigning when Theodore, in or about the year 675 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 6), appointed Erkenwald bishop; and Sebbi was king for thirty years, dying a monk about the year 695. How long Sighere lived is unknown; but as his son Offa was a young man in 709 [OFFA], he may have survived his uncle, and shared the kingdom with Sighard and Suefred

the sons of Sebbi. His name, however, is not attached to the charter granted by Oedilred to Barking, as are those of Sebbi and his sons. In a forged charter of Peterborough (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 40), the kingdom of Kent is spoken of as having fallen under the sway of Sighere. This is possibly a relic of a tradition which seems to be found in Kentish charters also, that the East Saxon kings, perhaps as agents of Mercia, exercised some authority in the remoter kingdom, but see SUEFRED. [S.]

SIGISBERT, monk with St. Columbanus at Luxueil. He went into banishment with his master, and founded the monastery of Disentis (Disentinense monasterium) at the head of the western source of the Rhine in Rhaetia. (Mabillon, *Ann.* i. 310, 504.) [J. G.]

SIGISMER, son-in-law of the emperor Theodosius II. An account of his entry into Lyons (or some other town where Sidonius then was) on the occasion of his espousing the daughter of the king of the Visigoths, is given by Sidonius (*Ep.* 20). [R. J. K.]

SIGISMUNDUS, ST., May 1, martyr, fifth king of the Burgundians (A.D. 516–524), was brought up under the influence of Avitus, the orthodox archbishop of Vienne, who succeeded in winning him, with two of his children, from the Arianism of his nation and family (Avitus, *Epist.* 27, 29, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lix. 243, 246; Agobardus, *adv. Leg. Gund.* xiii. *Patr. Lat.* civ. 124), and sought to lead his inclinations towards the Roman empire (see Mascou, *Annotation* ii., where the passages are collected, and Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule Mérid.* ii. 100). He married Ostrogotha, the daughter of Theodoric, the Ostrogothic king of Italy (Jornandes in Bouquet ii. 28), the betrothal being probably arranged when St. Epiphanius, the bishop of Pavia, undertook his mission to the Burgundian court at Lyons, in 494, to ransom the Lombard captives, carried off by Gundobald and his brother (see Ennodius, *Vita Epiphanii*, cap. xii. Boll. Jan. ii. 374; Mascou, xi. 6). While his father was still living, Sigismund was invested with regal dignity, and held his court at Geneva (Avitus, *Epp.* 29, 30; *Greg. Tur. Epitom.* xxxiv.). In 515 he founded, or, according to some (see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 89, 91), refounded the monastery of St. Maurice, at Agaunum, where tradition placed the martyrdom of the Legio Thebaea (Marius Avent. *Chronicon*, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 796). In the following year he succeeded his father (Marius, *ibid.*), and in 517 convened a council, under the presidency of Avitus, at a place called Epaunum, the site of which is uncertain, but is supposed to be the present Iene on the Rhone (EPAON, *Dict. Antiq.*; *Hist. Litt.* iii. 9). If the extent of his dominion may be inferred from the sees of the bishops present, Burgundy included at that time, besides the later duchy and county of the name, Dauphiny and Savoy, the city and dominion of Lyons and the Valais, besides a part of the present Switzerland (Mascou, xi. 10, 31). For the councils of Agaunum and Lyons, also held in Sigismund's reign, see Mansi, viii. 531–8, 567, sqq., and *Hist. Litt.* iii. 89 sqq. 93. He is said to have exiled the bishops who were present at the latter, for condemning incest in one of his officers (cf. *Vita S. Apollinaris*, Bouquet, iii. 404). About 517 Sigismund seems to have published at Lyons the enlightened code or redaction known as the *Loi Gombette* [GUNDOBALD]. The fair prospect of his reign, however, was marred by crime. After the death of his first wife, who bore him one son, Sigericus, he had married Fredegaria, apparently a servant, who, jealous for her own offspring, succeeded in stirring up false suspicions of the loyalty of her stepson, and induced Sigismund to put him to death in the year 522 (Marius, *ibid.*; Greg. Tur. iii. 5). Bitter remorse ensued, which drove him to make public profession of repentance, and to retire to St. Maurice, where, while practising all the austerities of a monk, he lavished endowments and established an unceasing service of psalmody (Greg. Tur. iii. 5). The crime, and the long seclusion which followed, alienated the powerful Theodoric, and diminished the loyalty of his own people at a time when he was called on to meet the aggression of the Franks. It was in 523 that three of the four sons of Clovis, namely, Clodomir, Clotaire, and Childebert, stirred up by their mother, the widowed Clotilda, invaded Burgundy. Sigismund was defeated and fled to St. Maurice, where he was betrayed by his own subjects to Clodomir, and carried prisoner in the garb of a monk to Orleans. Shortly afterwards, with his wife and two children, he was murdered at the neighbouring village of Coulmiers, by being cast alive, as was said, into a well (Marius, *ibid.*; Greg. Tur. iii. 6). His brother, Godemar, succeeded him as the sixth and last king of the Burgundians. The bodies of the murdered family were, some years later, transported to St. Maurice (*Vita S. Sigism.* Bouquet, iii. 404), and Sigismund, despite his crime, is numbered amongst the saints and martyrs. His cult commenced at a very early date, being recognised by Gregory of Tours, and his name appears in the Martyrologies of Babanus Maurus, Ado and Usuard on May 1 (see Roll. *Acta SS.* Mai. i. 85).

Sigismund was a well-intentioned, but weak man. It would seem that he surrendered himself too much to the influence of Roman ideas and habits for the king of a barbarian people, neighboured on one side by the powerful Ostrogothic monarchy, and on others by the fiercely aggressive Franks. His partizanship moreover for the orthodox faith, while it harmed him with his subjects, was not thorough-going enough to win the clergy from their leaning towards the Franks (see Fauriel, ii. 100, sqq.).

For the history of his relics, which were in after days transported in part to Prague, see Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. i. 88–91. Popular belief ascribes to him a miraculous efficacy in the cure of fevers (Greg. Tur. *De Glor. Mart.* i. 75; the mass is given in *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1134).

The letters addressed in his name to the pope and emperor were the work of Avitus (*Patr. Lat.* lix. 243, sqq.; Ceillier, x. 560, sqq.) [S. A. B.]

SIGUALDUS, patriarch of Aquileia, is mentioned as patriarch in the deed of foundation of two monasteries in May, A.D. 762. (Cappelletti, viii. 80.) In October, A.D. 772, he grants privileges to a nunnery at Brescia (*Bullarium Casinense*, ii. 16). He was therefore patriarch between these two periods, but the dates of his elevation and death are uncertain. He probably died in A.D. 776, and was the patriarch visited on

his death-bed by Charles the Great. (The Monk of St. Gall. *Gesta Kar.* ii. 27, in Pertz, *Script.* ii. 760.) [F. D.]

SIGULFUS, abbat of Ferrières and priest. He was a native of Britain, and accompanied Alcuin to the continent: he continued in close friendship with Alcuin and succeeded him at Ferrières, c. A.D. 800 (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 14, 301, 480). The questions which he put to Alcuin are stated by the latter (*Interr. et Resp. in Genes.* Pref. in Migne, t. c. 516) as his only motive for writing the exegetical notes on Genesis. Alcuin thought him much too fond of studying Virgil, especially as he was found encouraging others to do the same in secret (*Vit. Anon. S. Albini*, c. x.) His special name from Alcuin was Sigulfus Vetulus, but this may not mark his age. He provided the anonymous author with material for his Life of Alcuin (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. c. 25–100; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 166–7). [J. G.]

SIGWINE, an abbat of an unknown cell of Lindisfarne. See ETHELWULF. Sigwine occurs in the *Liber Vitae* of Durham in the list of abbats (p. 8). [J. R.]

SILANUS (SILVANUS), a deacon of the church of Panormus, mentioned in the reply of Paschasinus, bishop of Lilybaeum, as the bearer of Leo's letter to him, inquiring what was the right time of celebrating Easter in the year 444 (Leo, *Epp.* 3; in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 606). [F. D.]

SILAS (SHILA), a Nestorian, succeeded BABAEUS, whose archdeacon he had been, as catholicus of Seleucia, A.D. 503 or 505. He was married, according to the rule instituted by his predecessor, and had children; and is described as a self-indulgent covetous man, ruled by his wife. He is said to have gone so far as to seize the costly altar vestments and bestow them on his daughter; and to have excommunicated one Maris, who rebuked him for this sacrilege. The only fact recorded of him that bespeaks any sense of the duties of his high office is that, according to Maris, a Nestorian writer, he endeavoured to convert to his creed some "heretics" (i.e. Monophysites), who in his time were driven into Persia by the persecution of the emperor Justin. He endeavoured to arrange that his son-in-law, Elisha, a physician, should be his successor. In consequence of this attempt, a schism followed on his death (520 or 523). A rival candidate, Narses, was set up, supported by Jozachus bishop of Ahwaz (or "the Huzites"), a prelate powerful in the favour of Cavades, which he had gained by curing that king and his daughter from an illness. Both claimants, however, were encountered by an opposing party, which included three persons of special importance; the chief metropolitan, Jacob of Gandosapor (Elamitis), whose office it was to consecrate the catholicus; the chief bishop of the Seleucian province, Samuel of Cascara, on whom devolved the charge of the church during the vacancy; and the chief of the clergy, Paulus, archdeacon of Seleucia (see Assem. iv. 643 & ff.). Narses was consecrated notwithstanding, in the principal church of Seleucia, but by the metropolitan next in rank, Giavar of Nisibis. Elisha also obtained consecration, but (by a double irregularity) at the hands of David, metropolitan of Maru, and in the church of Nisibis. Elisha then proceeded to exercise the functions of the office he claimed, but was everywhere opposed by Narses, so that rival bishops were consecrated for every see that fell vacant. For twelve (or fifteen) years, the contest distracted the Nestorian communion. The goodwill of Berōes, the physician of Cavades, procured for Elisha the support of the king, and finally enabled him to overpower Narses and throw him into prison, where he died (535 or 538). A synod was then held, by which both consecrations were condemned and Elisha was deposed, and Paulus was raised to the catholicate [PAULUS (44)]. Of Elisha's end, nothing is recorded. The list of his works given by Ebedjesu (*Catal.*), including commentaries on Job and on certain of St. Paul's Epistles, shews him to have been a man of some learning. (Gregory Barh., *Chron. Eccl.* ii. 81; Assem. ii. 409; iii. 614 (from Amrus and Mares); Le Quien, ii. 1115, 1182, 1192.) [J. Gw.]

SILBONE, a military martyr at Babylon in Egypt, with PAPHNUTIUS and PANESNIU in the persecution of Diocletian (Georgii *SS. Coluthi et Panesniu Miracula*, p. 322). [G. T. S.]

SILCO, the first Christian king of Nubia. He expelled the Blemmyes from the neighbourhood of Philae, and erected an inscription, which still exists, commemorating his victory. It has been often copied and commented on by Niebuhr, Franz, Letronne, and Revillout, in his memoir on the Blemmyes read before the French Academy. (Cf. *Mém. de l'Acad. des Insc.*, Prim. Sér., *Sujets d'Erudition*, t. viii. part ii. p. 431, Paris, 1874.) It will also be found in Dean Payne Smith's translation of John of Ephesus, p. 345. Silco lived about the beginning of the seventh century. [G. T. S.]

SILLAN (SILVANUS, SIOLLAN), a name belonging to saints of the Irish kalendars, many of whom are simply commemorated as abbat, bishop, deacon, or without designation. [J. G.]

SILVANIA (SILVIA, SALVIA), a sister of Rufinus the minister of Theodosius the Great. She is famous in monastic history for her studies. She perused the commentators on the Bible (Stephen, Gregory, Pierius, Basil) to the amount of three millions of lines. At the age of threescore she could boast that she had never washed any part of her person save the tips of her fingers when she communicated, a boast which comes in connection with an amusing story of how she reproved a deacon JOVINUS (9), afterwards bishop of Ascalon, who was sailing with her to Egypt, for the care he bestowed on his body after a severe attack of sea-sickness. (Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, p. 779, 977 in *Pat. Lat.* lxxiii. 1210, lxxiv. 328; Gibbon, cap. xxix. note[32]; Pallad. *Laus. Hist.* 143.) On the chronology see Tillem. xi. 417, 419, 505, 639, xii. 311. [G. T. S.]

SILVANUS (1), a patripassian mentioned by Gennadius (*Dogm. Eccles.* c. 4) with PRAXEAS. [C. H.]

SILVANUS (2), bishop of Gaza, a martyr in the persecution of Maximin, c. 305. According to the Greek menology, he had served as a soldier before he took holy orders, and was very successful in the conversion of pagans. He was still a presbyter at the outbreak of the persecution, from the very beginning of which he endured many varied sufferings with the greatest fortitude. Finally, he with thirty-nine others, was condemned to the copper mines of Phaeno, in Palestine, their feet having been previously crippled by cauterizing the sinews. Not long before his martyrdom, which was one of the last in Palestine, he obtained the episcopate. Eusebius speaks with high admiration of his christian endurance, saying that he was "reserved to the last to set the seal, as it were, to the conflict in Palestine." (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13.) He suffered death by decapitation, according to the Roman martyrology, on May 4, 308. (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 7, 13; Theoph. p. 9; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 605.) [E. V.]

SILVANUS (3), bishop of Emesa, a martyr in Diocletian's persecution. In extreme old age, *τὴν ἡλικίαν ὑπερῆρως*, after a forty years' episcopate he was thrown to the wild beasts. (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 13, ix. 6; Theophan. p. 9.) The Greek menology (Feb. 6) incorrectly places the martyrdom of Silvanus under Numerian, and states that his deacon Lucas, and his reader Mocius, suffered at the same time, being encouraged to persevere in their testimony as they were led to the beasts by Julian (No. 78), a physician of Emesa, who paid for his rashness with his life. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 837.) [E. V.]

SILVANUS (4), bishop of Cirta, was a subdeacon under Paulus, bishop of that see, during the persecution under Diocletian, and, as well as he, became guilty of "tradition." Yet, having been chosen, it was said, by the dregs of the populace (harenarii) and contrary to the express wish of the Christian people, who desired to have a townsman, and one not tainted with the infamy of tradition, he was ordained by Secundus of Tigisis, as the successor of Paulus, at the meeting which took place at Cirta in March A.D. 305. The scene of mutual incrimination which took place on this occasion has been described above (Vol. I. 882). He became afterwards one of the ordainers of Majorinus, and received a share of the bribe provided by Lucilla. [LUCILLA.] These facts were elicited at the inquiry under Zenophilus, A.D. 320, at which it was proved, by ample evidence, not only that Silvanus had been guilty of the charge brought against him, but with others had appropriated plate and ornaments from the heathen temple of Serapis; and after he became a bishop received as a bribe for ordaining Victor, a fuller by trade, to be a presbyter, money which ought to have been given to the poor. After the enquiry he was banished for refusing to communicate with Ursacius and Zenophilus, at the time of the mission of Macarius, A.D. 348 (Aug. *Petil.* i. 23, iii. 69, 70; *De Gest. Emer.* 5; *c. Cresc.* iii. 32, 33, 34, iv. 66; *De Unico Bapt.* 30, 31; Aug. *Ep.* 53. 4 *Mon. Vet. D.* pp. 178, 180, 182, ed. Oberthür; pp. 167–171, ed. Dupin). [NUNDINARIUS; SECUNDUS (2).] [H. W. P.]

SILVANUS (5), a comedian, who while a young man under twenty obtained admission to the coenobium of Pachomius at Tabenna in Thebais. At first he was submissive to the rules, but after a time he indulged his old histrionic humours to such a degree that Pachomius sentenced him to expulsion. Upon his humble submission and the intercession of Petronius, one of the most virtuous of the brethren, Silvanus received a longer trial and became an eminent example of genuine repentance. But he lived only eight years from that time, dying in the lifetime of Pachomius, who died May 9, 348 (Boll. *Acta SS. Graec.* 14 Mai. pp. 36, 37; Tillem. vii. 216, 688). [C. H.]

SILVANUS (6), bishop of Tarsus and metropolitan, one of the most excellent of the Semiarians belonging to the body described by Athanasius as "brothers who mean what we mean, and differ only about the terms." (Ath. *de Synod.* 41.) He succeeded Antonius in the reign of Constantius. He was one of the 22 Oriental bishops who at the council of Sirmium, in 351, joined in the deposition of Photinus. (Hilar. *Synod*, p. 129; *fragm.* i. p. 48.) On the deposition and banishment of Cyril from Jerusalem, early in 358, Silvanus gave him a hospitable reception at Tarsus, in spite of the remonstrances of Acacius. (Theod. *H. E.* ii. 22.) The same year he took part in the Semiarian council of Ancyra (Labbe, ii. 790), as he did in that of Seleucia, in 359, at which he proved himself a vociferous advocate (*μέγα ἀνέκραγε*) for the acceptance of the Lucianic dedication creed of Antioch (Socr. *H. E.* ii. 39), the mere mention of which drove the Acacian party from the place of assembly by way of protest. On the conclusion of the council, Sylvanus was one of the ten bishops deputed to convey the report of the proceedings to Constantius (Theod. *H. E.* ii. 27). Acacian policy triumphed, and Silvanus, with other Semiarian leaders, was deposed by the Homoeans, in the council held at Constantinople in 360, the nominal ground in his case being that he had translated Theophilus, bishop of Eleutheropolis, to Castabala (Soz. *H. E.* iv. 24). On the accession of Julian, amongst other exiled bishops, Silvanus was restored to his see. He was among the Semiarian leaders who were the first of the rival Church parties to memorialize Julian on his arrival at Antioch after his elevation to the imperial dignity, requesting him to expel the Anomoeans, and call a general council to restore peace to the Church, and declaring their acceptance of the Nicene faith. (Socr. *H. E.* iii. 25.) In 366 he was one of the deputies to Liberius, together with Eustathius of Sebaste and Theophilus of Castabala. [THEOPHILUS (8).] He returned with the letters of communion of Liberius and the Roman Synod (Basil. *Ep.* 67 [50]). His death is placed by Tillemont in 373. (*Mém. Eccles.* tom. vi. p. 592; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 872). [E. V.]

SILVANUS (7), a bishop of the Audians among the Goths in Moesia, and one of the last bishops under whom that sect flourished (Epiph. Haer. 70; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, p. 76). He died before A.D. 377. (Tillem. vi. 694.) [C. H.]

SILVANUS (8), bishop of Omboe, in Thebais, mentioned in the paschal epistle of Theophilus, A.D. 402, as having been succeeded by Verres

(Jerom. *Ep.* xcviii. 26, ed. Vall.; Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 606). [C. H.]

SILVANUS (9), a presbyter of the beginning of the fifth century, who sent to Jerome, then at Bethlehem, in the year 405, the books of Pachomius and other ascetic writers. He had found that there were many men of Latin speech living in the Egyptian monasteries who were at a great disadvantage from not having these works in their own tongue. He therefore sent them to Jerome, who undertook their translation into Latin. (*Regulae S. Pachomii* in Jerome, vol. ii. 53 ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

SILVANUS (10), a bishop, driven out in the persecutions after Chrysostom's banishment, who took refuge in the Troad and supported himself by fishing. (Pallad. p. 197.) [E. V.]

SILVANUS (11), bishop of Summa or Zumma, a place of unknown site in Numidia, joined with Aurelius and other Catholic bishops in letters to Marcellinus respecting the arrangements for the conference, at which he was present (Aug. *Ep.* 128, 129; *de Gest. Em.* 5; *Carth. Coll.* i. 99). [FELIX (157).] He was also present at the council of Mileum against Pelagianism, A.D. 416 (Aug. *Ep.* 176. 182). Some years after this, perhaps A.D. 423, as primate of Numidia, he was requested by Augustine to come to Hippo to ordain, as bishop of Fussala, a presbyter who understood the Punic language, but at the last moment the intended bishop declined the office, and in order that the journey of Silvanus might not be fruitless, a young reader, named Anthony, was appointed (*Ep.* 209. 3). He also joined in a remonstrance to the Donatists, passed at a council held after the conference at Cirta, exhorting them to return to the church (*Ep.* 141). [H. W. P.]

SILVANUS (12), solitary of Sinai. He was a native of Palestine. He retired at first to Sceti, and thence to Mount Sinai. "He founded at Geraris near the great torrent a very extensive establishment for holy men, over which the excellent Zachariah subsequently presided." (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 32). Cotelerius, in his *Monument.* t. i. p. 678, has a number of curious stories about him, among which is the following. He trained his followers to industrial pursuits. On one occasion a wandering ascetic came, and seeing all the brethren working very diligently he said to them, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, Mary chose the better part." Silvanus overhearing this remark said at once, "Give a book to the brother and lead him to an empty cell." When the ninth hour came, the stranger looked out expecting some one to call him to eat, but no one came. At last, wearied and hungry, he set out to look for Silvanus. Addressing him, he said, "Father, the brethren have not eaten to-day." "Oh, yes," replied the abbat, "they have eaten." "And why," said the other, "did you not send for me?" "Because," responded Silvanus, "thou art a spiritual man, and dost not require food, but we are carnal and wish to eat, and therefore are compelled to work. Thou, however, hast chosen the better part and continuest in study the whole day, nor art willing to consume carnal food." The stranger confessed his fault and was forgiven, Silvanus playfully saying, "Martha is evidently necessary to Mary." Cotelerius tells stories too of his prolonged trances. On one occasion he awoke very sad, because he had been in the eternal world and had seen many monks going to hell and many secular persons to heaven, *l. c.* p. 679. [G. T. S.]

SILVANUS, deacon. [SILANUS.]

SILVANUS (13), a man of rank to whom Theodoret wrote a consolatory letter on the death of his wife. (Theod. *Ep.* 15.) [E. V.]

SILVANUS (14), first known bishop of Calahorra. Our information about him is derived from two letters of Ascanius, bishop of Tarragona, and the bishops of his province to pope Hilary, and the reply of the latter dated Dec. 30, A.D. 465 (in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 14). From the first letter it appears that Silvanus had seven or eight years before consecrated a bishop without any request from the places comprised in his see or the approval of Ascanius. The other bishops of the province were satisfied with admonishing him, and received the new bishop as one of themselves; but the see in question having again become vacant Silvanus had lately repeated the act, with the aggravation that the priest consecrated belonged to the diocese of another bishop, and the other bishop at the instance of the bishops of Saragossa having refused to join, Silvanus had performed the consecration alone. In the second letter the bishops express their surprise at the pope's delay in answering. His reply was remarkably favourable, in consequence probably of letters from people of rank and property at Calahorra, Tarazona and neighbouring towns, which alleged in excuse for Silvanus that his were not the only irregularities, bishops having been consecrated for other cities without the previous approval of the metropolitan. The pope in consideration of the troubled state of the times granted an amnesty for the past, while enjoining strict observance of the canons for the future. As the first letter was written some time before Hilary's reply, Silvanus probably became bishop about A.D. 455. (*Esp. Sag.* xxxiii. 128; Gams, *Kirchg. von Sp.* ii. (1) 430.) [F. D.]

SILVANUS (15), a presbyter of Rome, who having been in company with Misenus and Vitalis, the legates of pope Felix III., at Constantinople in 483, afterwards testified to their holding communion with heretics there (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 21; Tillem. xvi. 341, 352). [FELIX (3), p. 483.] [C. H.]

SILVENEUS (SYLUENEUS), monk at Kilrule (St. Andrews, Fifeshire); received the relics of St. Regulus on their arrival in Scotland about A.D. 369. He wrote *In omnes Psalmos* and *Meditationes*, and is venerated July 4. (Dempster, *H. E. Scot.* ii. 584; Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 204, 447) [REGULUS.] [J. G.]

SILVERIUS, bishop of Rome after Agapetus, during the reign of Justinian I. Agapetus having died at Constantinople, when on the point of returning to Italy (on the 22nd of April according to Anastasius) in the year 536, we are informed by Liberatus (*Breviarium*) that,

on the news of his death reaching Rome, Silverius, a subdeacon, and a son of pope Hormisdas, was elected and ordained. The exact date of his ordination is uncertain, though there is no doubt of its having been in the same year, 536. According to Anastasius (*Lib. Pontif. in Vit. Silverii*) the election of Silverius was not a free one on the part of the Roman church, but forced upon it by the Gothic king Theodatus, who at that time had possession of the city; and this not without simony on the part of Silverius. He says: "Hic levatus est a tyranno Theodato sine deliberatione decreti. Qui Theodatus, corruptus pecuniae dato, talem timorem induxit clero ut qui non consentirent in ejus ordinatione gladio punirentur. Sacerdotes quidam non subscripserunt in eum secundum morem antiquum, neque decretum confirmaverunt ante ordinationem." But he adds that after his ordination, thus effected by force and intimidation, the presbyters assented to it for the sake of the unity of the church. Though Liberatus, in his succinct account, makes no mention of these irregular proceedings, there seems no sufficient reason for concluding, with Baronius, the report of them to have been invented by way of justifying the subsequent deposition of Silverius. The Gothic king would be likely to use his power for securing the election of his own nominee, whose loyalty to himself he might hope to count on, threatened as he was at the time by the imperial army under Belisarius: nor is there anything in the general character of ecclesiastics of the period, or in what is known of that of Silverius himself, to render a simoniacal transaction in itself improbable. Baronius defends him against the charge on the strength of a supposed letter of his to Vigilius after the intrusion of the latter into the see, in which he accuses him of simony, which it is argued he could not well have done, had he been guilty of it himself. But the genuineness of this letter is more than doubtful; and even had he written it, his accusation of another would not have proved his own innocence. Still the charge rests only on the evidence, not always trustworthy, the *Lib. Pontif.*

In whatever way obtained, Silverius did not long enjoy his dignity. Belisarius, having previously got possession of Naples, entered Rome in the name of Justinian on the 10th of December, A.D. 536. In the meanwhile, Theodatus had been deposed by his subjects, had fled from Rome and been assassinated, and the Gothic general Vitiges had been elected in his room, and commenced a siege of Rome, now in the possession of Belisarius, in the March of the year 537.

Belisarius, after entering Rome, is said in the *Hist. Miscell.* (*lib.* 16 in Muratori, tom. i. p. 106, 107) to have been reproved and subjected to penance by Silverius on account of his cruel treatment of the Neapolitans after his siege of their city; which treatment Anastasius describes thus: "Ductus furore, interfecit Gotthos et omnes cives Neapolitanos, et misit praedam, ut nec ecclesiis parceret praedando, ita ut uxoribus praesentibus maritos earum gladio interficeret, et captivos filios et uxores nobilium exterminaret, nullis parcens, nec sacerdotibus nec servis Dei, nec virginibus sanctimonialibus." But, on the other hand, Procopius (*Bell. Goth.* lib. i.) commends the peculiar humanity of Belisarius after the capture of Naples; saying how he had proclaimed in the streets and churches, so as to check the rapacity of his soldiers, "The gold and silver are the just rewards of your valour: but spare the inhabitants; they are Christians, they are suppliants, they are your fellow-subjects. Restore the children to their parents, the wives to their husbands; and shew them by your generosity of what friends they have obstinately deprived themselves." If this testimony of the contemporary historian is to be believed rather than the other very contrary tradition, the story of Silverius having reproved him and made him do penance is discredited: nor was Belisarius likely, in the flush of victory, to have so submitted to a pope whom he soon afterwards (as will be seen) treated with so high a hand in obedience to the orders of the empress Theodora, whose designs to procure the election of Vigilius he had already, according to Liberatus, been made aware of before leaving Naples. Still it is possible that he may at first have treated the reigning pope with deference, till worked upon by his wife Antonina, whose ascendancy over him was notorious. It is she who appears to have been the leading spirit in the subsequent proceedings.

Vigilius was one of the deacons of pope Agapetus who had been with him in Constantinople, and had, on that pope's death there, been sent for by the empress Theodora, and promised the popedom through the agency of Belisarius on condition of his disallowing, after his elevation, the council of Chalcedon, and supporting the party of the Monophysites whom that notorious lady favoured. (See art. on VIGILIUS.) On his arrival in Italy he found Belisarius at Naples,[a] to whom he communicated the commands of Theodora, and is further said to have secured his good offices by a bribe (Liberatus, *Breviar.*). Belisarius having gained possession of Rome, and Vigilius having followed him there, measures were taken without delay to carry out the wishes of the empress. In the first place, attempts seem to have been made to win over Silverius, who was already in possession of the popedom, to her party. According to Anastasius, she sent a letter to him through Vigilius, imploring him to come to her without delay, or at any rate to recal to his see Anthimus, the Monophysite patriarch of Constantinople, who had been deposed in favour of Mennas under the influence of Agapetus: and Liberatus speaks of Belisarius and his wife having privately tried to persuade him to do the bidding of the empress by disallowing the council of Chalcedon, and writing a letter of communion to the Monophysite bishops in the East. On his refusal to comply, orders are said to have been received from the empress that some pretext must be sought for justifying his deposition, or at any rate for sending him forthwith to Constantinople, Vigilius being significantly mentioned as "one very dear to us, who has promised to us to recal the patriarch Anthimus." Anastasius, who tells us this, says also that Belisarius himself, though

[a] Liberatus says at Ravenna, which is probably a mistake for Naples, of which Belisarius is known to have got possession before proceeding to Rome, whereas Ravenna was not recovered till afterwards.

prepared to obey the empress, repudiated responsibility for the death of Silverius, if that were intended to be compassed: "Sed is qui interest in nece Silverii papae ipse reddet rationem de factis suis domino Jesu Christo." Nor did he, it is added, at first believe the accusations which were forthwith brought against the pope, though, through fear, he at length yielded to the persistence of many witnesses. The fact seems to have been that Belisarius was an unwilling agent in what he knew to be a nefarious transaction through fear of Theodora, and the influence of her confidante Antonina, the wife of Belisarius, who in this, as in other cases, managed her uxorious husband. The accusations against Silverius were to the effect, that he had been in communication with the Goths who were besieging Rome, and had written a letter to Vitiges to this effect: "Veni ad portam quae vocatur Asinaria juxta Lateranas, et civitatem tibi trado, et Belisarium patricium." Such a letter was produced, said to have been forged by one "Marcus Scholasticus," and one "Julianus Praetorianus." Belisarius occupied a palace on the Pincian, and thither the pope appears to have been thrice summoned to meet these charges. After the first interview he betook himself to the basilica of the martyr St. Sabina. Thence he was again summoned through Photis, the son of Antonina, who assured him of security by an oath. Though dissuaded by his friends, he again went to the Pincian palace, and was that day allowed to return to his church. Summoned a third time by Belisarius, he went once more, though after hesitation from suspicion of intended mischief. He entered the palace alone according to Liberatus, accompanied by Vigilius according to the less trustworthy account of Anastasius, and was thenceforth, says Liberatus, seen by his friends no more. Anastasius gives the following account of what took place. Antonina was sitting on a bed, with Belisarius sitting at her feet. 'Say, lord pope Silverius,' said she as he entered the room, 'What have we done to thee and to the Romans, that thou shouldest wish to betray us into the hands of the Goths?' While she was yet speaking, one John, "subdiaconus regionarius," came in, and took off the pope's *pallium*, led him into a chamber, stripped him of his robes, dressed him as a monk, and concealed him. One Sixtus, another "subdiaconus regionarius," having caught sight of him thus habited, went out and announced to the clergy that the lord pope was deposed and made a monk; on hearing which they all fled. He was banished, in the first instance, to Patara, a city of Syria, Vigilius being forthwith elected and ordained in his stead by order of Belisarius. Anastasius passes over this first banishment to Patara, speaking only of the second and final one; but Liberatus gives an account of it, and Procopius alludes to it, saying that Silverius was sent "in Graeciam." Liberatus further informs us that the bishop of Patara, after his arrival there, went to represent the matter to Justinian himself, and to protest against the deposition of the bishop of so great a see, "multos esse dicens in hoc mundo reges, et non esse unum, sicut ille papa est, super ecclesiam mundi totius." The emperor, who, though he prided himself on his management of ecclesiastical affairs, was really very often the tool of others who managed him (and especially of the intriguing and imperious Theodora, whom he had raised from a life of the lowest degradation to an equal share in his own imperial dignity), seems to have been ignorant of the facts. On hearing of them he asserted himself, ordering Silverius to be recalled to Rome, and investigation made of the genuineness of the letters which had been the ground of his condemnation. Should they be found to have been really written by him, he was to be banished from Rome, though retaining his rank as bishop; should the charge against him be disproved, he was to be restored to his see. This seems to be the meaning of Liberatus: "ut, si probaretur ab ipso fuisse scriptas, in quacunque civitate episcopus degeret; si autem falsae fuissent probatae, restitueretur sedi suae." The emperor's order so far prevailed that Silverius did go back to Rome, although Pelagius (the deacon—afterwards pope—whom pope Agapetus had appointed as his apocrisiarius at Constantinople, but whom Theodora seems to have won over to her side) had been sent post haste to prevent his return. But the empress carried the day after all, having succeeded somehow in keeping her husband quiet. For, on the arrival of Silverius at Rome (as we are informed by Liberatus), Vigilius represented to Belisarius that he could not do what was required of him unless the deposed pope were delivered into his hands. He was thereupon given up to two dependents of Vigilius, under whose custody he was sent to the island of Palmaria in the Tyrrhene sea (or Pontia, according to *Martyrol. Rom.* and Anastasius),[b] where he died from famine (defecit inedia) according to Liberatus; with whose account accords that of Anastasius: "et sustentavit eum (*i.e.* Vigilius) cum pane tribulationis ab aqua angustiae. Qui deficiens mortuus est, confessor factus." So also *Martyrologium Roman.*, "multis aerumnis confectus defecit." Procopius (*Hist. Arcan.*), on the other hand, speaks of one Eugenius, a servant of Antonina, as having been her instrument in bringing about his death, the expression used seeming to imply a death by violence. Allemann (note on *Hist. Arcan.*) argues that the account of Procopius, who was living at Rome at the time, and likely to be well acquainted with the facts, is to be received rather than the other; and attributes the implication of Vigilius to prejudice on the part of Liberatus. For Liberatus, he says, was a Carthaginian, and the Africans were incensed against Vigilius on account of his confirmation of the fifth council. There seems to be no reason why there should not be truth in both accounts. Silverius may have been sent to Palmaria (or Pontia) under the charge of the agents of Vigilius, and his end there may have been hastened by Eugenius, commissioned by Antonina.

The death of Silverius was on the 20th of June (xii Kal. Jul. *al.* Jun. *Anastas.*), most probably A.D. 538, *i.e.* in the year following that of

[b] Palmaria, Pontia, and Pandataria are three small islands over against the coast of Latium, to which people whom it was desired to get quickly rid of appear to have been sent under the emperors. Julia, daughter of Augustus, was for some time secluded in Pandataria (Tac. *Annal.* i. 53); and Nero, the son of Germanicus, was sent by Tiberius to Pontia, and, like Silverius, is said to have died of hunger there (Sueton. *in Tiber.* c. 54).

his deposition;—which certainly took place in the year 537, though Baronius assigns it to 538, erroneously supposing the siege of Rome by Vigites to have begun in the latter year. Baronius is most probably further in error in concluding the death of Silverius to have been in the year 540, on the strength of a letter said to have been addressed by him to Vigilius, which is dated viii. Kal. Jul. A.D. 539. But this letter has such signs of spuriousness that no conclusion can be drawn from it (see Pagi in Baron. A.D. 540, num. i.). The earlier date is probable from the very fact that Theodora, whose design to compass his death Belisarius is said, as above seen, to have suspected from the first, would be naturally anxious to get him out of the way as soon as possible. As long as he lived the position of Vigilius would be insecure, and Justinian might still be moved to interfere.

At the end of the life of Silverius Anastasius adds: "Et cessavit episcopatus dies sex." Binius and Baronius, taking this vacancy to have been after the death of Silverius (since he remained the lawful pope canonically notwithstanding his deposition), suppose Vigilius to have resigned his assumed position, and to have been properly elected after the time alleged. But there is not the least historical ground for this idea. According to Liberatus, Vigilius was proposed by Belisarius to the assembled clergy of Rome shortly after the deposition of Silverius ("et alia die Belisarius convocatis presbyteris," &c.), and, though some hesitated and others refused to concur, was thereupon ordained: and there is no record of any subsequent election or ordination. Hence we may suppose that the Roman church, under intimidation, accepted the new pope on his ordination by order of Belisarius, and that by the vacancy of six days was meant originally the interval between the deposition of Silverius and that event. It is true that Anastasius, who makes no mention of the ordination of Vigilius at the time when Liberatus informs us it took place, speaks of the vacancy after recording the death of Silverius; perhaps owing to the same feeling that influenced Binius and Baronius,—viz. unwillingness to recognise any vacancy of the see during the life of its lawful occupant. But very irregular things might easily be both done and condoned in the circumstances of the time. Such depositions of bishops, and ordinations of others in their room, under imperial dictation, were common enough elsewhere; and never indeed was there a time in which the dignity of the great Roman see suffered so much as this; a time when such things as have been related could be done through the machinations of two women such as Theodora and Antonina. Imperial domination from Constantinople proved in fact no good exchange for the more immediate authority of the Gothic kings of Italy, who, though themselves Arians, had generally treated the Catholic Church with respect and fairness. The eminent dignity of the Roman see, viewed as representing St. Peter's primacy, had indeed by this time been successfully asserted; but the Eastern emperors, accustomed to subservience, expected even popes to bend to their will as the ecclesiastics of the East had done; and Justinian especially, who was unhappily a theologian as well as a despot, was not the man to tolerate independence. At the same time the intrigues of his corrupt court rendered the domination exercised in his name all the more degrading. It was not till the time of Gregory the Great, when the imperial power was on the wane, and when a truly great man was in possession of the Roman see, that it began to rise to the great position of influence which it afterwards occupied in the world.

Silverius was buried in the island where he died. Sick persons were said to have been cured by resort to his tomb; and his sufferings for the faith at the hands of the Monophysite party have procured him a place in the Roman martyrology as a saint and martyr, his day being June 20.

Two epistles are attributed to Silverius. One, which has been already mentioned, purports to have been addressed by him to Vigilius, anathematising him for his usurpation, and to have been signed also by four other bishops. Its whole style, the improbability that, situated as he was, he would have been able to send such a letter with the concurrence of other bishops, and the Consuls named in it as contemporary, are sufficient proofs of its spuriousness. Though Baronius accepts it, it is decidedly rejected by Pagi. The other letter, addressed to a bishop Amator, giving an account of his trial and sufferings, is universally rejected by Baronius and Binius as well as others. So also one from the same Amator to himself, to which the letter last mentioned purports to be a reply. The authorities for his life, as above given, are, in addition to Anastasius, the contemporary writers, Liberatus (*Breviarium*) and Procopius (*de bell. Goth.*) and *Anecdota* or *Historia Arcana*). [J. B—Y.]

SILVESTER(1), bishop of Rome after Miltiades, from Jan. 31, A.D. 314, to Dec. 31, A.D. 335, during 21 years and 11 months. Though his time was an important one in church history, we have few genuine records of any personal action of his own. There is, on the other hand, a great store of legend about him to make up for the deficiency. The well-attested facts claim notice first.

It was in the first year of his episcopate that Constantine the Great, moved by the persistent appeals of the African Donatists, summoned the first council of Arles for reconsidering the decision against them of the synod held at Rome by his order in the year 313. [MILTIADES, DONATISM.] The presidency of the Roman synod had been committed by the emperor to the pope Miltiades, assisted by assessors from Gaul nominated by the emperor for the purpose. With the subsequent council of Arles Silvester evidently had nothing to do, beyond being represented at it by two presbyters, Claudianus and Vitus, and two deacons, Eugenius and Cyriacus, whose names appear in his behalf in the fifth place among the signatures. Whoever presided, the general conduct of the council seems to have been committed by the emperor to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse; as may be gathered from a letter to him from Constantine preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* x. 5). In this letter the emperor complains with considerable bitterness of the provoking conduct of the Donatists in refusing to acquiesce in the ruling of the Roman synod, which he had hoped would have settled the dispute. That synod had by

them been accused of prejudice, and of hastiness of procedure; and so Christians were still disgracefully at variance, and exposing the faith to the derision of its adversaries. In the hope therefore of getting the dispute settled by means of a fuller council, he has, he says, commanded a large number of bishops from various parts to meet at Arles, and he bids Chrestus repair thither within the specified time, with two presbyters chosen by himself, who, together with three servants, are to be provided with a conveyance at the public cost. Further, the name of Chrestus heads the signatures appended to the alleged acts of the council, though in the names at the head of a letter (to be afterwards spoken of) said to have been addressed to Silvester after its close, that of Marinus bishop of Arles comes first.[a] Certainly Silvester did not preside, nor did any representative in his place. Constantine, in making arrangements for the council, evidently takes no account of him, though the dispute to be settled was one that had arisen in Western Africa, where the popes had already claimed authority, which was in later times conceded to them. He does not even mention him in his letter to Chrestus. Indeed the fact of the council being convened to review the decisions of a previous one over which a pope had presided shews that the see of Rome was not considered by him to have any special prerogative of authority. Constantine acted in this case after his usual manner. While scrupulous in committing the settlement of ecclesiastical causes to ecclesiastics only, he still convened synods for the purpose by his own mere authority, summoned such bishops as he chose to them, and felt himself under no obligation to consult or give precedence to the bishop of Rome. Nor is there any recorded protest in his day on the part of the church against his mode of procedure.[b]

There is indeed one document—the letter above alluded to as addressed by the bishops of the Arles council to Silvester—which, if genuine and unadulterated, would exalt the status of the Roman bishop above what other evidence shews to have been at that time recognized. It is found in the commonly received acts of the council, and runs as follows:

"To the most beloved pope Silvester, Marinus (bishop of Arles, as aforesaid), Agraecius, &c. (here follow thirty-two names), eternal salvation in the Lord. United in the bond of charity, and in the unity of our mother the Catholic church, having been convened by the will of the most pious emperor in the city of Arles, we thence salute thee, most glorious pope, with due reverence. We have endured men, troublesome and pernicious to our law and tradition, and of unbridled mind, whom both the present authority of our God and the tradition and rule of faith have rejected. Wherefore, by the judgment of God and of mother church, who knows and approves her own, they have been either condemned or repulsed. And would, most beloved brother, that you had deemed it of sufficient importance to be present at so great a spectacle. If you had, we truly believe that the sentence against them would have been more severe; and, had you judged together with us, our assembly would have exulted with greater joy. But, as you could by no means leave those parts where both the apostles daily sit, and their blood without intermission testifies the glory of God,—we have notwithstanding thought it right, most dear brother, not only to treat of those things for the consideration of which we had been invited, but also to take counsel among ourselves with respect to divers matters, the provinces from which we come being divers. We have therefore thought fit, in the presence of the Holy Spirit and his angels, to promulge certain resolutions for present quiet. And we have thought it fit also that they should be especially made known *to all* through you, *who hold the greater dioceses*. What we have resolved on we subjoin in the writing of our mediocrity." A summary of the canons agreed on follows. Now, though this letter does not imply either that the bishop of Rome had taken any part in convening the council, or that his approval of its decrees was necessary, yet he is addressed in it with very marked deference, and a kind of apology is made by the writers for having done all they had done without him. Further, the phrase in it, *qui majores dioeceses tenes*, with the consequent desire expressed that the pope should promulgate the decrees, has been used by Schelstrate and others in proof of the pope's then acknowledged patriarchal jurisdiction over all the great dioceses (*i.e.* exarchates) of the Western Empire. For the word διοίκησις denoted the jurisdiction of a patriarch, larger than that of metropolitans, after the church in her ecclesiastical arrangements had followed the civil division of the empire into dioceses under exarchs which was introduced by Constantine. The word for a diocese in the modern sense was properly παροικία. It is, however, highly improbable that the word *diocese* would have been used ecclesiastically in this sense so early as A.D. 314, even if the civil division of the empire into dioceses had been by that time established. Hence Bingham contends (*Ant.* ix. i. 12, and ii. 2) that if the passage, "by all acknowledged to be a very corrupt one," be accepted, διοίκησις must be taken in the sense generally at that time expressed by παροικία: and he adduces instances of the word being used in this sense in canons of Carthaginian councils. It may be considered more probable that the whole epistle (on the ground not only of this passage but also of the general anachronism of its tone) is a forgery from beginning to end, concocted with the view of magnifying the Roman see. Acts of councils that have been handed down to us as genuine are not always trustworthy. Many, in whole or in part, are now generally discredited on grounds of internal evidence. For instance, as will be seen below, an alleged synodical letter from the council of Nicaea to the same Silvester, seeking his confirmation, and his reply to it, are both now rejected by the learned. The synodical letter from Arles may well be conceived to have been

[a] The latter probably, as was likely to be the case, had the formal presidency.

[b] Constantine's attitude towards the church was in accordance with his speech to the bishops mentioned by Eusebius (*V. C.* iv. 24): "ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησιας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθιστάμενος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην." On which speech Eusebius remarks, Ἀκόλουθα δ' οὖν τῷ λόγῳ διανοούμενος, τοὺς ἀρχομένους ἅπαντας ἐπεσκόπει, προὔτρεπέ τε, ὅση περ ἂν ἡ δύναμις, τὸν εὐσεβῆ μεταδιώκειν βίον."

forged with a like motive. In it there is this among other reasons for suspicion,—that (as is pointed out in the *Art.* on MARINUS) the pope is requested, as holding the greater dioceses, to communicate the decrees *to all*, whereas the bishops of Sardica, seventy years later, in their letter to pope Julius (well attested, since preserved by St. Hilary), only "thought it right that their brethren in Italy, Sardinia, and Sicily should learn their decrees through him."

Of the canons said to have been passed at Arles, the first only has any direct reference to the bishop of Rome. It decrees that Easter should henceforth be kept everywhere on the same day, and that the bishop of Rome should, according to custom, make known the day by letters addressed to all the churches. It is worthy of remark that in the synodal letter of the subsequent council of Nice (A.D. 325), at which general uniformity with regard to Easter was provided for, there is no mention of the bishop of Rome as the authority for declaring the proper day. In the following century the custom, said to have been established by "the Fathers," was for the patriarch of Alexandria to ascertain and notify it. Pope Leo, *e.g.* (440–461) learnt it from him on the ground of ancient custom:—"Statuerunt ergo *sancti patres* occasionem hujus erroris (viz. with regard to the Easter cycle) auferre, omnem hanc curam Alexandrino episcopo delegantes, quoniam apud Aegyptios hujus supputationis antiquitus tradita videbatur peritia" (Leo I. *ad Marcianum imp.* ep. 94, *al.* 121). Cf. ep. 109, *al.* 138, *ad episcopos Galliarum et Hispaniarum*, in which Leo notifies to those bishops the proper day for Easter, having, he says, himself learnt it from the emperor Marcianus, whom he had requested to ascertain it from those "qui habent hujus supputationis peritiam." See also Bingham, B. xx. ch. iv. sect. ix.

To the more memorable council of Nice in 325 Silvester was invited, but, declining to attend in person on the ground of his age, he sent two presbyters, Vitus and Vincentius, as his representatives (Euseb. *V. C.* iii. 7; Socr. *H. E.* i. 14; Sozom. *H. E.* i. 17; Theodoret. *H. E.* i. 6). The view that they presided over the council in his name, or that (as Baronius maintains) Osius of Cordova did so, is without foundation. In the subscriptions to the decrees of the council the name of Osius appears first, but simply as bishop of Cordova, not as in any way representing Rome; after which come those of Vitus and Vincentius, who sign "pro venerabili viro papa et episcopo nostro, sancto Sylvestro, ita credentes sicut scriptum est." The earliest, and indeed the only authority for the view of Osius having presided in the pope's name is that of Gelasius of Cyzicus at the end of the 5th century, who says only that Osius from Spain, "qui Silvestri episcopi maximae Romae locum obtinebat," together with the Roman presbyters Bito and Vincentius, was present (Gelas. *Hist. Concil. Nic.* l. ii. c. 5, in Labbe, vol. ii. p. 162). Equally groundless is the allegation first made by the sixth oecumenical council (680), that Silvester in concert with the emperor summoned the Nicene fathers.[e]

The gradual growth of this idea appears in the pontifical annals. The catalogue of popes called the Felician (A.D. 530) says only that the synod was held with his consent (cum consensu ejus); some later MSS. improve this phrase into "cum praecepto ejus." It is evident from all authentic documents that the synod of Nice, as that of Arles, was convened by the sole authority of the emperor, and that no peculiarly prominent position was accorded to the pope with respect to either. The fifth and sixth of the Nicene canons are well known as illustrating generally his recognized position at that time. The fifth provides for the final determination of appeals from excommunicated persons by provincial synods. No further appeal to the see of Rome, such as was afterwards conceded by the Westerns at Sardica A.D. 343 [JULIUS (5)], was as yet thought of. The sixth confirms to the bishop of Alexandria his customary authority over the churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, and similar authority to the bishop of Antioch, on the ground that "this is also customary to the bishop of Rome." The inference evidently is that the bishop of Rome was not then regarded as possessing jurisdiction of a different or higher kind than that of other patriarchs, and that such as he had above other bishops was considered to rest on custom rather than divine authority. An alleged synodical letter to Silvester, seeking his confirmation, and his reply to it (Labbe, vol. ii. p. 79), are both generally acknowledged to be spurious.

Spurious also are the accounts of three Roman synods said to have been held under Silvester. The first of these (alleged to have been summoned, A.D. 315, at the desire of Helena and Constantine, for a disputation with the Jews, see Labbe, vol. i. p. 1521) is referred to (apparently on the authority of the fabulous *Acts of S. Sylvester*, which will be mentioned below) by pope Hadrian, in a letter to Charlemagne (Hadr. *Ep.* 3. *ad Car. M.*). The second (Labbé, vol. i. p. 1575), assigned to the year 324, before the council of Nice, in which Arius is said to have been condemned, and several canons passed, is mentioned in the Felician catalogue, and its supposed acts are contained in the pseudo-Isidorian collection. In the third (Labbe, vol. ii. p. 417), assigned to the year 325, the Nicene decrees, already passed, are said to have been confirmed in the presence of Constantine, who certainly could not have been in Rome at the time spoken of. On these pretended councils see Hefele (*Conciliengeschichte*, i. 419, &c.).

But the most memorable of the fables about Silvester is that relating to the baptism of Constantine by him, and the celebrated "Donation." It is, though variously related, in the main as follows:—The emperor, having before his conversion authorized cruel persecution of the Christians, to escape which pope Silvester had hidden himself in Mount Soracte, was smitten with leprosy by divine judgment. He was advised by certain soothsayers whom he consulted (according to some versions of the story, by physicians, or by the priests of the Capitol) to use a bath of infants' blood for cure. A

[e] The statement occurs in the address of the council to the emperor: "Arius divisor atque partitor Trinitatis insurgebat: et continuo Constantinus semper Augustus et Silvester laudabilis magnam atque insignem in Nicaea synodum congregabant." (Hardouin. iii. p. 1417.)

great multitude of infants was accordingly collected for slaughter; but the emperor was so moved by their cries and those of their afflicted mothers that he was seized with remorse, and desisted from his purpose. Being in this state of mind, he was visited in visions of the night by SS. Peter and Paul, and directed by them to seek and recall Silvester, who would show him a pool by immersion in which he would be healed. Thereupon he recalled the pope from exile, was instructed by him in the faith, cured of his leprosy, and baptized. Moved by gratitude, he not only destroyed the heathen temples, and built and endowed numerous churches, but also made over to the pope and his successors the temporal dominion of Rome, of the greatest part of Italy, and of other provinces, thinking it unfit that the place where the monarch of the whole church and the vicar of Christ resided should be subject to earthly sway. (See *Lib. Pontif. in Vit. Sylvestri*, and the Lections *in Fest. S. Sylvestri* in the Breviaries of the various uses.) The earliest known authority for the whole story appears to be the *Acta Sylvestri*, with respect to which more will be said below. There is apparent reference to the earlier part of it in the account given by Gregory of Tours of the baptism of Clovis: "Procedit novus Constantinus ad lavacrum, deleturus leprae veteris morbum, sordentesque maculas gestorum antiquorum recenti latice deleturus." (Greg. Turon. *Hist.* l. ii. c. 31.) Such is the alleged origin of the "Donation of Constantine," which, having with the "False Decretals" assumed definite form probably in the 8th century, long continued to be accepted and referred to as the foundation of the pope's temporal sovereignty. It began to be questioned as early as the beginning of the 12th century, but was not universally rejected till the 16th. Gibbon (c. xlix.) gives a good summary, with references, of the history and exposure of the forgery. There seems to have been a foundation of fact for it so far as this: that Constantine, at Rome especially, though elsewhere also, was liberal in founding churches and in granting immunities and endowments to the clergy (Euseb. *V. C.* iii. 25–40; iv. 28, 39, 58–60; Sozom. i. 8, v. 5; Theodor. iv. 4); and it is not improbable that the subsequent possession of the Lateran palace by the popes was due to him.

The part of the story that attributes his conversion and baptism to Silvester is as undoubtedly legendary as the rest. It seems not unlikely to have been originally due to a desire on the part of unbelievers to throw discredit on Constantine's profession of Christianity. For we find an early form of it in the statement of the heathen historian Zosimus, that after the execution by his order of his son Crispus his nephew Licinius and others (that of his wife Fausta, though probable, is by some doubted), he sought lustration from the priests, and was informed by them that they had no means of expiating crimes like his; but that a Spaniard with an Egyptian name was afterwards introduced to him, who told him that the Christian doctrine assured forgiveness of all manner of sin, and that he was thus first led to embrace Christianity. (Zosim. ii. 29.) Sozomen (i. 5) refutes a similar pagan story, to the effect that having applied to and been repulsed by Sopater the philosopher, he fell in with certain Christian bishops, who promised him purification from all his sins after repentance and baptism. By the Spaniard with an Egyptian name Osius of Cordova has been supposed to be meant, who is accordingly added by more modern relators of the story to the two apostles seen in vision, as having also directed him to Silvester. So Tillemont and also Baronius and Binius, who further attribute his leprosy and remorse to the unhappy events in his life alluded to by Zosimus, and not merely (as is intimated in the *Lib. Pontif.* and alleged in the Breviaries) to his previous persecution of Christians. It is possible that something did actually occur to give foundation for the story at that period of the life of Constantine (during his visit to Rome A.D. 326), when he may well have passed through a season of peculiar remorse, and been drawn more than before towards the Christian doctrines of Atonement, and washing away of sin. But it is undoubted both that his profession and patronage of Christianity were anterior to the time spoken of, and also that he was not actually baptized till long afterwards, at the close of his life. There is abundant testimony that he did not seek baptism, or even imposition of hands as a catechumen, till in a suburb of Nicomedia, as death drew near, he received both for the first time from Eusebius, the Arian bishop of that see. (Euseb. *V. C.* iv. 61, 62; Theodoret. i. 32; Sozom. ii. 34; Socrat. i. 39; Photius, *cod.* 127; Ambrose, *Serm. de obit. Theodos.*; Jerom. *Chron. an.* 2353; Sozom. iv. 18; *Council of Rimini.*) In spite of this concurrent evidence Baronius warmly supports the fable of his previous baptism by Silvester. Emmanuel Schelstrate (*antiq. illustr. pt.* 2, *dissert.* 3, *c.* 6) supposes him to have been baptized a second time by Eusebius as a convert to Arianism. But this is only an unsupported expedient for reconciling the legend with the fact. After all, it seems not unlikely that the legend in its earliest form did not really imply actual baptism by Silvester, but only some sort of lustration for the cure of his alleged leprosy. The original Acts of Silvester, as referred to by pope Hadrian in his letters (as to which see below), do not seem of necessity to have implied baptism, though suggesting the idea of it,—and it is worth noticing that the lections of the York Breviary (see *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesie Eboracensis*, published by Surtees Soc. 1880) do not, like those of the Roman and Sarum uses, allege actual baptism but only the emperor's immersion in a fountain (*fontem*), which had been blessed by the pope, out of which he arose cleansed from his leprosy, and confessing that he had seen Christ.

The "Acta S. Sylvestri," alluded to above, which seem to have furnished the materials for most of the legends—including the banishment to Soracte, the leprosy of Constantine, his lustration by Silvester, and his Donation—are mentioned and approved as genuine in the *decretum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, commonly attributed to pope Gelasius (492–496), but probably of a later date. They are quoted in the 8th century by pope Hadrian in a letter to Charlemagne, where the donation is alluded to, and in another to the empress Irene and her son Constantine on the occasion of the 2nd Nicene

council, where the pope's purpose is to support the image-worship which that council was assembled to restore. He tells how St. Peter and St. Paul had appeared in a dream to Constantine the Great, and directed him to Silvester, then in banishment on mount Soracte, who would shew him a pool (*piscina*), after three immersions in which he would be cured of his leprosy: how he had asked Silvester who Peter and Paul were, and whether he had any pictures of them; and how Silvester had produced portraits, which the emperor recognised as agreeing with his dream. The original "Acts" have not been preserved. The extant editions of them, given in Latin by Surius (*Acta SS.* Decembr. p. 368), and in Greek by Combefícius (*Act.* p. 258), purport to be only compilations from an earlier document.

For references to the original document, see Acts of the 2nd Nicene Council, containing the letters of pope Hadrian above referred to.

Silvester died on the 31st of December, A.D. 335, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Priscilla. He is commemorated on the above-mentioned day in the Roman martyrology as a saint, and as having baptized Constantine and confirmed the Nicene council: also in the Greek menology on the 1st of January, as a worker of many miracles, and the converter, healer, and baptizer of Constantine. [J. B — y.]

SILVESTER (2), bishop and companion of St. Palladius, has his tradition collected by Colgan (*Acta SS.* 570–571), but it is very obscure. He was buried at Donard, co. Wicklow, where a church was dedicated to him and Solonius his associate (Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 368–369; O'Hanlon, *Ir. SS.* iii. 282–283). He has a Scotch and Irish tradition. [J. G.]

SILVIA, the mother of Gregory the Great. She retired, probably after the death of her husband, GORDIANUS (7), to a place afterwards called Cella Nova, near the gate of St. Paul. Gregory afterwards caused her portrait, with that of his father, to be placed in the atrium of a monastery, probably that of St. Andrew ad Clivum Scauri. They existed in the time of John the Deacon (c. 870), and are minutely described by him (Joannes Diaconus, *Vita Gregorii*, i. 1, 9, iv. 83; in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxv. 63, 66, 229). His description is given under GORDIANUS (7). She is commemorated as a saint on November 3rd. [F. D.]

SILVINA. [SALVINA.]

SILVIUS, companion of St. Regulus, and brother of Nathabeus (Skene, *Chron.* 187; Fordun, *Scot. Chron.* ii. c. 47, ed. Skene, i. 76–77; ii. 71); is probably the original of Dempster's (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 588) "Silvius Bonus natione Scotus" who flourished about A.D. 410; he was orator and poet, held in much esteem by the emperor Maximus, and is said to have written *Maximi Caesaris Laus*, *Invectivae in Ausonium*, *De bellis Aremoricis*, *Poemata diversi generis*, *Epistolae ad diversos.* [J. G.]

SIMEON (1), second bishop of Jerusalem, succeeding James, the brother of our Lord. According to the statement of Hegesippus, preserved by Eusebius, the correctness of which there is no reason to question, Simeon was the son of Clopas "mentioned in Holy Scripture" (Joh. xix. 25), the brother of Joseph, and therefore, legally, the uncle of our Lord, while Simeon himself—*ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θείου τοῦ* Κυρίου—was, legally, his cousin, *ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ* Κυρίου, and of the royal line of David (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 11, 32; iv. 22). The language of Hegesippus (*H. E.* iv. 82) evidently distinguishes between the relationship of James and Simeon to our Lord. Dr. Mill, however, follows Burton (*Eccl. Hist.* i. 290) in regarding Simeon as a brother of James and also of Jude, though perhaps by another mother (Mill, *Pantheistic Principles*, pp. 234, 253). Such an interpretation of Hegesippus' language is very unnatural, and is at variance with the statement of Epiphanius that Simeon was the cousin, "*ἀνεψιός*," of James the Just (Epiphan. *Haer.* lxxvii. c. 14, p. 1046; cf. Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 262). There is nothing to lead us to suppose that Simeon was of the number of the Twelve Apostles. The sameness of name however has led, contrary to all probability, to his identification with "Simon Zelotes," or the "Cananite." This is asserted in the work "*de Duodecim Apostolis*," falsely ascribed to St. Hippolytus (*Opera*, part ii. p. 30, ed. Fabric.), and by Sophronius (?), who, however, strangely confounds him with Jude—*Σίμων ὁ Καναναίτης, ὁ τοῦ* Κλωπᾶ. *ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας* (Hieron. *Op.* ii. p. 958), and by Isidore of Seville (*de Vit. et Obit. Sanct.* c. 81), (see Mill, *u. s.* p. 238, Lightfoot, *u. s.* p. 246). This extraordinary double identification also meets us in a list of the Twelve Apostles found at the end of a codex of the Four Gospels (Bibl. Reg. 1007), given by Coteler (*Patres Apost.* tom. i. p. 274, note 6), and in Pseudo-Dorotheus (*ibid.* p. 385, note 16). This last-named author makes a still greater confusion by identifying Simeon the cousin of our Lord, and the second bishop of Jerusalem with his father Cleopas (cf. Liv. xxiv. 18), and regarding him as a different person from Simon the Apostle—*Κλεώπας ὁ καὶ Συμεών, ἀνεψιὸς τοῦ* Κυρίου *γενόμενος καὶ δεύτερος ἐπίσκοπος Ἱεροσολύμων* (*ibid.*). Whether he was the same with Simon the brother of Christ (Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3) depends upon the view taken of the real nature of the relationship thus designated. Eusebius concludes from his reputed age at the time of his martyrdom, 120 years, and from Mary the wife of his father Cleopas being mentioned in the Gospels, that Simeon was one of those who saw and heard Christ (*H. E.* iii. 32). Bishop Lightfoot regards his age as "an exaggeration," and suggests that his being "a son of Cleopas mentioned in the Evangelical records," leads us to place his death earlier than the generally received date. Renan ingeniously evades the chronological difficulty by the hypothesis of a second Simeon, the great-grandson of Cleopas, who occupied the throne of Jerusalem after Judas the successor to Simeon the son of Cleopas, and suffered martyrdom towards the end of the reign of Trajan (*Les Evangiles*, p. 466, note 3, pp. 496, 540). This later Simeon is a creation of Renan's fertile brain, who may be safely discarded from our consideration.

According to Hegesippus, Simeon was unanimously chosen to fill the vacant see of Jerusalem on the violent death of James the Just. A tradition preserved by Epiphanius (*l. c.*) tells us that Simeon was an eye-witness of his kinsman's

martyrdom, standing afar off and remonstrating with his murderers. There is an element of legend (λόγος κατέχει) which may be safely rejected in the statement of Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 11), that the choice of Simeon as James's successor was made by the surviving apostles and disciples of Christ, and his kinsmen, assembling for that purpose after the fall of Jerusalem. But as Burton appositely remarks, although "if any of the apostles were at this time in Judea they possibly had a share in making this appointment, there is reason to think that for some years they had been engaged in distant countries, and Simeon was probably chosen by the elders of the Church of Jerusalem" (*Lectures on Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 290). Renan accepts Eusebius's postponement of Simeon's election till after the fall of Jerusalem. On the eve of so tremendous a catastrophe there would, he thinks, have been no hurry to appoint a successor to St. James (*Antechr.* iv. p. 22). The date usually assigned for the martyrdom of James is A.D. 62 or 63. This seems fixed by the account of Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 9. 1). Whether the appointment of Simeon immediately succeeded, or was not made till the retirement of the Christian Jews to Pella cannot be determined. The former seems rather the more probable. His retreat at Pella would save him from the inquisition after descendants of the royal line of David, made by Vespasian, according to Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 12), as well as the later enquiry instituted by Domitian (*ib.* 19, 20). He must have returned with the members of his church to Jerusalem when allowed to do so by the Roman authorities. Of his episcopate we know absolutely nothing. His martyrdom took place some time in the reign of Trajan, ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 32), but its exact date is uncertain. By a misinterpretation of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius which seemed to assign it together with the martyrdom of Ignatius, to the 9th or 10th year of Trajan, Simeon's death has been assigned to A.D. 107 or 108. Lloyd and Dodwell put it as late as A.D. 110, Burton as early as A.D. 104. Bishop Lightfoot has clearly traced the origin of this error—"the dates being left loose were liable to be assigned to any of the neighbouring years by later scribes and redactors"—and has shown good reason for placing the event earlier in Trajan's reign (Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 21, 58–60; ii. 442–450). The facts as narrated by Hegesippus are these. When in his 121st year Simeon was accused by certain Jewish sectaries on a double charge, first that he was of the line of David, and therefore a possible claimant of the throne of his royal ancestor, and secondly that he was a Christian. The accusation was laid before Atticus who was then pro-consul. Hegesippus relates that Simeon was subjected to torture for many days in succession, and that he bore his sufferings with a firmness which astonished all the beholders, especially Atticus himself, who marvelled at such endurance in one of so advanced an age. As the closing act of the tragedy he was ordered to be crucified (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 32). The compiler of the *Chronicon Paschale* erroneously describes the heretical accusers of Simeon as Cerinthians and Nicolaitans (*Chron. Pasch.* p. 471, ed. Bonn.). There can be no doubt that in common with the persecutors of James the Just, they were members of one or other of the seven sects, αἱ ἕπτα αἱρέσεις, mentioned more than once by Hegesippus (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23, iv. 22). These sects were mainly Jewish. Hegesippus goes on to say that after Simeon's death his accusers were apprehended on one of the charges brought against him as being members of the royal house. He adds that the death of Simeon, the last of the generation who were eye-witnesses and hearers of Christ, was the signal for the birth of heresies polluting the hitherto original purity of the church, which a certain Thebuthis [THEBUTHIS] had already begun to corrupt secretly through jealousy at not being made a bishop (Euseb. *H. E. ll. cc.*). Simeon is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on Feb. 18, and in the Greek on Ap. 27. There appears no sufficient probability for Dean Spence's opinion that Simeon was the author of the recently published *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which he thinks was written by him during his residence at Pella for the instruction of converts from among the neighbouring heathen. (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 11, 12, 32, iv. 22; Routh, *Rell. Sacr.* i. pp. 212 sq.; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* ii. 186–188; Burton, *Lect. on Eccl. Hist.* i. 290, 341, 357, ii. 14, 17; Lightfoot, *Ignatius*, i. 15, 21 sq., 39, 58, 60, 66; ii. 443–449.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (2), surnamed Bar-Saboë (filius tinctoris), 9th catholicus of Seleucia and Ctesiphon on the Tigris, and martyr, succeeded Papas A.D. 326, having probably been his assistant. According to Sozomen (*E. H.* ii. cc. 9, 10), the Magi and Jews excited Sapor against the Christians, and one of the first to be cast into prison was the catholicus. With a number of other Christians, himself being the last, he suffered martyrdom on Good Friday, probably A.D. 344, but the date is uncertain. His feast is April 17th. (Assem. *B. O.* ii. 399, iii. 612, *Acta Mart. Or.* i. 229; Le Quien, *O. C.* ii. 1107; Ruinart, *Act. Mart.* 584 sq.) [J. G.]

SIMEON (3), bishop of Beth-Arsam in Persia, A.D. 510–525. He converted three leaders among the Magi, who were beheaded ten days after their baptism. He signed Zeno's Henoticon, but opposed Nestorianism. The only writings of his extant are a liturgy composed for the Persian church, sometimes attributed to Philoxenus (Renaudot, *Liturg.* t. ii. p. 301); and two letters, one without any address, concerning Barsaumas, bishop of Nisibis, and Nestorianism, the other directed to Simeon, abbat of Gabula, concerning the Homerite martyrs, requesting him to interest the Jewish patriarch at Tiberias in their sufferings. An analysis of this letter will be found under ELESBAAN in t. ii. p. 73. [HOMERITE CH. AND MART.] (Asseman. *Bib. Orient.* i. 341–379; Wright's *Cat. Syr. MSS.* pp. 1045, 1057, 1105; Ceill. x. 643.) [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (4), bishop of Bostra in Arabia Auranitis, c. 560. The opening paragraph of a letter to him from Anastasius patriarch of Antioch, on the Sabbath, defending image worship by analogy, was brought forward by Constantine, bishop of Constantia, at the 4th Session of the Second Nicene Council A.D. 787 (Labbe, vii. 248, 759). [E. V.]

SIMEON (5), bishop of Edessa, in the middle of the 7th century. According to the

Chronicon of Dionysius, he died A.D. 650, and was buried in the church of St. Zoaras the martyr, at Amida. (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 103.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (6), bishop of Edessa, succeeded Timotheus A.D. 761. He had previously been an ascetic at Beth Cheduna. Having been chosen bishop he refused to accept the office, but was violently dragged before George, the patriarch, and forcibly ordained. On the third day he fled to a monastery near Edessa, and eventually took refuge in a mountain near Samosata, where he finished his days in showing hospitality to wayfarers. (Dionys. *Chron.* apud Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* ii. 111.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (7), (Alcuinus, *Epp.* 64, 65, 72. [EANBALD II., p. 13, *a*.] [J. G.]

SIMEON (8) and Maris, presbyters and monks in the diocese of Apamea, who took a lively interest in Chrysostom's Phoenician mission. Chrysostom writes to them, though personal strangers, begging them to endeavour to find some suitable men to aid John the presbyter in his missionary work (Chrys. *Ep.* 55). Tillemont identifies Simeon with the disciple of Marcian, the abbat of a large monastery at Nicertes in Apamea. (Theod. *Vit. Patr.* c. 3; Tillemont, *Mém. Ecclés.* tom. xi. p. 304.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (9), one of the original leaders of the Messalian or Euchite party (Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 11). [EUCHITES.] [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (10), called PRISCUS, a solitary commemorated by Theodoret, whose mother had received his benediction, and acquainted her son with the marvellous story of his life and miraculous powers. His first place of retirement was a cave in the mountain side, whence he was driven by the crowds who were attracted by the fame of his miracles. He then established himself on Mount Amanus. This retreat he had to leave for the same cause, repairing with a number of disciples to Mount Sinai, where he built two establishments for his followers, whom he instructed in the religious and ascetic life till his decease. Theodoret relates several of the miracles ascribed to him. (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. vi.) [E. V.]

SIMEON (11), an Italian monk and a friend of Cassian when in Egypt. Being able to support himself only by transcribing Latin manuscripts, knowing no other art and being unacquainted with Greek, the ordinary language of Egypt, he was by a charitable device of one of the fathers, furnished with employment in his own line, when out of work (Cassian. *Inst.* v. 39). Tillemont (xiv. 164) suggests that he might have been the solitary Simon, a saying of whom is recorded by Poemen (Coteler. *Mon. Gr. Eccl.* i. 615). [C. H.]

SIMEON (12), STYLITES, A.D. 388–460, Jan. 5, *Mart. Rom.* Sept. 1. Bas. *Men.* He was the first of a succession of pillar saints, somewhat like the enclosed anchorites of the early Celtic Church, except that the latter were enclosed in a cell at the level of the earth, the former were enclosed in a box or paling at a height varying from ten to sixty feet. In fact Symeon was himself, according to Theodoret, originally an enclosed anchorite, and only raised his cell to avoid the honours paid to him (cf. Reeves on church of St. Doulough, p. 8–11, with Evagr. *H. E.* i. 21). The fashion however rapidly spread even to the sects separated from the Church, as we learn from Joannes Moschus, *Prat. Spirit.* cxxix.; cf. Ceill. xi. 701, that the Monophysites of 6th century had pillar saints as well as the orthodox. Sometimes both parties had opposition Stylites in the same district. The common idea about the pillar saints, that they stood balancing themselves at such a dizzy elevation without any support is quite mistaken. Evagrius tells us Simeon's pillar was only three feet in circumference at the top, which would barely afford standing ground. Asseman has depicted Simeon's column in his life of the saint with a railing or kind of wooden pulpit at the summit. Some such structure must have stood there, not only to prevent his fall, but also to enable him to write those epistles he sent broadcast to emperors, bishops and councils on all pressing questions. Simeon was born at Sisan, a village on the borders of Cilicia and Syria. At an early period of his life, apparently when about sixteen, he with his brother embraced the monastic life, and joined a monastery, where he created a disturbance by the excessive character of his austerities, some of them indeed, as described by Theodoret, of a very disgusting character. He dug a trench in the garden, and buried himself in it up to his head during a whole summer. He passed forty days in a dark cave. He tied a girdle round him garnished with sharp goads and pricks, which drew blood. These practices naturally seemed to his brethren a reproach against their own easier life. They therefore, after bearing with him for nine years, desired his expulsion, whereupon he made his way to another monastery, ruled by an abbat named Maris, where he simply asked for a cell where he might pass Lent by himself. A monk named Bassus built up the door of his cell, having previously placed there six loaves and a vessel full of water. At the end of Lent Bassus opened the cell and found him on his knees, the food and water being all untouched. He established himself about the year 413 in a cell near Antioch, where his austerities speedily attracted a number of followers, who formed a society called the Mandra. From 413–423 Simeon spent his time in an enclosed cell. In 423 he built a low pillar, which he gradually raised, till in A.D. 430 he attained the height of forty cubits, where, with his neck manacled by an iron collar, he spent the last thirty years of his life engaged in perpetual adorations, save when he condescended to bestow his advice about mundane matters. His extraordinary life made a great impression; large numbers of Arabians, Armenians, and other pagans were converted by him, while the emperors and bishops and pilgrims from the most distant lands, even Spain and Britain, consulted him most reverently. A contemporary biographer tells us that he was once seized with an illness which lasted nine months and threatened his dissolution. The emperor Theodosius wrote a letter to him, and sent three bishops to pray him to descend for a time from his post, and offered the

services of his own physician to heal him. Simeon received the bishops with every mark of honour, but replied to the emperor in a letter in which he gave him and his sisters some very plain advice about the conduct of their government. He refused however to quit his column, saying to the bishops "God knows what was my intention when embracing this state of life. He will not permit me, as I hope, to need human remedies. He has himself the power to cure me when He will." He passed the whole of the following Lent without food, and on the thirty-eighth day found the ulcer in the foot from which he was suffering, perfectly healed. Evagrius tells a story which all other biographers have omitted, and which shows that he was the first of the pillar saints and that his practice was an innovation. "When Simeon, that angel upon earth, that citizen in the flesh of the Heavenly Jerusalem, had devised his strange and hitherto unknown walk, the inhabitants of the holy desert (presumably the Nitrian) sent a person to him, charged with an injunction to render a reason of this singular custom, why abandoning the beaten path which the saints had trodden, he is pursuing another altogether unknown to mankind; and further, that he should come and travel the road of the elect fathers. They, at the same time, gave orders that, if he should manifest a perfect readiness to come down, liberty should be given him to follow out the course he had chosen, inasmuch as his compliance would be sufficient proof that he was persevering under Divine guidance, but that he should be dragged down by force in case he should manifest repugnance or be swayed by self-will, and refuse to be guided implicitly by the injunction. When the person thus deputed came and announced the command of the Fathers, and Simeon, in obedience to the injunction, immediately put one foot forward, the messenger declared him free to fulfil his own course, saying "Be stout and play the man; the post which thou hast chosen is from God." Simeon was the object of deepest reverence all through life. The news of his approaching death caused therefore great excitement. Great crowds assembled in July 459 round his pillar to receive his last words. On August 29th he was seized with a mortal illness, and he died Sept. 2nd, 459. His body was transported with great pomp to Antioch, attended by a train of bishops and clergy, and guarded by the troops under Ardabyrius commander of the forces of the East. The emperor Leo wished to bring it to Constantinople, and sent letters to the bishop of Antioch demanding it. The people of Antioch piteously reminded the emperor, "Forasmuch as our city is without walls, for we have been visited in wrath by their fall, we brought hither the sacred body to be our wall and bulwark"; and consequently were permitted to retain the coveted relics, which however did not avail to protect the city against capture by the Persians. [CHOSROES I. of Persia, Vol. I. p. 483.] Simeon wrote many epistles on current ecclesiastical matters. The subjects of the following are known: (1) Evagrius, *Hist.* lib. i. cap. 13, mentions an epistle addressed by him to the emperor Theodosius against restoring to the Jews the synagogues of which they had been deprived. It effectually incited the emperor to intolerant courses. He withdrew the concession, and dismissed the official who had advised it. (2) Evagrius, ii. 10, mentions an epistle addressed to Leo, on behalf of the council of Chalcedon, and against the ordination of Timotheus Aelurus. (3) Evagrius (l. c.) gives extracts from another epistle addressed to Basil of Antioch on the same topic. (4) An epistle to the empress Eudocia on the same (Niceph. xv. 13), by which she was converted from Eutychian error. (5) Eulogius of Alexandria mentions his profession of the Catholic faith, which Cave conjectures to have been identical with Epist. 2, ut supra, cf. *Phot. Biblioth.* cod. 230. Besides these, there is extant a Latin version of a sermon, *de Morte assidue cogitanda*, which in the Biblioth. Patr. is usually ascribed to our Simeon. Lambecius, on the authority of a MS. in the imperial library at Vienna, ascribes it to Simeon of Mesopotamia, cf. Lambec. *Comment. de Biblioth.* Caesaraea, vol. 8, lib. v. col. 198 D. ed. Kollar. Evagrius (i. 13) describes the appearance of Simeon's relics in his time, and also (cap. 14) a visit he paid to the monastery and pillar of Simeon. The pillar was then enclosed in a church, which no woman was ever allowed to enter, and where supernatural manifestations were often seen, including a large brilliant star shooting along a balustrade, and also a resemblance of the saint's face flitting about here and there, with a long beard, and wearing a tiara as in life. These manifestations, like the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, were only vouchsafed on the saint's commemoration day. The peasants of the neighbourhood used to dance round the pillar, and compass it about with their beasts of burden to ensure good luck. The statements of Evagrius have been of late fully verified. Count de Vogüé in his *Syrie Centrale*, t. i. p. 141–154, Paris, 1865–77, gives a very full account of the present state of the church described by Evagrius, and has shown its minute accuracy. He has identified the remains of the very pillar occupied by the saint. The plates 139–150 give full details of the buildings. In them he discovered one of the three examples of painted mural decorations found in the monuments of Central Syria, cf. plate 151. It is the only one which he found in the interior of buildings. The form of the ornaments and the choice of colours are derived from ancient art, as is also the system of architecture. The colours used are red, green, black and white. The ruins, as De Vogüé tells us, are still called Kalat 'Sem'an (the House of Simon). The ruins of the convent in which he was received after he was expelled from his first abode may still exist in the village still called Deir Sem'am (Convent of Simon) at the foot of the hill on which the church is situated (cf. De Vogüé, p. 125, plates 108–114). The ruins testify to the popularity of the saint's convent as a place of pilgrimage soon after his death. Thus in the village there still exist the remains of a public guest-house, with an inscription testifying that it was finished on July 2nd 479. Outside the village are the ruins of a triumphal arch over the road which led up to the church of St. Simeon. De Vogüé assigns the close of the 5th or the beginning of the 6th century as the date of the erection of the church and arch. With the accounts of De Vogüé and Evagrius may be com-

pared the statements of Joannes Phocas, a monk of Crete, who visited and described the monastery and pillar in A.D. 1185, printed in Leo. Allat. Συμμίκτοις. The title of Phocas' work is *Compendiaria descriptio castrorum et urbium ab urbe Antiochia usque Hierosolymam.* Authorities—Theodoret, *Philotheus*, c. 26; Evagr. l. c.; Theodor. Lect. *H. E.* i. 12, ii. 42; *AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. t. i. p. 264, where three lives are given; Till. *Mém.* xv. 347; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 438; Fab. *Biblioth. Graeca*, x. 522; Allat. *De Symeon. Scriptt.*; Asseman. *AA. MM.* ii. p. 227–346, on this last page he depicts his pillar, which may be compared with De Vogüé's narrative. His narrative is based on an account given by a contemporary of the saint called Cosmas, and a homily in his praise by Saint James of Sarug in Mesopotamia about the end of the 5th cent. [JACOBUS (13)]; Ceillier, iii. 353. [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (13) STYLITES, called JUNIOR or MAUMASTORITES, May 24, Bas. *Men.*, possibly Sep. 3. *Mart. Rom.*; born at Antioch A.D. 521, his father was originally of Edessa. His mother was one Martha of Antioch. He entered a monastery while very young, where a certain John the Stylite was the presiding spirit. Evagrius the historian was personally acquainted with him. Nicephorus of Antioch wrote a prolix life of him, which will be found in *AA. SS.* Boll. 24 Maii, t. v. p. 298. It is full of miracles, visions, and legends, and follows largely the same lines as the life of the Elder Simeon. Evagrius (*H. E.* vi. 23) tells us that "Simeon far surpassed all his contemporaries in virtue, and endured the discipline of a life on the top of a column from his earliest years, since he even cast his teeth in that situation." He was credited with the gift of prophecy, and Evagrius (l. c. and v. 21) gives several instances of his wonderful power. He was sustained by the branches of a shrub which grew upon the mountain near Theopolis, where his monastery was situated. He died A.D. 596. The life of Simeon by Nicephorus and his extant writings will be found in Migne's *Pat. Graeca*, t. lxxxvi. col. 2965–3220. Some of his devotional compositions are mentioned by Allatius, *de Sym. Scriptt.* p. 21 as extant in MS. His ascetic sermons are also noted by Assem. *Bib. Orient.* ii. 510, as extant in an Arabic version at Rome. A letter, stirring up the emperor Justin Junior to punish the Samaritans who had assaulted the Christians, is given at length in the Fifth Action of the Second Nicene Council. His life was also written by an archbishop Arcadius of Cyprus. It is cited by St. John of Damascus in his *Orat. 3 de Imagin.* in *Pat. Gr.* xciv. 1393. The life of Simeon's mother Martha is given by the Bollandist, *l. c.* p. 403–431 out of a Greek MS. of Florence. In it we find an epistle of Simeon to Thomas the Guardian of the True Cross at Jerusalem. (Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* x. 325, 524, xi. 299; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* i. 508; Ceillier, xi. 674.) [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (14) STYLITES, called TERTIUS, Jul. 26, Bas. *Men.* presbyter and archimandrite. He is reverenced by both the Greek and Coptic churches, and must therefore have lived in the 5th century, before the complete breach happened between the orthodox and Jacobite parties. Some have identified him with the Simeon Stylites of Aegae in Cilicia, mentioned by Joannes Moschus (*Prat. Spirit.* c. 57) as having been killed by lightning. (*AA. SS.* Boll. Jul. t. vi. p. 310; Allat. *de Sym. Scriptt.* p. 22; Fab. *Bibl. Graec.* x. 525.) [G. T. S.]

SIMEON (15), one of the Acoemetae monks of Constantinople, sent by his archimandrite Cyril to Rome in 484, where he charged the papal envoys Misenus and Vitalis with holding communion with the heretics at Constantinople and avoiding the orthodox there (Evag. *H. E.* iii. 21; Tillem. xvi. 352). [C. H.]

SIMEON (16) called SALUS, a hermit of Emesa, in the 6th century, mentioned by Evagrius (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 34), falsely suspected of incontinency, because of his giving bread to a mendicant, a woman of bad character. He was known by the epithet salus ("foolish," Syriac), because in his wish to degrade himself in the eyes of men he counterfeited idiocy. His life is narrated by Leontius, bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus, who is mentioned at the second council of Nicaea. (*Conc. Nic.* ii. A.D. 787, Act. iv.) He is commemorated by the Roman Church on July 1, by the Greek July 21. [I. G. S.]

SIMEON (17), surnamed, or perhaps christened, TITUS after his Paulician conversion. About the year 684, Simeon, then an officer of the household of Constantine Pogonatus, was sent by the emperor into the districts of Armenia, where the Paulician sect was spreading, with orders to have the ringleaders stoned to death, and their adherents brought over to the church. With the aid of Trypho, a local chieftain, he took captive Constantine Silvanus and all his followers at Cibossa, near Colonia. After the violent death of Constantine Silvanus, Simeon assisted the bishops in their efforts to reclaim the sectaries. Their Christian fortitude and sincerity produced a profound impression upon him. He returned to the imperial court at Constantinople, but after a stay of three years could no longer conceal or deny his convictions. He secretly repaired to Cibossa in 687. There Constantine's remaining followers were still to be found, and Simeon, who now took the apostolic name Titus, was placed at the head of the sect. The Paulician apostate Justus, who had been the first to take part in the stoning of Constantine Silvanus, accused Simeon before the bishop of Colonia. The result was an investigation, by order of Justinian II., in 690. Simeon and many others died at the stake (Pet. Sic. *Hist. Man.* i. 25–27; Phot. *c. Man.* i. 17, 18; Gibbon, c. 54; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* v. 342). [M. B. C.]

SIMON (1) MAGUS has been the subject of so many legends, and of so much speculation, that it is important to discriminate carefully what is told of him by the different primary authorities.

The Simon of the Acts of the Apostles.—At the bottom of all the stories concerning Simon lies what is related Acts viii. 9–24. According to this account, Simon was a magician who exercised sorcery in Samaria, and with such success that the people universally accepted his claim to be "some great one," and declared him to be "that power of God which is called great." We are further told that Simon was so impressed by the miracles wrought by Philip, that

he himself asked, and obtained, admission to Christian baptism; but that he subsequently betrayed the superficial character of his conversion by offering money to Peter with the view of obtaining the power of conferring the gift of the Holy Ghost. All subsequent accounts of Simon retain the two features, that he possessed magical power, and that he came personally into collision with Peter. The Acts say nothing as to Simon's having been a teacher of heretical doctrine; nor do they tell whether or not Simon broke off all connection with the Christian society after his exposure by Peter.

The Simon of Justin Martyr.—When Justin Martyr wrote his *Apology*, the sect of Simonians appears to have been formidable, for he speaks four times of their founder, Simon (*Apol.* i. 26. 56; ii. 15; *Dial.* 20); and we need not doubt that he identified him with the Simon of the Acts. He states that he was a Samaritan, adding that his birthplace was a village called Gitta; he describes him as a formidable magician, and tells that he came to Rome in the days of Claudius Caesar, and made such an impression by his magical powers, that he was honoured as a god, a statue being erected to him on the Tiber, between the two bridges, bearing the inscription, "Simoni deo Sancto." Now, in the year 1574, there was dug up in the place indicated by Justin, viz. the island in the Tiber, a marble fragment, apparently the base of a statue, bearing the inscription, "Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio," with the name of the dedicator (see Gruter, *Inscrip. Antiq.* i. p. 95, n. 5). Hence critics have generally been of opinion that Justin made a mistake in imagining that a statue really dedicated to a Sabine deity (Ovid. *Fasti*, vi. 214) had been erected in honour of the heretic Simon. And though some (*e.g.* Burton *Bampton Lectures*, n. 42) have thought it incredible that Justin could have committed so gross a blunder, yet the coincidence is too remarkable to admit of any other satisfactory explanation. If the Simonians in Rome pointed out the statue to Justin as proof of the honour in which their founder had been held, it does the Saint no great dishonour to believe that, having never heard of Semo Sancus, he had not the means of exposing the Simonian misconception; in which he was the more ready to acquiesce, because he believed that Simon had been able to exhibit magical wonders, such as would deceive the Roman people into accepting his pretensions.

Justin Martyr, in his *Apology*, further states that almost all the Samaritans, and some even of other nations, worshipped Simon, and acknowledged him as "the first God" ("above all principality, power, and dominion," *Dial.* 120), and that they held that a woman named Helena, who went about with him, and who had formerly been a prostitute, was his "first conception" (ἔννοια πρώτη). In connection with Simon, Justin speaks of another Samaritan heretic, MENANDER.

Justin states, in the same place, that he had published a treatise against heresies. Now in the part of the work of Irenaeus against heresies which deals with Simon and Menander, the coincidences with Justin are too numerous and striking to leave any room for doubt that Irenaeus is here using the work of Justin as his authority; and therefore the section on Simon (Irenaeus, i. 23) may be regarded as but a fuller account than that given in the *Apology* of Justin's tradition concerning Simon. We need not doubt that it was Justin who set the example followed by later heresiologists of placing the two Samaritan heretics, Simon and Menander, at the head of their list. From Irenaeus we get the following additional particulars: Simon's claim for himself, was to be the highest power, that is to say, the Father who is over all; he taught that he was the same who among the Jews appeared as Son, in Samaria descended as Father, in other nations had walked as the Holy Spirit. He was content to be called by whatever name men chose to assign to him. Helen was a prostitute whom he had redeemed at Tyre, and led about with him, saying that she was the first conception of his mind, the mother of all, by whom he had in the beginning conceived the making of angels and archangels. Knowing thus his will, she had leaped away from him, descended to the lower regions, and generated angels and powers by whom this world was made. But this "Ennoea" was detained in these lower regions by her offspring, and not suffered to return to the Father of whom they were ignorant. Thus she suffered all manner of contumely, so far as to be included in a human body, and to pass by transmigration from one female body to another. She was, for example, the Helen for whose sake the Trojan war was fought; and afterwards fell lower and lower, until at last she was found in a brothel. She was the lost sheep. In order to redeem her, the Supreme Power descended to the lower world; he passed through the regions ruled by the principalities and powers and angels, in each region making himself like to those who dwelt there; and so among men he seemed to be man, though not really so, and seemed to suffer though he really did not. His object was to bring to men the knowledge of himself, and so to give them salvation from the sway of those powers who, through their mutual jealousies, had misgoverned the world. See the article HELENA, Vol. II. p. 880.

Now it is to be noted, that in what is here told of Simon there is a large portion common to almost all the forms of Gnostic myths, together with something special to this form. Common to nearly all the forms is the place in the work of creation assigned to the female principle, the conception of the Deity; the ignorance of the rulers of this lower world with regard to the Supreme Power; the descent of the female into the lower regions, and her inability to return (see SOPHIA). In fact, the very name Sophia is given to this Helen in the report of Pseudo-Tertullian (compare also Clem. *Recog.* ii. 12; *Hom.* ii. 26). Common to many myths is also the descent of the Redeemer from the upper regions, his deception of the rulers of the regions he passed through, by assuming their forms (see CAULACAU, OPHITES), and the Docetic theory of the Saviour's Passion. What is special to the Simonian tale, is the identification of Simon himself with the Supreme, and of his consort Helena with the female principle; together with the doctrine of transmigration of souls, which was necessary to give these identifications a chance of acceptance, it not being

credible that the male and female Supreme principles should only make their first appearance in the world at a late stage in its history.

Now if Simon had been really the inventor of the Gnostic myths, it is not credible that they should pass into so many systems which did not care to retain any memory of his name. On the other hand, if this mythology had been in Simon's time already current, it is intelligible that he might make use of it in order to justify to his disciples his relations with a fallen woman. She had but repeated the experience of the Gnostic Sophia—had fallen and been entangled among baser natures; and he had played the part of the Redeemer, and set her free. It seems probable, therefore, that the Simon described by Justin was not, as he supposed, the father of Gnosticism, but had found at the time of his teaching a Gnostic system already developed. It follows, then, that Justin's Simon could not be identical with the contemporary of the Apostles; and the name Simon is so common a one, that the supposition of two Simons presents no difficulty. It must be remembered that the Simon of the Acts is a century older than Justin; and so it is likely to have been a later personage concerning whose birthplace, and whose relations with the other sex, traditions were still fresh in Justin's time. It may be added, that Justin's Simon appears to have carried his doctrine of transmigration of souls to the point of pretending that it was he himself who had appeared as Jesus of Nazareth. Such a pretension would be scarcely intelligible unless this Simon had been born after our Lord's death. We come, then, to the conclusion, that the Simon described by Justin was his elder only by a generation; that he was a Gnostic teacher who had gained some followers at Samaria; and that Justin rashly identified him with the magician told of in the Acts of the Apostles. Mention has been made (Vol. II. p. 880) of Baur's somewhat forced conjecture (*Christliche Gnosis*, p. 308) that Justin may possibly have made another confusion, and in his representation of the honour in which the Samaritans generally held Simon, may have been misled by the cult there paid to the Phoenician sun and moon deities: the name Simon having a common root with שֶׁמֶשׁ; and σελήνη appearing in the Clementine *Recognitions* instead of Helena as the name of Simon's consort. But certain it is, that Justin (*Dial.* 120) claims credit for his own independence in rejecting the pretensions of Simon, Samaritan though he was.

Irenaeus further states that Simon taught, that the Jewish prophecies were inspired by the creator angels; therefore, those who had hope in him and in Helen need not attend to them, but freely do what they would; for that men should be saved according to his grace, and not according to just works. For actions were just not by any intrinsic quality of their own, but by the accident of their being ordered by these creator angels, who had merely wished to enslave those who heard them. But he promised that the world should be dissolved, and that those who were his own should be redeemed. And, accordingly, his priests, Irenaeus tells us, led lascivious lives, used magic and incantations, made philtres, had familiar spirits by whose aid they were able to trouble with dreams those whom they would. They had images of Simon and Helen, in the forms respectively of Jupiter and Minerva.

It remains to enquire, whether there is anything else in the early notices of Simon which may reasonably be believed to have been derived from Justin. The Clementine writings will be considered separately. The section on Simon in the *Refutation of all Heresies*, by Hippolytus, divides itself into two parts; the larger portion is founded on a work ascribed to Simon called the μεγάλη ἀπόφασις, which we do not hear of through any other source than Hippolytus. This work must receive a separate discussion. But the article on Simon concludes with a section, the greater part of which is in such verbal agreement with Irenaeus as would lead us to conclude that Hippolytus was simply transcribing Irenaeus, if it were not for variations and additions which can be explained on the supposition, that Hippolytus is drawing directly from the source used by Irenaeus, viz. the anti-heretical treatise of Justin. In connection with this section must be considered the treatment of Simon in the lost earlier treatise of Hippolytus, which may be conjecturally gathered from the use made of it by Pseudo-Tertullian, Philaster, and Epiphanius (see Vol. III. p. 93). The section in the first of these authorities adds nothing to the account of Irenaeus except that, as already mentioned, it gives the name Sapientia to the being whom Simon descended to redeem. Between Philaster and Epiphanius there are several verbal coincidences which afford proof that they are drawing from a common source. These are to be found in the description given by both of the passion and jealousies that Helen excited among the creator angels: in what is told by both of Helen's expectation of a deliverer. "Expectabat virtutem aliam, id est Magi ipsius Simonis praesentiam (Phil.), αὕτη δὲ προσεδόκα τὴν ἐμὴν παρουσίαν (Epiph.); and in their common report that the Trojan wooden horse typified the ignorance of the nations "per allegoriam asserit quod illa machina ignorantia erat universarum gentium" (Phil.), τὸν παρ' Ὁμήρου δούριον ἵππον ἔλεγε ὁ γόης ὅτι ἄγνοιά ἐστιν τῶν ἐθνῶν (Epiph.).

When this common matter is compared with the section in the *Refutation*, the hypothesis is fully confirmed that Hippolytus was the source from which Epiphanius and Philaster drew. Hippolytus speaks at length of the use made by Simon of the heathen poets, of the story of Helen and her torch, and the Trojan horse; and he finds in the Trojan war, excited by the beauty of Helen, a representation of the conflict raised among the creator angels by the descent among them of Sophia. Hippolytus gives a fuller account than Irenaeus of the immoral teaching of the Simonians. According to the representation of Epiphanius, we find in the system of Simon almost every feature, and even the terminology of the common Gnostic mythology, reproduced so exactly as even to suggest a doubt whether Epiphanius or his authority has not mixed up with his account of the Simonians some things belonging to other sects. With respect to one thing not found in the system of Simon, we take the opportunity of making a remark omitted in the article OPHITES, viz. that the Egyptian "Book of the Dead" teaches us to

recognize as a feature peculiar to Egyptian Gnosticism, the instruction of the disciple in formulae to be used by the soul after death, in order to obtain a passage from the rulers of the different regions which it must traverse. To return to Epiphanius, notice must be taken of a remarkable feature in his account, viz. that he twice reports the doctrine of Simon in the first person. Simon is introduced, saying, "For each heaven I was transfigured into the form of the dwellers in that heaven, that I might escape the notice of the angelic powers, and might descend on the Ennoea, who is also called Prounikos and Holy Spirit, by whom I created the angels, and the angels created the world and men." And again, "This is she who is now with me: for her sake I descended, and she expected my appearing." The first person is so inartificially introduced by Epiphanius that we may conclude he is transcribing his authority; and that the first person was similarly used in the lost work of Hippolytus. It seems likely that Hippolytus found this feature in *his* authority, the work of Justin; for if at the time of writing the earlier treatise he had already direct knowledge of the μεγάλη ἀπόφασις, it is not likely that he would have been so completely silent as to the various points so largely reported in the *Refutation of all Heresies*. It would follow then, that Justin drew his account of Simon from a book purporting to be written by that heretic; and if we are justified in inferring from Epiphanius that this book made use of St. Paul's Epistles, we have an additional reason for believing that Justin's Simon was later than the Simon of the Acts.

There is one thing common to Philaster and Epiphanius which appears not to have been taken from Hippolytus. They both speak of the death of Simon; but their mention of it is separate from the part which contains their common matter, and in their account there are no verbal coincidences. Both, however, show themselves acquainted with the story which came to be the received account of Simon's death, viz. that to give the emperor a crowning proof of his magical skill, he had attempted to fly through the air, but that through the efficacy of the Apostle's prayers the demons who bore him were compelled to let him go, whereupon he perished miserably. Philaster says "Fleeing the blessed Apostle Peter from Jerusalem, he came to Rome, and there contended with the blessed Apostle before Nero; and being conquered by the prayer of the blessed Apostle, and smitten by an angel, he deservedly died in such a way as that the falsehood of his magic might be evidently manifest to all men." There is nothing of this in Pseudo-Tertullian, who, however, like Philaster, has the word "meruit"; but in Pseudo-Tertullian, and doubtless in their common source, this word is used in speaking of the sentence pronounced by Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. Epiphanius has ἐν μέσῃ τῇ τῶν Ῥωμαίων πόλει ὁ τάλας καταπεσὼν τέθνηκε. But this story is unknown to Hippolytus, who gives quite a different account of the death of Simon. His relation is, that after the scene recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, Simon travelled to Rome and there encountered the Apostles, and that when he was deceiving many by his magic arts he was especially resisted by Peter. And when he was near being thoroughly exposed, he bid his disciples dig a trench and bury him, promising that he would rise again on the third day. They did as he bad them; but he never rose. We may conclude that the story known to Philaster and Epiphanius, though, of course, earlier than the end of the fourth century when they wrote, is of later origin than the beginning of the third century when Hippolytus wrote. That Hippolytus did not find his own account in Justin may be concluded from the place it occupies in his narrative, where it comes in a kind of appendix to what is borrowed from Justin; and also from the fact, that this form of the story is unknown to all other writers.

The Simon of the Clementines.—In the articles, CLEMENTINE LITERATURE and PREACHING OF PETER, an account has been given of the literature which made its appearance in the second century, professing to give a report of discourses delivered by the Apostle Peter. Some of these discourses had for their object the confutation of heathenism; others were directed against heresy; and naturally the heretic, into whose mouth the erroneous teaching was put which the author desired to combat, was he who was known to have come into collision with the Apostle, Simon Magus. The Clementines agree with Justin in identifying Simon of Gitta with the Simon of the Acts; and there is every reason to believe that Justin was the authority which the Clementine writers followed. Justin has evidently direct knowledge of the Simonians, and regards them as formidable heretics; but in the Clementines the special doctrines which Justin has taught us to recognize as Simonian have no prominence; and the introduction of Simon is clearly no more than a literary contrivance for bringing in the theological discussions in which the author himself takes an interest. When a real character is introduced into a historical romance, though the language put into his mouth may be pure fiction, the previous history attributed to him is likely to have a foundation in fact. Thus, though we have no right to connect with the historical Simon the doctrinal teaching of the Clementines, the notices of his personal history deserve attention. Some merely repeat what we had in Justin's extant writings; but the statement that Simon's father's name was Antonius, and his mother's Rachel, probably gives us an additional point of the Justinian tradition. It is less easy to say whether the account given of Simon's earlier history and of his relations with Dositheus is to be regarded as derived from Justin, or as mere Clementine invention. That account has been reported and discussed at length in the article DOSITHEUS, Vol. I. p. 902, and need not be repeated here. But the story contains one feature which, though not noticed in the extant Justin, must be pronounced a genuine characteristic of Simonianism; viz. the title, the Standing one (ὁ ἑστώς), which Simon claimed for himself when identifying himself with the Supreme. The Simonian use of this title is confirmed both by Hippolytus and by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* ii. 11, p. 456). This epithet had been used by Philo in speaking of the stability and immutability of God (*De nomin. mutat.* p. 1054), and is similarly employed also by Clem. Alex.

(*Strom.* i. 24, p. 414, vii. 10, p. 866). Two or three other touches found in the same place (*Hom.* ii. 22) possibly give a genuine representation of the teaching of this Samaritan heretic. On the other hand, there appears to be nothing historical in the Clementine enumeration of the various ways in which Simon displayed his magical power. The fact seems to be that Justin describes the Gnostic teacher as a magician merely because he identified him with the Simon of the Acts, and that the Clementine forger, finding the character of a magician already fixed on his leading personage, exercised his imagination in devising stories appropriate to that character.

One concluding remark must be made concerning these Clementine writings, viz. that the circuits of Peter, which they describe, are exclusively made through Eastern cities. Peter follows Simon with the purpose of exposing him from Caesarea to Tyre, Tripolis, Laodicea; and the climax of his success is reached at Antioch in Syria, where the story comes to an end. There are, no doubt, a very few places where mention is made of Simon's intention to go to Rome, and of Peter's resolve to pursue him thither: but all these notices are quite separable from the context, and might be struck out without injury to the story. In fact the Clementine writings underwent many recastings, and the form in which they have come to us is that in which in the third century they were presented for acceptance at Rome. There is every appearance that the original "circuits of Peter" knew nothing of his exposure of the magician at Rome; and that the references to the Roman visit were only interpolated when the tale was dressed up for Roman use in the form of the *Recognitions of Clement*.

The Simon of the "Apophasis." We return now to consider the work ascribed to Simon called ἡ μεγάλη ἀπόφασις, from which Hippolytus has given considerable extracts (*Ref.* vi. 9–18).

The use of the New Testament in the work cited clearly proves that it is not as early as the Simon of the Acts. The author undertakes to give an interpretation of the Pauline phrase, "that we should not be condemned with the world" (1 Cor. xi. 32). But it does not follow that the author may not have been Simon of Gitta. Proof has already been produced from Epiphanius that writings under the name of this heretic were current; and in the passage cited (*Haer.* xxi. 3) Epiphanius complains of Simon's forced applications of Pauline language, specifying in particular his use of the passage (Eph. vi. 14) which speaks of the Christian armour. St. Jerome also professes acquaintance with the writings of Simon, which would seem to have been voluminous. In his commentary on Matt. xxiv. he says, "Simon Samaritanus . . . haec quoque inter caetera in suis voluminibus scripta dimittens: Ego sum sermo Dei, ego sum speciosus, ego paracletus, ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei." The language of this extract seems to indicate acquaintance with St. John's Gospel. Simon is also recognized as a writer in the Clementine *Recognitions*, ii. 38, where Simon is asked, "probare potes, an ex aliis aliquibus quas omnes ignoramus, an ex graecis auctoribus, an ex tuis scripturis propriis?" But when we recognize that Simon of Gitta was a second-century heretic, we find no reason why he may not have been acquainted with New Testament books; and as writings under his name were current, we cannot say that the *Apophasis* may not have been one of them, even though no authority but Hippolytus has mentioned its name.

The book, however, described by Hippolytus is of a different character from what Justin's account would have led us to expect. The mythological element which predominates in Justin's account of Simonianism is almost entirely absent from the extant portions of the *Apophasis*, which, if we were to judge by these extracts, aimed at a philosophic character, and professed to give a theory of Cosmogony. The only phrase that connects these extracts with Simonianism, as otherwise known, is the epithet, the "Standing One," applied to the Supreme; which in the extracts takes the form ἑστὼς, στὰς, στησόμενος, which may be compared with "who art and wast and art to come" in the Revelation of St. John. It is, however, intelligible that an outsider, reading a work of Simon's, would care very little to master his obscure philosophic speculations, and would be likely, passing these over, to fasten on the mythology of the book; and therefore we are not entitled to pronounce the *Apophasis* to be not Simon's on account of its difference in character from what Justin would have led us to expect. The Gnostic system, however, which it discloses, instead of being like Justin's Simonianism of the ordinary Ophite type, is, as Hippolytus has noticed, more closely allied to Valentinianism, of which it has the air of being an earlier stage. Like Valentinianism it deals in syzygies, referring the origin of things to the union of male and female principles of which it enumerates three pairs, forming "six roots." These are, as he in one place lays down, heaven and earth, sun and moon, air and water. Above these is the Supreme Principle, having no consort, but itself bisexual; and this principle is fire, concerning which he takes pains to explain that we must distinguish τὸ φανερὸν τοῦ πυρὸς and τὸ κρυπτόν; the former being that which is cognizable by sense, the latter being the hidden principle from which the sensible qualities flow. The six roots otherwise considered are called, νοῦς and ἐπίνοια, φωνή and ὄνομα, λογισμός and ἐνθύμησις. Nous has a leading place in all the Gnostic systems; ἐπίνοια comes here in the place of what, not only in other Gnostic systems, but in Justin's account of Simon's, is called ἔννοια. Simon then forces many texts of Scripture to bear witness to his theory. Thus he finds his six roots in the six days of creation: the three days before the sun and moon are the two first roots, Heaven and earth, together with the Supreme Principle: Isaiah's "Hear, O heaven, and give ear, O earth," is an address to the same two "roots." Testimony is elicited in the same way from Homer. It is not worth while to enter into further details.

Our information about second-century Gnosticism, is too scanty to give us a right to reject the Simonian authorship of the *Apophasis*, merely because the document is unlike other reports of Simon's teaching; but the present writer has already called attention (OPHITES, p. 84 *sq.*, *Hermathena*, ii. 389) to the strange

resemblances between documents which Hippolytus produces as emanating from quite different sects; the coincidences being such as to establish decisively a literary connection between the documents; and to prove either that some of these writers borrowed from others, or else that Hippolytus was imposed on by spurious wares, all manufactured in the same workshop. In particular, there is not only a strong family likeness between Simon's general method of dealing with the Scriptures and with heathen poets, and those employed in the other documents preserved in the *Regulations*, but there are also many coincidences in details. On a careful examination of them, I find that in several instances a fair case can be made out for the priority of the Simonian document. Thus the Sethite writer (*Ref.* v. 20, p. 143) speaks of the three days before the sun and moon; but this mention is quite gratuitous: Simon, on the contrary, having started the theory that the six days in Genesis i. are the six "roots," is forced to explain why there should be three days before the third and fourth roots, sun and moon. In like manner, the use made of Is. i. 2, in the system of Justinus (v. 26, p. 157), and of 1 Cor. xi. 32, in the Peratic system (v. 12, p. 125), seems somewhat more forced than in the Simonian system. We are told by Irenaeus of the use made of Homer by Simon, and by Epiphanius of his strained interpretations of Scripture. We may, therefore, accept as characteristic of genuine Simonianism that strange method of exegesis, common to several of the Gnostic systems as quoted by Hippolytus, which can discover its doctrines in the most unlikely texts of Scripture, and which finds confirmatory proofs in Homer and other poets. On the whole, though the matter is by no means free from doubt, I find it possible to believe that Hippolytus, in his extracts from the *Apophasis*, has preserved for us genuine specimens of Simonian teaching. In this way it would be possible to explain other coincidences between the systems described by Hippolytus: for Simon's place in the history of Gnosticism is early, and his writings and his methods would probably be followed by his successors.

The Simon of the legends.—By the time that the "Circuits of Peter" had been dressed up for Roman use in the form, having Clement for the narrator of the story, the soil had been prepared for a plentiful crop of legends. The "Circuits" gave the idea that the encounter of Simon with Peter, recorded in the Acts, had been followed by a series of conflicts in other cities. Justin Martyr's supposed discovery of a statue of Simon at Rome was accepted as proof that the impostor had visited that city. There, also, then a conflict must have taken place, though Justin Martyr had made no mention of it; and Simon's character as a magician made it fitting that the story of the encounter should contain specimens of the impostor's lying wonders defeated by the higher miraculous powers at the Apostle's command. Justin Martyr had assumed that the visit of Simon to Rome took place soon after what is told of him in the Acts of the Apostles; that is to say, in the reign of the emperor Claudius. Those who accepted that date naturally made Peter Simon's sole antagonist, he being the Apostle whom the Acts recorded as having rebuked the magician; so, for example, Eusebius tells the story (*H. E.* ii. 14). But at Rome the legend of Simon had to be fitted in with a tradition, probably a true one, that both Peter and Paul had visited the city in the reign of Nero. Thus it was natural to put down the date of Simon's conflict to that emperor's reign; and equally naturally, although the principal part in the conflict continued to be ascribed to Peter, the Apostle Paul was represented as his assistant in the combat. The story had taken this shape as early as the beginning of the third century. In the passage already quoted from Hippolytus (*Ref.* vi. 20), Simon is said when at Rome to have been in conflict with the Apostles (plural number), but to have been mightily resisted by Peter when deceiving many with his sorceries. The extant Greek Acts of Peter and Paul give details of the conflict and represent both Apostles as having taken part in it.

Some of the legends of the conflict with Simon have been given in the articles LINUS and MARCELLUS (11). Simon and Peter are each required to raise a dead body to life. Simon, by his magical power, makes the head of the corpse appear to move, and is supposed to have been successful; but when he goes away from the neighbourhood of the body, it remains lifeless. Peter, on the other hand, by his prayers effects a real resurrection. Simon and Peter are challenged each to divine what the other is planning. Peter, taking the emperor into the secret, prepares blessed bread; but the magician cannot guess what the Apostle has been doing. Simon raises hell-hounds, who rush upon Peter; but on presentation of the bread, prepared in anticipation of the attack, the beasts vanish. Another story of hell-hounds has been reported in the article MARCELLUS. But Simon still retains the emperor's confidence by means of an exhibition of his power to rise from the dead. He pretends to permit his head to be cut off, but through his magic, he has power to deceive the eyes of the spectators; so the executioner, who imagines he decapitates him, really only cuts off the head of a ram. So Simon is able to walk in, on the third day, alive and triumphant. Finally, recognizing that Peter is too strong for him, he determines to quit the scene with glory, and announces to the emperor his intention of flying up to heaven. According to the most popular version of the story, a wooden tower is erected for his ascent in the Campus Martius, and in the sight of the emperor and people he is seen going up in a fiery chariot. But on the adjuration of Peter the two demons who were bearing him were compelled to drop him, and he perished miserably;—on the spot, according to some accounts, a few days after, according to others. We may connect with this story what is told by Suetonius, vi. 12 (see also Dio Chrysost. *Orat.* xxi. 9), that Nero did cause a wooden theatre to be erected in the Campus Martius, and that there one who tried to play the part of Icarus fell so near the emperor as to spatter him with his blood. It has been already said that this version of the death of Simon was known to Epiphanius and Philaster towards the end of the fourth century; a somewhat earlier witness is Cyril of Jerusalem, who tells the story at length (*Catech.* vi. 15), and ascribes the fall of Simon to the joint prayer-

of Peter and Paul. The earliest writer to mention the tale is Arnobius (*adv. Gent.* ii. 12), at the beginning of the fourth century. And the fact that the story was unknown to Hippolytus proves that it was not invented till the third century was pretty far advanced. We may gather from the great variety of forms in which the death of Simon was told, a confirmation of what has been already stated, that the earliest form of the story of Peter and Simon did not carry the conflict beyond Antioch. If it had given details of the conflict at Rome, these would have fixed the tradition for later writers.

The Simon of modern criticism.—The Clementine writings were produced in Rome, early in the third century, by members of the Elkesaite sect, which was then endeavouring to establish itself there. One of the characteristics of these heretics was hostility to Paul, whom they refused to recognize as an apostle. Baur has the merit of directing attention to the manifestations of this characteristic in the Clementines; and in particular he pointed out that in the disputations between Simon and Peter, some of the claims which Simon is represented as making (such as that of having seen our Lord, though not in his lifetime, yet subsequently in vision), were really the claims of Paul; and that Peter's refutation of Simon is in some places to be understood as intended as a polemic against Paul. The passages in question are found only in the Clementine *Homilies*, which the investigation in the article CLEMENTINE LITERATURE leads us to regard as one of the latest forms which these forgeries assumed. In the Clementine *Recognitions*, there is abundance of anti-Paulinism; but the idea does not appear to have occurred to the writer to dress up Paul under the mask of Simon. However, the idea started by Baur was improved by his followers until it came to assume the shape that, wherever in ancient documents we find mention made of Simon Magus, we are to understand Paul to be meant. To begin with the Acts of the Apostles, we are asked to believe that the Simon of whom we read in chap. viii. was no real character, but only a presentation of Paul. Simon claimed to be the power of God which is called Great; but Paul not only calls his gospel the power of God (Rom. i. 16, 1 Cor. i. 18), but claims that the power of Christ rested in himself (2 Cor. xii. 9), and that he lived by the power of God (2 Cor. xiii. 4). In the narrative (Acts viii.) the power of bestowing the Holy Ghost, which Philip does not appear to have exercised, is clearly represented as the special prerogative of the Apostles. When therefore Simon offered money in order to obtain the power of conferring the Holy Ghost, this was in other words to offer money in order to obtain the rank of apostle. We are therefore to detect that we have here a covert account of the refusal of the elder Apostles to admit Paul's claim to rank with them, backed though it was by a gift of money for the poor saints in Jerusalem. Peter tells him that he has no lot in the matter; that is to say, that he has no part in the lot of Apostleship (see Acts i. 17, 25) that he is still in the "gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity"; that is to say, full of bitter hatred against Peter (Gal. ii. 11) and not observant of the Mosaic Law. We are not to be surprised that St. Luke, Paulinist though he was, should insert in his history this libel on his master. He knew the story to be current among the Jewish disciples, and he wished to take the sting out of it, by telling it in such a way as to lead his readers to imagine that Simon was actually a real person, distinct from Paul. And so, having begun to speak of Paul in the beginning of chap. viii., he interpolates the episode of Philip's adventures, and does not return to speak of Paul until his reader's attention has been drawn off, so as not to be likely to recognize Paul under the mask of Simon.

It is not necessary to spend much time in pulling to pieces speculations exhibiting so much ingenuity, but so wanting in common sense. If, by way of nickname, a public character is called by a name not his own, common sense tells us that that must be a name to which discreditable associations are already known to attach. If a revolutionary agitator is called Catiline, that is because the name of Catiline is already known as associated with reckless and treasonable designs. It would be silly of any one to conclude from the modern use of the nickname that there never had been such a person as Catiline, and that the traditional story about him must be so interpreted as best to describe the modern character. Further, we can understand that obscure third-century heretics, not choosing to incur the odium of assailing directly one held in veneration through the rest of the Christian world, should resort to disguise. But Paul's opponents, in his lifetime, had no temptation to resort to oblique attacks: they could say what they pleased against Paul of Tarsus, and not run the risk of being unintelligible by speaking of Simon of Gitta.

Lipsius, whose account of his predecessors' speculations we have abridged from his article "Simon," in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*, exercises his own ingenuity in dealing with the legendary history of Simon. The ingenuity which discovers Paul in the Simon of the Acts has, of course, a much easier task in finding him in the Simon of the legends. But since the history, as it has come down to us, leaves much to be desired, if we are to suppose it was constructed with the view of serving as a libel on Paul, we must modify the legends so as best to adapt them to this object, and we must then believe that we have recovered the original form of the legend. Thus, the *Homilies* represent the final disputation between Peter and Simon to have taken place at Laodicea; but we must believe that the original form laid the scene at Antioch, where took place the collision between Peter and Paul recorded (Gal. ii.). The Clementines, as we now have them, represent Simon as going voluntarily to Rome; but the original must surely have represented him as carried off as a prisoner by the Roman authorities, and so on. It is needless to examine minutely speculations which are vitiated by the faulty method of investigation. The chronological order is—the historical personage comes first; then the legends which arise about him; then the use that is made of his name. The proper order of investigation is, therefore, first to ascertain what is historical about Simon before discussing his legends. Now it cannot reasonably be

doubted that Simon of Gitta is an historical personage. The heretical sect which claimed him for its founder was regarded by Justin Martyr as most formidable, though possibly its local influence may have given it undue importance in Justin's eyes. He speaks of it as predominant in Samaria, and as not unknown elsewhere; that is to say, probably, he had met members of the sect at Rome. The existence of the sect is testified by Hegesippus (Eus. iv. 22) and by Celsus (Orig. *adv. Cels.* v. 62), who states that some of them were called Heleniani. It is also mentioned by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. 17), who states that a branch of them was called Entychitae. The sect had become almost extinct in Origen's time, who doubts (*adv. Cels.* i. 57) whether there were then thirty Simonians in the world; but we need not doubt of its existence in Justin's time, or of the fact that they claimed Simon of Gitta as their founder. That writings in his name were in circulation, we have already quoted the testimony of the Clementine Recognitions and of Epiphanius, as confirming that of Hippolytus. The Simon of the Acts is also a real person. If we read Acts viii., which relates the preaching of Philip, in connection with chap. xxi., which tells of several days spent by Luke in Philip's house, we have the simple explanation of the insertion of the former chapter, that Luke was glad to include in his history a narrative of the early preaching of the Gospel communicated to him by an eye-witness. We need not ascribe to Luke any more recondite motive for relating the incident, than that he believed that it had occurred. There is no evidence that this Samaritan magician had obtained elsewhere any great notoriety; and there is every reason to think that any later writer who speaks of him derived his knowledge from the Acts of the Apostles. We have already said that we believe Justin to have been mistaken in identifying Simon of the Acts with Simon of Gitta, whom we take to have been a second-century Gnostic teacher; but this identification is followed in the Clementines. In any case, we see that the whole manufacture of the latter story is later than Simon of Gitta, if not, as we believe, later than Justin Martyr. The anti-Paulinists, therefore, who dressed Paul in the disguise of Simon, are more than a century later than any opponents Paul had in his lifetime, who, if they wished to fix a nickname on the Apostle, were not likely to go to the book of the Acts of the Apostles to look for one. [G. S.]

SIMON (2), a friend of Isidore of Pelusium [PAULUS (62)]. [C. H.]

SIMON (3), THE SYRIAN, Jacobite patriarch of Alexandria A.D. 689–700. He was nominated by the Emir Abdel-Aziz, when the Copts were distracted between the rival claims of two abbats, John and Victor. He received an embassy from India, asking for a bishop and priests. His memory is celebrated by the Ethiopians and Copts on July 24. (Le Quien, ii. xvii. 453; Renaudot, 179–189; *AA. SS.* Boll. Jun. v. 76; Neale, ii. 83–90.) [G. T. S.]

SIMONIANI. Under this name the followers of Simon Magus are described in the *Apost. Constit* vi. 16, cf. Epiph. *adv. Haer.* Num. xxi. The Nestorians were, by imperial decree, designated by this opprobrious name after the exile of Nestorius [NESTORIANS]. [G. T. S.]

SIMPLICIA (1), the widow of Alypius, governor of Cappadocia. On her husband's premature death, being left in delicate health, with a family of children and troublesome legal business connected with her estates, which would entail long and wearisome journeys, Gregory Nazianzen wrote his urgent letter on her behalf to Jacobus, her husband's successor as governor. (Greg. Naz. *Epp.* 146, 147.) [E. V.]

SIMPLICIA (2), a wealthy lady of Cappadocia, very lavish in her gifts to the church, but suspected of unsoundness in the faith. One of her domestic slaves, who acted as her steward, having been forcibly consecrated bishop by Basil and Gregory, at the request of a congregation that had been for a long time destitute of episcopal superintendence, against his own will, and without asking or obtaining his mistress's consent, she not unnaturally became very indignant at this invasion of her rights, and wrote a violent letter to Basil, upbraiding him with what he had done, and threatening him with the vengeance of her eunuchs. Basil, in his reply, manifests the haughtiest disdain of her threats, and adopts a tone of bitter invective, which may have silenced the lady, but cannot have convinced her of the equity of his acts. (Basil, *Ep.* 115 [87].) Simplicia acquiesced in the loss of her slave as long as Basil lived. On his death she renewed her claim, loading Basil's memory with praises, but requiring that this ordination should be annulled, stating that the man was unworthy of the episcopal office, and threatening to carry the matter before the secular courts if her demand were not obeyed. Gregory Nazianzen shews, by his reply, that he felt the weakness of his case and the essential justice of Simplicia's claim. He requests that she will not deprive the Church of a bishop, but sanction by her free will the ordination which had been made against her will. Any charges against the man should be made before the properly constituted tribunal, and investigated in open court in her presence. The claim that her servant should give an account of his stewardship he allows to be reasonable, if only it were urged in a kindly spirit. Her gifts, which he hints were rather the fruit of ostentation than of piety, purchased for her no right to lord it over others. Her perseverance in her present line of conduct would only strengthen the suspicion felt of her heterodoxy. (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 38.) [E. V.]

SIMPLICIANUS, ST., bishop of Milan next after St. Ambrose, better known by what we hear of his influence over others more famous than himself, than by any writings of his own He must have been born early in the 4th century, perhaps at Rome, but was certainly a resident there between A.D. 350 and 360, during which time he became instrumental in the conversion of Victorinus (Aug. *Conf.* viii. 2). [VICTORINUS.] At some time, later perhaps than this, he became intimate with St. Ambrose, whose father in the Christian faith he is called by Augustine, *i.e.* perhaps in intercourse with him at Rome, or after his removal to Milan. About A.D. 374, the year in which his friend was so suddenly raised to the episcopate, he appears to have taken

up his residence at Milan, but there is no solid ground for the statement of Baronius, that he was sent thither by pope Damasus, in order to guide the new bishop in his new and unexpected office (Baronius, Ann. 375, xxii.; Tillemont, vol. x. p. 398). It is certain, however, that he was held in deep reverence by St. Ambrose, who speaks of his continual study of holy Scripture, and who was often consulted by him (Aug. *Conf.* viii. 2; Ambr. *Ep.* 37. 2, 65. 1). Four letters addressed to him by St. Ambrose are extant. 1. A reply to one from Simplicianus, expressing his pleasure received from a discourse of his to the people on the writings of St. Paul, and his wish that he would continue the subject. He adds his own partial fulfilment of that wish, by showing from Scripture, especially from the writings of St. Paul, that the Christian alone enjoys true liberty (Ambr. *Ep.* 37). 2. Continuing the same subject he shows that he also, whether man or woman, alone possesses true wealth (*ibid.* 38). 3. In reply to some questions put by Simplicianus, as to the explanation of certain passages of Scripture, especially the pouring out of blood into basons and on the altar, Ex. xxiv. 6 (*Ep.* 61). 4. In reply to his enquiry how it was that Moses, holding the place which he did, consulted his brother Aaron so much, with special reference to Lev. x. 16 (*Ep.* 67).

It was while Augustine was residing near Milan, A.D. 386, that he became acquainted with Simplicianus, who related to him the history of the conversion of Victorinus, a narrative which, coming as it did at so critical a point in the condition of his mind, awakened in him an eager desire to follow his example (exarsi ad imitandum) (*Conf.* viii. 5), and the friendship thus formed was preserved by Augustine throughout his life. How it came to pass that Simplicianus was appointed to the see of Milan, A.D. 397, is related by Paulinus in his life of St. Ambrose (c. 46), and may be seen above (Vol. I. p. 97). He appears to have died A.D. 400, and was succeeded by Venerius. It was to him, no doubt, that the letter of Vigilius, bishop of Trent, was addressed concerning the acts of the martyrs Alexander, Martyrius, and Sisinnius, whose relics in compliance with his request, were sent at the same time, though Gennadius by his expression, *ad Simplicianum quendam*, seems to throw some doubt upon this (Baronius, ann. 401. ii.; Paulin, *Vit. S. Ambr.* c. 52). As well as pope Siricius he was consulted by the 3rd Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, on the subject of admission to the priesthood of persons baptized in infancy by Donatists (*Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 263, ed. Oberthür, p. 208, ed. Dupin; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 133; Baronius, ann. 397. xlvi.). His name is also mentioned with great respect by the first council of Toledo, A.D. 400, and his consent, as well as that of Siricius, was required to the restoration to communion and admission to holy orders of excommunicated Priscillianists (Baronius, ann. 405, xlv. liv.). A modest and humble man, his influence over others, which was very great, was shewn more in drawing forth their thoughts than in recording his own, and thus it was his enquiries which gave occasion both to the letters of St. Ambrose already mentioned, and to the treatises of Augustus addressed to him in the early days of his episcopate, viz. the two books of answers to various questions (de diversis quaestionibus). i. *a.* concerning passages in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Rom. vii. 7, 25). *b.* On election and reprobation as shewn in the cases of Jacob and Esau. ii. Questions arising out of the books of Samuel and Kings; *a.* the evil spirit in Saul. *b.* God's "repentance" respecting him. *c.* The appearance of Samuel to Saul at En-dor, a subject which he mentions also in the reply to the questions of Dulcitius. *d.* The proper attitude in prayer. *e.* The complaint of Elijah for the death of the widow's son at Sarepta. *f.* The mission of the lying spirit from God to the prophets of Ahab (1 Kings xxii. 21–23). These books were sent to Simplicianus by Augustine, with a letter expressing the utmost kindness and respect, and are described by him in his *Retractations*, but with the omission of the last of the questions. He also refers to them in his books on predestination and the perseverance of saints, and he mentions him with great respect in the "City of God" (Aug. *Ep.* 37; *Retract.* ii. 1; *De Praed.* 8; *De Dono Persev.* 52; *Civ. D.* x. 29). Simplicianus died at Milan, and was buried on Aug. 15, but the calendars both of Rome and Milan postpone his commemoration to the following day. His remains were transferred by S. Carlo Borromeo in 1582, from their original place of interment in a church bearing his name to another in the same church (Tillemont, x. 401; Ceillier, iv. 325, vi. 7, ix. 6, 78, 249–254; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* vol. i. p. 299). [H. W. P.]

SIMPLICIOLA, virgin. [QUINTILIANUS (3).]

SIMPLICIUS (1), governor of Tarsus, under whom St. Boniface is said to have suffered on May 14. Boniface was steward to Aglae, a Roman lady, with whom he lived in unlawful intercourse. She was converted to the faith, renounced sin, induced Boniface to follow her example, and sent him to the East to secure some relics of the martyrs in the Diocletian persecution which was then raging. Simplicius put him to death at Tarsus (*AA. SS.* Boll. Mai. iii. 280; Ceill. ii. 477). [G. T. S.]

SIMPLICIUS (2), ST., sixth bishop of Autun. Though a saint of some repute in Gaul, and finding mention as well in the ancient as in the more recent Latin martyrologies, his life and even the date of his episcopate are very obscure. On the one hand his name appears in the records of the council of Cologne in 346 (Mansi, ii., 1771) and that of Sardica in the following year. On the other he appears in the lives of the bishops Amator and Germanus of Auxerre, as their contemporary, which would bring him down to about 418 (Stephanus, *Vita S. Amatoris*, Boll. *Acta SS.* Mai. i. 58; Constantius, *Vita S. Germani Autiss.*, Boll. ibid. Jul. vii. 202). Looking to the suspicion that attaches to the council of Cologne, and the fact that no see is appended to Simplicius' name at that of Sardica, we are safer in following the undoubtedly high authority of Constantius' narrative, and adopting the later date (cf. *Gall. Christ.* iv. 334; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jun. iv. 812). Gregory of Tours preserves the traditions of him current in his time, according to which he was of noble birth and great wealth. Like many other Gallic bishops, he was a layman when elevated to the episcopate Nor did he separate from his wife, though they lived to-

gether as brother and sister, a miracle closing the mouths of murmuring sceptics. Another miracle crushes the worship of Berecyntian Cybele, who was still carried round at Autun to give fertility to the crops and vineyards. (*De Glor. Conf.* lxxvi., lxxvii.) His day is June 24. For his cult see Boll. Jun. iv. 812. [S. A. B.]

SIMPLICIUS (3), of Emona, originally a grammarian, and then the friend of Maximin, the cruel minister of Valentinian, was vicar of Rome in A.D. 374. He rivalled his master in cruelty. Ammian gives a long list of the persons executed by him. He was put to death by Gratian's orders in Illyricum, probably in A.D. 376 Ammianus, xxviii. i. 45–57). A rescript of Valentinian I. addressed to him, is referred to in the rescript of Gratian and Valentinian II. given in the *Appendix to the Theodosian Code* (ed. Ritter), and in Baronius, A.D. 381. By it those who held unlawful religious assemblies and deposed bishops were banished 100 miles from Rome. The occasion of the rescript probably was the disturbances arising from the contested election between pope Damasus and Ursinus. [F. D.]

SIMPLICIUS (4). A tribune to whom Gregory Nyssen dedicated his short treatise, *De Fide* (*Greg. Nyss.*, tom. iii. p. 38). [E. V.]

SIMPLICIUS (5), ST., seventeenth archbishop of Vienne, at the close of the 4th and beginning of the 5th centuries, was involved in a long struggle against the pretensions of the see of Arles to metropolitan jurisdiction over his province. The council of Turin, held about 397 or a little later, in its second canon, suggested a modus vivendi, under which it seems for some years peace was kept, the two prelates exercising metropolitan jurisdiction in their respective provinces (Mansi, iii. 861; Ceillier, vii. 738), but the bishops of Arles again obtained the ascendant, and in 417 pope Zosimus, in a letter addressed to the bishops of the province of Vienne and Narbonensis Secunda rebukes Simplicius for what he describes as shameless usurpations of the rights of Arles (*Epist.* v., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 665). The keenness of the controversy may be judged from the existence of a forged letter of the same pope, purporting to revoke his words and restore matters to the footing they were on after the council of Turin (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Feb. 1, 354). Simplicius is commemorated Feb. 3. His name is not found in the older martyrologies, but Gregory of Tours has a quotation from a Paulinus, perhaps of Nola, in which Simplicius, with other bishops, is held up as an example of sanctity and faith (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 13; for his cult see Boll. *ibid.*) [S. A. B.]

SIMPLICIUS (6), a friend of St. Augustine, remarkable for his memory. He knew the writings of Virgil by heart so well that Augustine thought he could repeat them backwards (Aug. *de An.* iv. 9). [H. W. P.]

SIMPLICIUS (7), bishop of Rome after Hilarius, from 22 Feb. A.D. 468 (according to the conclusion of Pagi, *in Baron. ad ann.* 467, iv.), to March, A.D. 483.

According to *Lib. Pontif.* he was a native of Tibur, the son of one Castinus. He witnessed, during his episcopate, the memorable event of the fall of the Western empire, and the accession (A.D. 476) of Odoacer as king of Italy. But this change, however politically important, does not seem to have affected at the time the pope or the Church at Rome. The later emperors, Anthemius, Nepos, Augustulus, who reigned during the earlier years of Simplicius' popedom, being merely nominees of the Eastern emperor, had little power or influence; and Odoacer, himself an Arian, did not interfere with church affairs.

The reigning emperors of the East were, first Leo I., the Thracian, called also *The Great*, and after him Zeno, his son-in-law, who succeeded him A.D. 474, but whose reign was interrupted from 475 to 477, by the usurpation of Basiliscus. The contemporary bishop of Constantinople was Acacius (471–489). The most memorable incidents of the pontificate of Simplicius were his negociations, and eventual breach, with this prelate, and with the emperor Zeno who supported him, — leading up to the long schism between the churches of the East and West, which ensued in the time of the following pope, Felix III. (II.). The questions on which difference arose were, as will be seen, in connection partly with the rival claims of the sees of Rome and Constantinople, and partly with the Monophysite or Eutychian heresy, which continued to cause discord in the church long after its condemnation by the council of Chalcedon in 451.

The first occasion of difference with respect to the rival claims of the two sees was the promulgation of an edict by the emperor Leo I., at the instance of Acacius, confirming the 28th canon of the council of Chalcedon. This canon, said to have been passed unanimously by all present except the legates of pope Leo, not only confirmed the 3rd canon of Constantinople, which had given to the bishop of new Rome (i.e. Constantinople) a primacy of honour (i.e. honorary rank) next after the bishop of old Rome, but further gave him authority to ordain the metropolitans of the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian dioceses, thus investing him with the powers as well as the rank of a Patriarch, second only to the pope of Rome. Pope Leo had subsequently objected to this canon, to which he never gave his assent. He rested his objection to it on its being, as he said, an infringement of the canons of Nice, and entrenching on the rights of other patriarchs. A main ground of his objection to it probably was that it expressed a desire on the part of the bishops of Constantinople, which had become the real seat of empire, to rival, with the view perhaps of eventually superseding, the old primacy of Rome. At Rome the position maintained was that the authority of a see rested on its ecclesiastical origin, and that of Rome especially on its having been the see of St. Peter. The view at Constantinople, where there was no apostle to fall back on, was, that the temporal preeminence of a city was a sufficient ground for ecclesiastical ascendancy. Hence the long struggle between the two sees. The remark may here be allowed in passing, that—whatever may be thought of the assumed basis, or the legitimacy of papal claims—it was surely well for the church at large that the patriarchs of Constantinople, dependent as they were on Caesar, did not eventually succeed in their attempted rivalry of Rome.

Acacius, in inducing the emperor to confirm the 28th canon of Chalcedon by a special edict, had for his purpose to make it plain to the world that the eminence and authority thereby assigned to his see were still maintained, and had not been conceded to the remonstrances of pope Leo. And the language used by the emperor in his edict—styling the church of Constantinople "the Mother of his Piety, and of all Christians, and of the orthodox faith"—confirms the supposition, that an idea was even entertained of the new seat of empire superseding the old one in ecclesiastical prerogative as well as temporal rank. If so, it was both natural and fit that Simplicius should take alarm. Accordingly he sent Probus, bishop of Canusium in Apulia, as his legate to Constantinople to remonstrate against the edict; but with what success we are not informed. We know of the legation only from mention of it in a letter of pope Gelasius, as follows: "Eaque nihilominus etiam sub sanctae memoriae Papa Simplicio legatum sedis apostolicae sanctae memoriae Probum Canusinae urbis episcopum, Leone Principe tunc petente, praesentem docuisse nullatenus posse tentari, neque his prorsus praebuisse consensum. *Atque ideo non civitatis cujuslibet respiciant qualitatem, sed modum dispensationis ecclesiasticae paterna traditione firmatum convenienter observent.*" (Gelas. *ep. ad Dardan. episc.*).

With regard to the doctrinal controversies of the day,—in connexion also with which, as has been said, differences between Rome and Constantinople eventually arose,—Simplicius appears to have been in accord with the emperor Leo, and for some time with Zeno, as well as with Acacius. The great patriarchal sees were, during the first years of his reign, occupied by orthodox prelates, who had the imperial support. Alexandria had been held by Timothy Salophacialus since the Eutychian usurper, Timothy Aelurus, had been deposed and banished by the emperor Leo, A.D. 460. At Antioch Julianus, an orthodox patriarch, who had been elected on the expulsion of the usurper Peter Fallo by Leo I., A.D. 471, was still in possession of the see. At Ephesus the Eutychian patriarch Paulus had been deposed. But the usurpation of the empire by Basiliscus, A.D. 475, introduced immediate discord and disturbance. He declared at once for Eutychianism, and, as a first step, recalled Timothy Aelurus to the see of Alexandria. Having taken possession of it, and driven Salophacialus to flight, Aelurus, in the same year, 475, repaired to Constantinople, where crowds of the populace received him in triumph, crying before him, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Acacius, however, and the clergy generally, refused him entry into their churches, so that he was compelled to celebrate the divine mysteries in private houses. His purpose in visiting the imperial city was to bring about, through the new emperor, the general triumph of his party, and with this view to procure the calling of a new general council for reconsidering and reversing the decisions of Chalcedon. This he had previously urged on Leo I., when, on the accession of that emperor, A.D. 457, he had been first ordained by his party bishop of Alexandria; and for some time Leo seems to have been inclined to call a council, though in the end, having been strongly dissuaded by pope Leo, he had relinquished the idea, and (as aforesaid) deposed Aelurus.

In this state of things certain clergy and monks of Constantinople sent a messenger with letters to represent it to Simplicius at Rome. Simplicius without delay wrote to Basiliscus and to Acacius. In his letter to the former, after complimentary language to the usurper himself, he expresses his horror at the doings of Aelurus, of which he had been informed by the monks and clergy, and his surprise that they had been possible under the emperor's piety. With more policy than sincerity, he addresses Basiliscus as one universally known to be devoted to God and orthodoxy, as endowed with the virtues of his predecessors Leo and Marcian, and, like them, well disposed to Catholic truth. He hopes — nay, he does not doubt—that the new emperor will follow their faith, as he has succeeded to their empire; he reminds him that the stability of his power will depend on his propitiating the Giver of it by support of the truth, and that it is the duty of princes to restrain those whom the church has condemned. He further refers him to the letters of pope Leo, defining clearly the true faith, which would be found in the imperial archives, but of which, for the emperor's easier consideration of them, he has sent copies to Acacius. As to Timothy Aelurus, he speaks of him, in no measured language, as an impious parricide, a bloody robber, and far more detestable than Cain: and he requests that the poison of that deadly head should be removed from the abodes of men to waste its virulence in solitude.[a] The opportunity is not lost, in the course of the letter, of insinuating to the new emperor the peculiar spiritual authority of the Roman see. These words occur, "The truths which have flowed pure from the fountain of the Scriptures cannot be disturbed by any arguments of cloudy subtilty. For there remains one and the same rule of apostolical doctrine in the successors of him to whom the Lord enjoined the care of the whole sheepfold — to whom he promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against him, and that what by him should be bound on earth should not be loosed in heaven." And the pope conjures the emperor in the voice of St. Peter, the unworthy minister of whose see he is, not to allow the enemies of the ancient faith to go on with impunity. It is observable that in the letter to Acacius, sent at the same time, Simplicius does not thus assert the paramount authority of St. Peter's see, feeling, perhaps, that such assertion would incense rather than awe the patriarch. But, in urging him to use his influence with the emperor, he requests him to add force to his appeal by speaking in the pope's name as well as his own:—"Ergo cum praedictis presbyteris ac monachis opportune pietati ejus nostro quoque nomine supplica, et legationem hanc pro nobis quoque clementiae ejus insinua." He further especially urges Acacius to prevent, if possible, the assembling of a council for reviewing the deci-

[a] The charge of parricide against Aelurus has reference to his supposed implication in the murder of Proterius, whose see he had usurped at Alexandria in 470.

sions of Chalcedon, which he understood to be contemplated. This subject he did not touch on in his letter to the emperor, for fear, we may suppose, of suggesting to him what he might not be himself intending. He wrote also to the monks and others who had informed him of the state of things, sending them copies of his letters to Basiliscus and Acacius. In his letter to them he alludes to the fact, that Acacius himself had not written to him; but intimates no displeasure on this head. He says, "We do not think his silence to be blamed, since, knowing the faith of that most excellent priest, we hold it for certain that it is not his own fault that he has been silent." The silence of the patriarch might perhaps be partly due to his unwillingness to commit himself to any step which might seem like an appeal to Rome. It was certainly not due at that time to indifference; for we find him afterwards making a resolute stand against Aelurus and the emperor, when the latter continued to back up the Eutychian cause. Simplicius seized also the opportunity of an embassy from Odoacer to Constantinople to despatch a second shorter letter to Acacius to the same effect as the former one.

Meanwhile Basiliscus at Constantinople allowed Aelurus to convene a synod, at which the expelled Eutychian bishops were ordered restitution to their sees, and all previous proceedings against Aelurus himself were declared null and void. After this the emperor issued an Encyclic letter, addressed to Aelurus, in which, while accepting with all honour the councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus, he utterly repudiated and condemned that of Chalcedon; required all, under pain of deposition, exile, and other punishments, to agree to this condemnation; and ordered all copies of pope Leo's letters and of the Acts of Chalcedon, wherever found, to be burnt. The document is given in full by Evagrius (l. 3, c. 4.). Acacius refused to sign it. But in the compliant East elsewhere it was accepted generally. At Ephesus, whither Aelurus went, 600 bishops of Asia are said to have signed it; and at a synod held there Acacius and all other bishops who should refuse assent were declared to be deposed, and, in contravention of the 28th canon of Chalcedon, Ephesus, Heraclea, and Cæsarea were exempted from the jurisdiction of Constantinople. There also Paulus, who had been deposed by Acacius, was reinstated in the see.[b] At Antioch also, Peter Fullo, the Eutychian bishop who had been deposed, was restored to the see in the room of Julian. Meanwhile, at Constantinople, Acacius, supported by the clergy and monks, was resolute in his resistance, and with success. He induced Daniel Stylites (one of the pillar-saints of the day) to descend from his pillar, and aid in rousing the populace; and Basiliscus had to leave the city for safety. The disaffection of the people, thus at length excited on religious grounds, was taken advantage of by Zeno, who in 477 marched on Constantinople to recover his throne. Basiliscus at this juncture implored the protection of Acacius and Daniel, retracted his Encyclic, and professed orthodoxy. But it was of no avail. Zeno without further difficulty became again the emperor of the East.

During all these troubles under Basiliscus Simplicius seems to have had no opportunity of exercising any influence; but, as soon as he heard of the restitution of Zeno, being informed of it first by certain clergy and monks of Constantinople—the same, probably, as had previously been before Acacius in telling him of the state of things,—he wrote at once to the emperor. After language of compliment and congratulation (which would have come with a better grace if he had not written previously in somewhat similar strain to the usurper Basiliscus), the main drift of his letter is to exhort the emperor to follow the steps of his predecessors Marcian and Leo, seeing that the side they had taken in religious matters was now evidently shown to have the support of Heaven; to allow no tampering with the decisions of Chalcedon; to drive all Eutychian bishops from the sees which they had usurped; and especially to send Aelurus from human society into solitude. To Acacius also he wrote (having this time received a letter from him after that of the monks and clergy), desiring him to back up his own appeal to the emperor, and especially urging the necessity of getting Aelurus irrevocably banished into solitude. A second letter from Acacius informed the pope of the death of Timothy Aelurus, of the unsuccessful attempt of Peter Mongus to get possession of the see, of his subsequent flight, and of the peaceable restoration of Timothy Salophacialus. This Peter Mongus (Μογγός, *the Stammerer*) was a deacon of Alexandria, who had been banished with Aelurus in 470, and had rejoined him then in 475. He will appear as a prominent figure in subsequent proceedings. To this letter from Acacius the pope replied, expressing joy for the good news but at the same time warning him to keep an eye on the restored Alexandrian patriarch, who had once before failed in the constancy of a faithful prelate in allowing the name of Dioscorus (the patriarch deposed after the council of Chalcedon) to be recited at the altar. Soon afterwards, however, having received a letter from Salophacialus, expressing penitence for his former weakness, Simplicius wrote again to Acacius to assure him on this head, but to inform him further that, according to the information given by Salophacialus, Mongus was still lurking at Alexandria, and to urge his immediate banishment. He wrote twice to this effect to Acacius, and twice also to the emperor himself. It does not appear, however, that Zeno was thus moved to take any step against Peter Mongus, whom we find still at Alexandria, when a few years later (as will be seen) Acacius, instead of repudiating him, took him up. It

[b] The unanimity of the Asian bishops may easily be accounted for by their objection to the canon of Chalcedon which had given to the bishop of Constantinople patriarchal jurisdiction over them. A main purpose of the synod held at Ephesus under Aelurus was to restore to the see of Ephesus its ancient patriarchal independence; and this would be likely to be welcome there. It may be observed here that the peculiar zeal of Acacius at this juncture in support of the council of Chalcedon may have been intensified by similar considerations on the other side of the question. He certainly did not show afterwards any great unwillingness to fraternise with the Eutychians, when other motives came in. Various motives as well as pure zeal for truth or error, have to be taken into account for a right understanding of the history of controversies.

may be that the emperor and his advisers were already disposed to the conciliatory policy towards the Eutychians which they afterwards maintained in spite of indignant protests from the pope. Still, so far, the correspondence between Rome and Constantinople had been amicable with respect to affairs at Alexandria.

At Antioch too we find Simplicius complaining of the Eutychian leaders having been allowed to remain, and attributing the troubles that occurred there to this cause. Peter Fullo had been deposed there, synods condemning him having been held apparently both at Rome and at Constantinople; but he had not been banished. And, with respect to this see, there were about this time some further threatening symptoms of want of concert between Simplicius and Acacius, though causing no open breach between them at the time. The sequence of events there at this time is not known to us with full certainty, the accounts of the historians being somewhat discordant. According to the generally accepted view it was as follows. After the restoration of Zeno to the empire, Peter Fullo (as aforesaid) was deposed, and John Codonatus (who had been previously ordained by Fullo as bishop of Apamea) for a short time took possession of the see, but was deposed after a tenure of about three months by a synod at Antioch, and Stephen (called Stephen the elder) was elected and ordained. After a short episcopate, the duration of which is uncertain, he was murdered at the altar by a Eutychian mob, being pricked to death with pointed reeds, and his body thrown into the Orontes. Zeno thereupon sent to Antioch and caused the culprits to be executed; and then, in concert with Acacius, took measures for filling up the see. According to ancient custom, confirmed by the canons of both Nice and Constantinople, the new patriarch should have been elected and ordained by those of his own province. But, with the view of avoiding contest and tumult, the election was held at Constantinople, and the ordination performed there by Acacius. The choice fell on another Stephen, called Stephen the younger, to whom there was no objection on the ground of orthodoxy. This irregular proceeding—especially on the part of the Constantinopolitan patriarch—might well have excited the serious displeasure of the pope. But both Zeno and Acacius having written to him to explain how what they had done had been done only under the pressure of necessity, he expressed himself as satisfied, and let it pass; but only on the understanding, and the assurance of the emperor's promise, that it would never be done again, or made into a precedent. His letter to the emperor to this effect bears the date of A.D. 479.

In the year 482 the death of the younger Stephen left the see of Antioch again vacant. Calandio succeeded him, who appears evidently to have been the nominee of the authorities at Constantinople; for John Codonatus, above spoken of, is said on good authority to have been in the first place re-appointed at Antioch. Whether or not this Calandio was elected and ordained, under the emperor's direction, canonically in his own province, or, like Stephen, at Constantinople, is uncertain. [See *Art.* on CALANDIO.] The letter of Simplicius to Acacius written after the event (*Ep.* xvi. *apud* Labbe) favours the former supposition. For it contains no complaint of the proceedings having been uncanonical, but only of the news of the election having reached Simplicius from the electing synod, and not from Acacius, and of the latter not having informed him of what was going on at Antioch. This complaint, however, implies some dissatisfaction on the part of Simplicius with the conduct of Acacius, and is significant of already cooled relations between them. Still the pope accepted Calandio as a lawfully appointed patriarch.[c]

The death of Timothy Salophacialus at Alexandria, in the same year with the election of Calandio (482), gave rise to much more serious differences between Constantinople and Rome. Strained relations now resulted in decided conflict, ending in an open schism, which lasted thirty-five years, between Eastern and Western Christendom.

John Talaias was elected canonically by a synod of the orthodox at Alexandria in the room of Salophacialus. Simplicius received a notification of the election from the synod, and was on the point of replying, and expressing his assent, when he was startled by receiving a letter from the emperor Zeno which accused Talaias of being guilty of perjury, and therefore unfit to be promoted, and further intimated that, in the emperor's opinion, Peter Mongus (the Eutychian friend of the deceased Aelurus, and the temporary usurper of his see after his death, who has been spoken of above) was the most proper person to succeed Salophacialus. Simplicius at once addressed Acacius (who had not written himself, having his reasons for letting the emperor be the pope's informant), expressing sorrow and surprise at not having been informed of the matter by Acacius himself, whom he supposes, or affects to suppose, zealous for orthodoxy; he protests against the promotion of a notorious and excommunicated heretic like Mongus; and he implores Acacius to do all he can to prevent it. The letter written at the same time to Zeno himself has not been preserved. That to Acacius is dated "Idibus Juliis, Severino consule," i.e. 15 July A.D.

[c] The sequence of events that has been given is the one generally received, and appears on the whole most probable. But the statements of some of the historians are inconsistent with it. Pagi (in Baron., *ad ann.*, 479 II. and 482 III.) maintains the view that it was the younger, not the elder, Stephen, who was murdered at Antioch, and that it was Calandio, and he only, who was uncanonically ordained at Constantinople. Taking this view, which rests on what Theophanes and other historians say, he supposes the letters of Simplicius to Zeno and Acacius (*Epp.* xiv. xv. Labbe)—in which the uncanonical ordination of a bishop of Antioch, not mentioned by name, at Constantinople is condoned—to have reference to Calandio, and not to the younger Stephen. But, in order to make his view tenable, he has to alter the date of the first of these letters, which in the extant text of it denotes A.D. 479, *i.e.* three years earlier than the ordination of Calandio. He supposes transcribers of the epistle to have changed the date. But there seems to be no sufficient ground for this supposition: and, further, the letter of Simplicius to Acacius which was undoubtedly written on the occasion of the ordination of Calandio, since his name is mentioned in it (*Ep.* xvi.), appears, from its purport, to have been written on a different occasion from that of the other two.

482. Hearing nothing from Acacius, though there had been ample opportunity for him to send a letter, he wrote to him again in the November of the same year, but still got no reply. So much appears from the extant letters of Simplicius (*Epp.* xvii. xviii. Labbe). We learn from other sources what had been going on meanwhile, and what afterwards occurred.

It appears that John Talaias was on more than one ground unacceptable at Constantinople. He had been sent there previously from Alexandria in the time of the patriarch Salophacialus, and is said to have sworn to the emperor before his departure that he would never accept the see of Alexandria. Hence the charge of perjury made against him.[d] Further, he was known to be a friend of Illus, the emperor's *Magister Officiorum*, who had been his patron, but who at the time when the see of Alexandria became vacant was in disfavour, and had been sent away to Antioch. Further, whereas Talaias had sent in due form a synodical letter, announcing his election to the pope, he had not done so to Acacius. He had only sent a messenger with a letter to Illus, whom he supposed to be still in the imperial city, charging him to make his election known to Acacius and the emperor, and to deliver letters to them which he enclosed. The messenger, on his arrival at Constantinople, finding that Illus was no longer there, had departed to seek him at Antioch, without delivering the letters intended for Acacius and the emperor. And thus Acacius first heard of the election of John Talaias without having received any notification of it from the elected prelate himself. A charge also of complicity with heresy was brought against Talaias, on the ground that it was said to have been under his advice that Timothy Salophacialus had once (as has been above stated) inserted the name of Dioscorus in the diptychs (Liberatus c. 17). But the other circumstances were sufficient to cause his election to be unwelcome at Constantinople. He had previously been distasteful to the emperor as a probable candidate for the see of Alexandria (perhaps owing to his intimacy even then with Illus, who proved himself justly open to suspicion of disallegiance by afterwards joining the usurper Leontinus against Zeno); and his conduct now implied that, while he sought the support of Rome, and of Illus also, he was not anxious to court the favour of the emperor and Acacius. But the selection of the notorious Mongus, in whose condemnation both Zeno and Acacius had once concurred, was a startling step. It is said to have been the scheme of Acacius, who recommended it to the emperor. Acacius had already (as has appeared) failed to satisfy the more ardent zeal of pope Simplicius in conniving at the immunity from banishment of the Eutychian leaders; and this final step may have been only in pursuance of a policy of conciliation that he had been for some time entertaining, while at the same time he thought it might secure the allegiance to Constantinople of the large party at Alexandria which was in distinct opposition to that of John Talaias. He himself does not seem to have had very decided views, or cared very keenly about doctrine for its own sake, though he ever declared himself entirely orthodox. His justification of the elevation of Mongus was that the latter was now prepared to profess orthodoxy, and that, being popular at Alexandria, he was likely to be able to reconcile the misbelievers. Liberatus (*Breviar.*) relates as follows:—Acacius, moved as has been said, and on the grounds above alleged, induced the emperor to take up the cause of Mongus against Talaias: messengers from Mongus himself came to Constantinople, expressing, in his name, a desire of unity in the faith: they were presented by Acacius to the emperor, who was easily persuaded to write to the civil authorities at Alexandria, ordering them to expel John Talaias, and retain Peter Mongus (who appears to have already been elected by his party) in the see; but on condition only that the latter should accept the profession of faith sent him by the emperor, and send synodical letters to Acacius, Simplicius, and the other archbishops. So ready was Acacius to accept Mongus that he caused his name to be recited in the Diptychs on the strength of his mere promise of compliance, without waiting till he had carried it into effect. The profession of faith on this occasion sent, with the view of promoting union, is known as the *Henoticon* of Zeno. It is given in full by Evagrius Scholasticus (l. 3. c. 14), and by Liberatus (*Brev.* c. 17), and will be found in Baronius (*ad ann.* 482, xxvi.). It is addressed in Zeno's name to the clergy monks and laity of Alexandria and the rest of Egypt, and invites all to join themselves to the Catholic Church on the basis of a common acceptance of the creed of Nice and Constantinople, which is declared to be incumbent upon all and a sufficient definition of the faith. It approves the council of Ephesus, adding a definition of the faith as against Nestorianism, and further pronounces an anathema against Nestorius, and also against Eutyches, both of whom, it is said, had contravened the faith. But it avoids any acceptance of the council of Chalcedon, which had condemned the Monophysite doctrine which had been taught by Eutyches, referring to it only in these slighting terms, which imply derogation of it, though not rejection:—"Whoever thinks or has thought differently, either now, or at any other time, *or in the Council of Chalcedon*, we anathematize him; but most of all Nestorius, Eutyches, and the favourers of their doctrines." It is to be observed that it contains no similar anathema of, nor even an allusion to, Dioscorus of Alexandria, who ought in consistency to have been condemned as well as Eutyches. But the sole purpose of the document, which is not quite consistent with itself, was to induce the Egyptian Monophysites to join the orthodox communion, by offering them only such a profession as they might

[d] So alleged Zeno and Acacius. Evagrius (*H.E. lib.* 3, c. 12), giving Zacharias *Rhetor* as his authority, represents his oath to the emperor to have been only that he would not canvass for the see. Evagrius's account of the matter is, that at the instigation of certain persons in Alexandria, he had gone to Constantinople to request that he should be allowed to nominate a successor to the see when it should become vacant, and that the emperor, detecting in him a desire to get it for himself, had made him swear that he would not himself seek it. But he is not thus acquitted of perjury; for Evagrius (on the authority of the same Zacharias) alleges further that he obtained the see by simony.

possibly be willing to accept, with an appearance of their accepting orthodoxy. Peter Mongus accepted and signed this *Henoticon*, and got it accepted generally by his party in Egypt. He appears himself to have done even more than this; for in two letters to Acacius and to pope Simplicius (given by Evagrius, l. 3, c. 13) he declares his acceptance of the council of Chalcedon itself. But it is further said by Leontius (*de sect. act.* 5), that he afterwards anathematized the council of Chalcedon, when he found many of his followers—who came to be called *Acephali* because they formed a party without a recognised head—deserting him on the ground of his uncertain utterance.

The above account of the drift and purpose of the *Henoticon*, and of the action of Mongus with respect to it, has seemed relevant to a life of Simplicius, being required in order to account for and justify his and his successors' condemnation of the *Henoticon* itself, and their unflinching repudiation of Peter Mongus, and of all who had been in communion with him. The *Henoticon*, though in itself not unorthodox, was regarded as a compromise with a condemned heresy, which the popes, according to their principles, felt bound to have no dealings with; and, as to Peter Mongus, not only his tergiversation, but also the mere fact of his having been an excommunicated person when elevated to the see of Alexandria in place of the patriarch lawfully elected by the orthodox community, afforded a sufficient justification of the utter repudiation of him and his abettors on the part of Simplicius and his successors. It does not of necessity follow that the irreconcileable attitude of the successors of Simplicius towards the Eastern churches after the death of Mongus was equally justifiable.

Liberatus (c. 18) further informs us that, driven from Alexandria, John Talaias repaired to his friend Illus at Antioch, by whom he was recommended to apply to Calandio, the patriarch there. The latter took up his cause, and gave him synodical letters to Simplicius, to whom he advised him to appeal for support. These letters were in the first place sent, with a request that Simplicius would write to Acacius. He at once did so; but Acacius vouchsafed no reply, beyond simply saying that he could not recognise Talaias, having received Peter Mongus into communion on the basis of the emperor's *Henoticon*. Simplicius then wrote to Acacius again, representing that he ought not to have received Peter into communion without the concurrence of the Apostolic See; that a man who had been condemned by a common decree could not be freed from the ban except by a common council; and that it would be necessary for him first to accept unreservedly the council of Chalcedon and the *tome* of pope Leo. Simplicius received no reply to this second letter. He died not long after writing it, in the beginning of March, A.D. 483, according to Anastasius. John Talaias himself arrived at Rome after the pope's decease, and thus had to present his personal appeal to Felix, the successor of Simplicius. (See FELIX III.)

Baronius and Binius make much of this appeal of John Talaias to the see of Rome, as implying a recognition of the pope's supremacy over the church at large. But all that appears in this and other similar cases is that prelates, when aggrieved in the East, sought the protection and support of the great Roman see, which was acknowledged as the first in rank, and had the widest influence. It is true that popes had long asserted claims to be the supreme shepherds, as representing St. Peter, of the whole Catholic sheepfold: but it is not true that such claims were ever acknowledged in the East; and even in the West they received, in some quarters, but tardy acknowledgment. It has been observed above, that, though Simplicius is found asserting a claim of this kind when he could do so with effect, he refrains from such assertion in his letters to Acacius, with whom he knew, it may be supposed, that it would only provoke resentment.

Besides the letters of Simplicius above referred to, there are three others attributed to him. One (not dated) is to Zeno, bishop of Seville in Spain, and metropolitan of Bætica, constituting him vicar of the Roman see (*Ep.* i. *ap.* Labbe). Another (dated 30 May, A.D. 482) is to John, bishop of the metropolitan see of Ravenna, reproving him severely for having ordained one Gregory to the see of Modena against his will. Such ordinations by force appear to have been not uncommon. In this case Simplicius directs that Gregory shall undertake the charge to which he had been unwillingly ordained, but exempts him from the jurisdiction of Ravenna; and he threatens John with suspension from the power of ordination, if again guilty of a similar offence (*Ep.* ii.). The third letter (dated 19 November, A.D. 475) has reference to one Gaudentius, bishop of Aufidum in Italy, and is addressed to three neighbouring bishops, Florentius, Equitius, and Severus. This Gaudentius had ordained clergy in some way uncanonically, and had appropriated to himself for three years the whole of the revenues of his church, instead of reserving three-fourths of them, according to canonical rule, for the poor, for church fabrics, and for the clergy. He is deprived of the power of ordaining in future, Severus (one of the bishops addressed) being empowered to hold ordinations in his stead; he is required to restore the revenues which he had misappropriated, and one Onager, a presbyter, is entrusted henceforth with the charge of them.

Simplicius is said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have dedicated and enriched with gifts many churches at Rome, to have provided for clergy taking their turns week by week in attendances at the churches of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Lawrence, for confessions and baptisms, and to have been buried in the Basilica of St. Peter. He is commemorated as pope and confessor on the 2nd of March in the Roman Calendar. [J. B—Y.]

SIMPLICIUS (8), ST., fifteenth archbishop of Bourges, is known to us from an interesting account of his election, which took place A.D. 472, by Sidonius Apollinaris. The vacancy had brought forward so many candidates that two benches would not suffice to seat them. Every sort of intrigue was being employed in the various interests, till at last the perplexed people, with whom the choice lay, summoned Sidonius, recently made bishop of Clermont, to Bourges, and confided the selection to him, having bound

themselves by oath to abide by it. Sidonius called to his aid Agroecius, archbishop of Sens, and Euphronius, bishop of Autun, and finally, in a discourse pronounced in the church, preserved in a letter to St. Perpetuus of Tours, after stating the principles on which a bishop should be chosen, gave his decision for Simplicius, whose friend he seems to have been (see *Epist.* iii. 11, Ceillier, x. 386). Of a family which had won distinction both in the church and the law-courts, Simplicius, according to the same authority, combined the activity of youth with the prudence of age, displayed both genius and talent in letters, was charitable, a good citizen, and had already built a church. Not even the Arians could find anything to say against him. The choice, however, was in violation of the canons, as Simplicius was a layman. He was also married and the father of a family. Whether his episcopate fulfilled the high promises made in his name we do not know, as there are no records of it. He is, however, commemorated as a saint, March 1. He was buried in the church he had built, and which afterwards was known as S. Austregisili in Castro. (Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* vii. 5, 8; *Gall. Christ.* ii. 8; Boll. *Acta SS.* Mart. i. 34–8; Ceillier, x. 380–1.) [S. A. B.]

SIMPLICIUS (9), saint, third abbat of M. Cassino, after Constantius, c. 560–570, was one of Gregory the Great's authorities for his account of S. Benedict (*Dial.* ii. 1 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxvi. 126). He is said to have been the first to cause the rule of S. Benedict to be read by all monks. Nine verses of his are preserved, inviting one who desires to become a monk to study the rule. He is commemorated on October 22nd (*AA. SS.* Oct. ix. 589). [F. D.]

SIMPLICIUS (10) in A.D. 600, informed Gregory the Great of the wants of the hospice for old men at Mount Sinai, and also of the troubles of the priest Palladius there (*Epp.* xi. 1, 2). [F. D.]

SIMPLICIUS (11), bishop of Paris. In A.D. 601, Gregory the Great wrote to him and other Gallic bishops, commending to them the monks who were going to St. Augustine with LAURENTIUS (25) and MELLITUS (*Epp.* xi. 58). [F. D.]

SINACH, bishop of Clogher, date unknown, but probably about the close of the 8th century. (Ware, *Ir. Bps.* Clogher; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 72.) [J. G.]

SINDEREDUS, bishop of Toledo, succeeded GUNDERIC (4) before A.D. 710. Isidorus Pacensis gives an inconsistent account of him; after praising him for his sanctity, he says that Sindered at the instigation of WITTIZA, with a zeal not according to knowledge, persecuted continually aged and honourable members of the church of Toledo, and that on the Arab invasion like a hireling, he deserted his flock and fled to Rome. His signature appears among those at the council there in A.D. 721. (Mansi, xii. 265; *Esp. Sag.* v. 302; Gams, *Kirchenq. von Sp.* ii. (2) 242.) [F. D.]

SINELLUS (1) bishop of Clogher, co. Tyrone, about A.D. 550, as successor to Tighernach. (Ware, *Ir. Bps.* Clogher; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* iii. 71; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 210.)

SINELLUS (2) bishop of Movilla, co. Down, died A.D. 603 (*Ann. Tig.*); his feast is Oct. 1, where *M. Doneg.* calls him priest. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 650, c. 8; Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 152, 380.) [J. G.]

SINICIUS, second bishop of Rheims and Soissons, was disciple and successor of Sixtus, *c.* A.D. 300. In the *Acta* of Sixtus and Sinicius (Boll. *A. SS.* Sept. i. 125, with commentarius praevius, pp. 118–25), he is said to have come from Rome, when a presbyter, with Sixtus, and was consecrated by him as bishop for the Suessiones: at Sixtus' death he succeeded him also at Rheims [SIXTUS (1)] (Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 205, and note 31, ed. 1732; Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* i. c. 3; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxxv. 32, 105; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 646; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 2, 334). [J. G.]

SIPHORI (al. lec. SYMPHORI), the earlier name of those heretics called in Gennadius's time BONOSIANI (Gennad. *Eccles. Dogm.* c. 52). Why they were so called is not known (Tillem. x. 242). [C. H.]

SIRICA (1), abbess of the nunnery of SS. Gavinus and Luxorius at Cagliari, had assumed to make a will, which was supported on the ground that she had never worn the attire of a nun. Gregory the Great, notwithstanding, decided that she had no testamentary power (*Epp.* ix. 7). [F. D.]

SIRICA (2), wife of GAUDIOSUS (5).

SIRICIUS, bishop of Rome after Damasus from the latter part of December, A.D. 384, or the earlier part of January, A.D. 385, to Nov. 26 (?) A.D. 398. With regard to the date of his accession, there is no doubt that Damasus, his predecessor, died in December, on or before the 10th day of the month, according to *Martyrol. Hieron.* "iv. Id. Dec. Romae depositio S. Damasi episcopi"; and that the year was 384 appears from Prosper Aquitanus, *Chron.*, "Ricemere et Clearcho coss. Romanae ecclesiae post Damasum Siricius praefuit annis xv."; a statement confirmed by what Jerome says of himself (*Ad Rufin.* and *Ep.* 99), viz., that, having come to Rome in 382, he left it in the August of the year which followed that of the death of Damasus after a stay of nearly three years. The only question is whether Siricius was consecrated before the end of the same year or early in the following one. Prosper Aquit., in the passage given above, implies that it was in the same year; and this supposition would account for the duration of 15 years assigned by him to his episcopate, which duration is given also in the epitaph on his tomb (cited by Baronius, *ad ann.* 398, i.); "Ter quinos populum qui rexit ad annos amore." For, if the years of his accession and of his death were reckoned in, there would be fifteen wholly or in part included. On the other hand the *Liber Pontificalis* speaks of a vacancy of 31 (*al.* 36) days after the death of Damasus, thus throwing the accession of Siricius into January, 385.

On this question of date, which is of no historical importance, see Pagi, *Baron. ad ann.* 385, V.

During the violent conflicts which had attended the election of Damasus as successor to Felix II. Siricius had supported Damasus against his rival Ursinus, and after the death

of the former is said to have been elected by the general consent of the Roman people to succeed him, though Ursinus had again come forward. He had been previously presbyter of a church in Rome called that of "the Pastor." His election was confirmed (with allusion to the unanimity of the electors and to the rejection of Ursinus) by the boy emperor, Valentinian II., who then reigned in Italy under the direction of his mother Justina, in a letter to the praefect Pinianus, dated vii. Kal. Mart. (Feb. 23).

Siricius followed the example of Damasus in maintaining the authority of the Roman see. When the praefecture of East Illyricum had been assigned (A.D. 379) to the Eastern division of the empire, Damasus had insisted on its being still subject to the spiritual authority of Rome, and had constituted Acholius bishop of Thessalonica and after him Anysius (who succeeded Acholius A.D. 383), his own vicars for the maintenance of such authority. Siricius, on his accession, renewed this vicariate jurisdiction to Anysius (Innoc. *Epp.* i. xiii.).

Further, one of his earliest acts was his issue of the first of the Papal Decretals that has any claim to genuineness, though he speaks in it of earlier *Decreta* sent to the provinces by pope Liberius. It is dated, "iii. Id. Febr., Arcadio et Bautone vv. cc. (i.e., *viris clarissimis*), coss."—denoting Feb. 11, A.D. 385. Its genuineness is undisputed. Pagi says of it (*in* Baron. *ad ann.* 585, V. *et sq.*), "Neque ea in dubium revocanda, cum sola in Dionysii Exigui Collectione reperiatur, ex eaque desumpta sit quaecunque Cresconius ex Siricii decretis citat." It is plainly referred to by pope Innocent I. (*Ep.* vi. *ad* Exsuperium). Quesnel includes it without hesitation in his *Cod. Rom. cum Leone edit.*, c. 29. Its occasion was a letter from Himerius, bishop of Tarragona in Spain, addressed to Damasus, but received by Siricius, in which the pope's advice was asked on certain matters of discipline, and with regard to certain abuses prevalent in the Spanish church. Siricius, having taken counsel in a Roman synod, issued this decretal in reply, to be communicated by Himerius to all the bishops of Spain, and also to those of neighbouring provinces with a view to universal observance. The opportunity was taken of asserting in very decided terms the authority of the Roman See: "We bear the burdens of all who are heavy laden; nay, rather the blessed apostle Peter bears them in us, who, as we trust, in all things protects and guards us, the heirs of his administration." Again, "To all the questions which thou hast referred to the Roman Church as being the head of thy body, we have given, as I think, sufficient answers;" and in conclusion, "Although it is not allowable for any of the priests of the Lord to be ignorant of the statutes of the apostolic See or of the venerable definitions of the canons, yet it may be more useful, and in regard to the antiquity of thy priesthood more glorious for thyself, if those things which have been written generally, but specially addressed to thee, be made known to all our brethren everywhere through the solicitude of thy unanimity, ... that they may remain inviolate, and no way be left open for any excuses in time to come." Among the rules thus promulgated for universal observance, the following are the most important. 1. Arians returning to the Church are not to be rebaptized, but reconciled only by invocation of the Septiform Spirit, and imposition of episcopal hands. This is declared to be the rule of the whole East and West, and is required to be followed under pain of separation from Roman communion. 2. Adults are to be baptized (unless in danger of death) at Easter and Pentecost only. This rule, not hitherto universally observed, is henceforth to be followed by all under pain of divulsion from "the solidity of the apostolical rock on which Christ has built the Universal Church." 3. Apostates to heathenism, reconciled sinners who have returned to their former lives, monks or nuns guilty of fornication, are to continue during life in penitence, and be reconciled only at the point of death. But, while monks and nuns thus sinning are to be incarcerated during life, other persons who, as aforesaid, have, through human weakness, relapsed into sin, may after penance and reconciliation attend, though not partake of, the Eucharist, i.e. occupy the position of *consistentes*. 4. No man may marry a virgin who has been betrothed to another, since violation of the sacerdotal benediction on betrothal is of the nature of sacrilege. 5. Priests and deacons are prohibited from all sexual intercourse, whether with wives married before ordination or with others. Siricius approaches this subject with great earnestness, grounding the prohibition on the necessity of those who minister daily about holy things keeping themselves continually pure, and quoting the text, "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." It appears from what he says that it was at that time usual in Spain for the clergy to have wives and live with them, and that many were found to defend the practice on the ground of the allowance of marriage to the Levitical priesthood. To such as had erred through ignorance in this regard Siricius allows condonation of the past on condition of future continence, though forbidding their promotion to any higher clerical order: but such as defend the practice are to know themselves to be degraded from their office, and forbidden ever again to officiate, "by the authority of the Apostolic See." This utterance is important as being the earliest known decisive enforcement of clerical celibacy by the Roman See. A feeling against marriage as inconsistent with the highest sanctity, and hence against the marriage of the clergy, had long been extensively prevalent. The council of Illiberis in Spain (313) had, though apparently without much practical result, ordered all the clergy "to abstain from wives and the begetting of children." The councils of Ancyra and Neocaesarea (314?) had been less exacting, the former allowing deacons to marry if they had obtained the bishop's leave before ordination, the latter ordering only the deposition of presbyters who should marry after ordination. The great synod of Nice (325), moved, it is recorded, by the protest of Paphnutius the confessor, had refrained from requiring married clergy to separate from their wives (Socrat. *H. E.* I. ii.; Sozom. i. 23, etc.). Thus what the oecumenical council had refused to require Siricius now declared to be of general obligation, in virtue of the authority of the apostolic see. It is to be observed, however, that the

rule, as laid down by him, affected only the higher clerical orders, not including subdeacons, to whom it was extended by Leo I. (c. A.D. 442. See *Epp.* xiv. 4; cxlvii. 3). Its extension to them we find afterwards required by pope Gregory the Great in Sicily, where up to his time it had not been so extended (Greg. *Epp., Lib.* I. *Indict.* ix., *Ep.* 42). 5. No one who has been twice married, or has married a widow, or has been subjected to penance, is to be ordained to any clerical order; and any cleric in minor orders, who has married as aforesaid, is to be reduced to lay communion. 6. Monks, if worthy, may be ordained: but not without the probation in the successive orders of the ministry, required in all cases. All candidates, after passing through the orders of lector, acolyte, and subdeacon, must be deacons for five years before they can be ordained priests, and then priests for ten years before they can be made bishops. In the enunciation of this rule the lawfulness of marriage for all under the order of deacon is distinctly recognized: for one of the qualifications for the offices of acolyte and subdeacon is that the candidate should be "content with one wife, whom he has espoused as a virgin with the benediction of a priest." But it is added that "continence" must precede advancement to the diaconate.

The zeal of Siricius against heresy appears in the first place from his correspondence with the usurper Maximus, who in 383 had obtained the imperial authority in Gaul. To him the pope wrote, exhorting him to support the Catholic faith, and complaining of the recent ordination of one Agricius, who seems to have been suspected of heresy. Maximus, in his extant reply, declares his desire to maintain the true faith, undertakes to refer the case of Agricius to a synod of clergy, and takes credit for measures already taken against the Manicheans in Gaul, the atrocity of whose principles, as avowed by themselves at their trial, he speaks of as being such as he blushes to mention.[a] He doubtless alludes to the Priscillianists, who were often called Manicheans, and some of whom, Priscillian himself included, had been summoned to a synod at Bordeaux in 384, and been beheaded under this same Maximus, after a subsequent synod at Trèves A.D. 385. [See MAXIMUS, Emperor.] The pope's zeal against the Manicheans at Rome is intimated by the statement, that there "he found Manicheans, whom he sent into exile, and provided that they should not communicate with the faithful, since it was not lawful to vex the Lord's body with a polluted mouth" (*Lib. Pontif. in Vita Siricii*). The reference here seems to be to the alleged habit of the Manicheans to make a show of conformity by frequenting Catholic communion.[b] It is added that even converts from them were to be sent into monasteries, and not be admitted to communion till at the point of death. A law of Theodosius inflicting civil disfranchisement on Manicheans may probably have been promulgated at the instance of Siricius: "Manichaeis, sub perpetua justae infamiae nota, testandi et vivendi jure Romano omnes protinus eripimus facultatem, neque eos aut relinquendae aut capiendae alicujus haereditatis habere sinimus potestatem, etc." (*Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 1, 7). But, on the other hand, that the violent action of the emperor Maximus against the Priscillianists was disapproved by Siricius appears from canon vi. of the synod of Turin, held A.D. 401: "Those Gallican bishops who renounced communion with Felix of Trèves shall be received into the communion of the synod, in accordance with the letter of Ambrose of blessed memory, and of the Pope" (Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, § 113). This Felix of Trèves had been appointed bishop of that see by the synod held there (as aforesaid) for the condemnation of the Priscillianists. Martin of Tours, disapproving of the violent proceedings, had renounced communion with him and his supporters; and it appears from the above canon of the Turin Synod that other Gallican bishops had done the same, and that pope Siricius, with Ambrose of Milan, had approved by letter.

Another class of heretics afterwards fell under the condemnation of Siricius. Jovinian, notorious through St. Jerome's vehement writings against him, having been expelled from Milan, had come to Rome and obtained a following there. This teacher (called by Neander the Protestant of his time) was inspired by a reactionary feeling against the ascetic principles then prevalent, especially so far as they involved the view of higher sanctity, and higher reward, being attainable through counsels of perfection. He held that all the regenerate (meaning the inwardly regenerate, not merely the baptized) were alike in a state of grace, from which they could not fall; that virginity, marriage, and widowhood, were states of equal merit; that it was immaterial whether a person abstained from food or partook of it with thanksgiving; and that there would be no difference of reward hereafter. In connection with his denial of any peculiar merit in virginity, he maintained further that the mother of our Lord, though she conceived Christ as a virgin, brought Him forth in the natural way, her womb being opened at His birth (Hieron. *in Jovin.*; Ambrose, *Ep.* 7, given by Labbe, vol. ii. p. 1222; Augustin. *Haeres.* 82). His teaching at Rome came under the notice of two eminent laymen, Pammachius and Victorinus, who represented it to pope Siricius. He thereupon assembled a synod of clergy, at which Jovinian was excommunicated, together with his abettors, Auxentius, Genialis, Germinator, Felix, Frontinus, Martianus, Januarius, and Ingenius. These departed to Milan, whither Siricius also sent three presbyters with a letter addressed to the Milanese clergy, informing them of what had been done at Rome, and expressing confidence that they would pay regard to it. The letter is full of strong invective against Jovinian and his colleagues,—"dogs such as never before had barked against the Church's mysteries,"—but it contains no arguments. Siricius, on his part, disclaims any dis-

[a] See Article on MANICHEANS for a view of the principles which may have called a blush into the cheek of Maximus.

[b] See Article on GELASIUS, where there is notice of that pope's prohibition of communicating in one kind only, supposed to have reference to the practice of the Manicheans, who were in the habit of communicating with the orthodox, but, according to their principles, which forbade the use of wine, abstaining from the cup.

paragement of marriage, "at which (he says) we assist with the veil," though he "venerates with greater honour virgins devoted to God, who are the fruit of marriages." [c]

The synodical reply from Milan to this letter is preserved among the epistles of St. Ambrose (*Ep.* xlii. *edit. Benedict.*), who presided at the Milanese synod. In it he and his colleagues thank Siricius for his vigilance, concur with him in his strictures on the views of Jovinian, supply the arguments which the pope's letter had been wanting in, and finally declare that they had condemned those whom the pope condemned, according to his judgment. The introductory words of this epistle have been adduced in proof of the view then held of the pope's supreme authority. They are: "We recognize in the letter of your holiness the watchfulness of a good shepherd, diligently keeping the door committed to thee, and with pious solicitude guarding the sheepfold of Christ, worthy of being heard and followed by the sheep of the Lord." But this language, though expressing recognition of the bishop of Rome as the representative of St. Peter among the apostles, cannot be pressed as implying that he was the one doorkeeper of the whole church, or an infallible authority in definitions of faith. On the contrary the bishops at Milan proceed to endorse his judgment, not as a matter of course or as being bound to do so, but on the merits of the case, setting forth their reasons. These proceedings appear to have been in the year 390.

About the same time, or soon after, the Meletian schism at Antioch came under the notice of Siricius. Its origin and history (for fuller account of which see articles on FLAVIANUS, MELETIUS, PAULINUS, EVAGRIUS) may be briefly stated thus:—About the year 330 or 331 (the exact date is uncertain), Eustathius, the orthodox bishop of Antioch, had been deposed and banished through the intrigues of the Arian party, and another intruded into the see. The general community of Antioch, the orthodox as well as the Arian, had accepted the interloper; all except the more strictly orthodox, who remained loyal to their banished bishop, and were consequently called Eustathians. They continued apart after the death of Eustathius, refusing to acknowledge the successive Arian occupants of the see. In the year 360 it became vacant by the translation of Eudoxius to Constantinople, and then all except the Eustathians agreed in the election of Meletius, who was himself entirely orthodox. He proved more rigidly so than some of his supporters had anticipated; for after his election he excommunicated the Arians. Thereupon the emperor Constantius banished him, and placed an Arian, Euzoius, in his room. Thus the Arians of Antioch had at length their own bishop to themselves; but the Catholics were still divided. Those who had concurred in the election of Meletius adhered to him still; but the Eustathians refused to acknowledge him because of his having been elected by the mixed party which included Arians. And so the Catholics were split into two parties; that of the "Meletians" and that of the "Eustathians." During this state of things, Lucifer of Cagliari, after fruitless attempts to heal the schism, unhappily perpetuated it by ordaining Paulinus, the leader of the Eustathians, as their bishop. The church at large was divided as to the claims of the rival bishops. Pope Damasus and the Westerns generally acknowledged Paulinus; so did Athanasius, with the bishops of Egypt, as well as those of Arabia and Cyprus. The rest of the Easterns, including Basil of Caesarea, supported Meletius, whose popularity in the East is sufficiently evidenced by his appointment as president of the council of Constantinople, called the 2nd oecumenical, A.D. 381. It was evidently nothing to the Constantinopolitan Fathers that he was disowned at the time by Rome. His death in the year of the convention of the council (381), and while it was still sitting, afforded a favourable opportunity for making peace by the general acceptance of Paulinus, especially as he and Meletius were said to have agreed together, with the consent of their respective adherents, that the survivor should be the sole bishop. Gregory Nazianzen, too, who succeeded Meletius in the presidency of the council, recommended the acceptance of this arrangement. But party feeling proved too strong for his counsels to prevail; and a successor to Meletius was, with the sanction of the council, ordained in the person of Flavianus. Nor did even the death of Paulinus in 388 bring about a union, for he had, unhappily before his death, if reports be true, and without the concurrence of other bishops, ordained a successor to himself in the person of Evagrius.[d] Thus there were still two rival bishops, each of them orthodox, and each claiming to be the legitimate occupant of the see;—Flavianus representing the Meletians, and Evagrius representing the irreconcilable Eustathians.

The attitude of Siricius at this new juncture is not certainly known. He certainly may be supposed to have previously supported Paulinus and the Eustathians, as Damasus before him had done; but the case of Evagrius was different, his appointment being alleged to have been uncanonical; and there is no distinct evidence that Siricius declared himself in his favour, though it seems from a letter of St. Ambrose, to be noticed presently, that he was reckoned on as likely to support him. Theodoret, indeed,

[c] This mention of "the veil" is the third allusion that has come before us in the letters of Siricius to the religious ceremonies then held necessary for sanctifying Christian marriage. It was the yellow bridal veil, which the priest blessed. "Marriage," says St. Ambrose, "ought to be sanctified *velamine sacerdotali et benedictione*" (*Ep.* xix. *edit. Benedict.*). It appears further from one of the passages above quoted that priestly benediction accompanied the betrothal as well as the actual marriage.

[d] So distinctly says Theodoret (v. 23). Baronius discredits the statement as being contrary to those of Socrates (v. 15) and Sozomen (vii. 15), who speak only of the election of Evagrius after the death of Paulinus. But he acknowledges, on the testimony of St. Ambrose, that the appointment of Evagrius must have been in some way uncanonical. It is to be observed that Socrates and Sozomen, throughout their account of things, show a decided bias on the side of the Eustathians, whom Rome favoured, so that they would be likely to suppress anything that was not fully proved to the disadvantage of the party; and also that Socrates is inaccurate in speaking of Damasus as the contemporary pope. On the other hand, Theodoret throughout his narrative favours Flavianus

states that even after the ordination of Evagrius, the Romans ceased not to act hostilely against Flavianus. But this is not conclusive, since he says the same of the bishops of Egypt, who, according to Ambrose (*Ep.* lvi. *ad Theoph. edit. Benedict.*) stood neutral. So did Ambrose himself, speaking of each of the claimants relying more on the invalidity of his rival's ordination than the validity of his own (*ib.*).

At length, probably towards the end of the year 391, the emperor Theodosius was induced to convene a council at Capua, to which the two rivals were summoned; but there is no record of Siricius having taken any part in it, though he may have been represented by deputies, as was customary with the popes in the case of councils held elsewhere than at Rome. Ambrose, however, rather than he, appears to have taken the lead in the whole proceedings. He certainly was present at Capua, as appears from his subsequent letter (*Ep.* 9, *al.* 56, *al.* 78) to Theophilus of Alexandria, in which are the words, "quando omnes convenimus"; and he may be supposed with probability to have presided at the council, of which, and of what followed afterwards, he gives an account in the aforesaid letter to Theophilus. From this account it appears that Flavianus had refused to come, and that Evagrius, who had been present, had failed to establish his case. "Non habet quod urgeat Evagrius; et habet quod metuat Flavianus, ideoque refugit examen": — "Solus exlex Flavianus non venit, quando omnes convenimus." Under these circumstances the council contented itself with decreeing continuance of communion with the orthodox of both parties, and referring settlement of the claims of the rival bishops to Theophilus, with the bishops of Egypt as his assessors, on the ground that Egypt had been so far neutral in the dispute. Flavianus however declined submitting his case to the proposed tribunal, and again appealed to the emperor. Ambrose, being informed of this by Theophilus, expresses deep regret that, after all the labours of the clergy with a view to peace, recourse should be had once more to judgments of this world, and desires Theophilus to renew his summons to Flavianus, and adjudge the case in his absence, should he still refuse to appear. He further desires him to communicate the result to the bishop of Rome, in the hope of his confirmation of the sentence. "For (says he) we presume that you will pass such a judgment as cannot displease him." This is the intimation referred to above, which seems to shew that Siricius was known or supposed to be opposed to Flavianus, and which so far confirms what Theodoret implies. Baronius adduces this suggested seeking of the pope's confirmation as proving that no decision would have been held valid without it. But all that appears is that it was hoped that the authority of the Roman see might add such additional weight to that of Alexandria as to induce Flavianus to give up his appeal to the emperor; and now that the decision was likely to be against Flavianus, that the support of Rome might be expected. Flavianus, however, seems to have been as little disposed to submit to Rome as to any other ecclesiastical authority with regard to his claim to the see of Antioch. For it is probably to this juncture that Theodoret refers when he says that Flavianus addressed the emperor to this effect:—"Were I accused on the ground of faith or morals, I would submit to the sentence of the judges assigned me; but if they contest my right to my see, I will neither plead before them, nor oppose those who aspire to its dignity. I will myself resign it, that you may give it to whom you will." Theodoret adds that the emperor was so well pleased with the magnanimity and wisdom of Flavianus that he bade him return to his country, and feed the flock committed to him. And thus things remained, the schism at Antioch continuing till after the death of Evagrius, when St. Chrysostom, whom Flavianus himself had ordained priest, intervened as peacemaker. On the occasion of his own consecration to the see of Constantinople (A.D. 398), he induced Theophilus to be reconciled to Flavianus, and to join with him in sending an embassy to Rome to procure his recognition by Siricius. The application was successful; and thus at length Flavianus, notwithstanding his previous defiance of high ecclesiastical authorities, and his recourse to Caesar, was acknowledged by the whole church as the lawful bishop of Antioch. (Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 23; Socrat. *H. E.* v. 15; Sozom. *H. E.* vii. 15; viii. 3.)

At the council of Capua, spoken of above, opportunity was taken of bringing accusations of crime and heresy against Bonosus, bishop of Sardica, after whom was called the sect of the Bonosiani. Though he is said by Marius Mercator to have been condemned by pope Damasus, he was still in possession of his see. He was of the same school of thought with Jovinian, spoken of above, the prominent charge against him being that, with Helvidius (against whom also Jerome wrote), he denied the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord. The synod of Capua (which in this, as in the main case before it, appears to have acted, under the influence of St. Ambrose, equitably and without prejudice) committed the hearing of the charge against him to Anysius metropolitan of Thessalonica with the bishops of Macedon. There is a letter addressed to these bishops, preserved among the epistles of St. Ambrose (though the way in which his action in the matter is referred to shews that it was not his), which may have been from pope Siricius. It appears from it that the bishops had condemned the views of Bonosus, but had shrunk from passing sentence on him without the sanction of the writer of this letter, to whom they had therefore applied for his judgment. He replies that, though he agrees with them in condemning the impious views of Bonosus, he cannot act in the matter, since it was to them, and not to himself, that the synod had referred the case. Holstein (in *Collect. Roman.*) attributes this letter to Siricius, whose it most probably was, since the bishop of Rome was the most likely authority to be referred to by Anysius, who (as has been seen above) had been constituted by Siricius as his vicar in East Illyricum. If so, this is an unusual instance of forbearance in a bishop of Rome to assert the authority of his see. (Ambrose, *Epp.*—*Ep.* v. in *edit. Roman.*; appended to *Ep.* lvi. in *edit. Benedict.*)

The relations of Siricius to his great contemporary St. Jerome remain to be noticed, though there is nothing very definite to be said about

them. It was some six months after the death of Damasus, whose highly valued secretary he had been, that Jerome left Rome for ever. There was a strong feeling against him in Rome at the time, aroused by his unsparing denunciation of the vices of the clergy, and his propagation of ascetic views and practices. The recent death of the girl Blesilla, which was attributed to excessive fasting, had intensified this feeling. Scandal was also rife (to which, however, no credit is due) with respect to his spiritual intercourse with devout ladies, and especially with Paula, the mother of Blesilla, who gave some umbrage to the suspicion by joining him after his departure from Rome. In his bitterly expressed letter to Asilla, in which, after leaving the city, he inveighed against his opponents and calumniators, he makes no mention of the new pope; but it may be concluded, if only from his silence, that he had lost the countenance which he had enjoyed under Damasus. One expression in the letter suggests the idea, that he had been a little disappointed at not being made pope himself, and that coolness between him and Siricius may have arisen from this cause. For, speaking of former times, when Damasus had been his "mouthpiece," he says that by almost universal opinion he had himself been thought worthy of the episcopate. Siricius and he were indeed at one in their advocacy of virginity against Jovinian, and in their general orthodoxy; but there seems to have been no intercourse between them. And, even in the course of the controversy against Jovinian, Siricius appears to have joined others at Rome in disapproving of Jerome's alleged disparagement of matrimony: for the latter, writing to his friend Pammachius who had been attacked for supporting his position on the subject, expresses himself thus: "Audio totius in te urbis studia concitata; audio Pontificis et populi voluntatem pari mente congruere. Minus est tenere sacerdotium quam mereri." The concluding sarcasm is significant enough of Jerome's feeling towards the pontiff, though his reverence for the Roman See restrained him, in this and in other instances, from his accustomed vituperation of opponents. Further, Rufinus, the once close friend of Jerome, having quarrelled with him in Palestine on the subject of Origenism, but having been temporarily reconciled, in the year 395 left Jerusalem for Rome. Here he was favourably received by Siricius, who continued to support him, and gave him a commendatory letter on his departure, after the quarrel had broken out afresh, and with increased violence, between him and Jerome. The latter, however, on this occasion, as before, refrained from all strong language against the pope, attributing his action in the matter (here again with a tinge of sarcasm) to amiable simplicity.[e]

Siricius' neglect of Jerome and his patronage of Rufinus are grounds on which Baronius disparages this pope, going so far as to say that his days were shortened by divine judgment (Baron. *ad ann.* 397; xxxii.). A further ground of complaint (*ad ann.* 394; xl.) is his supposed unworthy treatment of another ascetic saint, Paulinus of Nola. He, when, having abandoned his wealth in order to retire from the world, he passed through Rome (A.D. 395) on his way to Nola, alleges himself to have been so badly treated by the Roman clergy that he had been obliged to leave the city in haste and proceed on his journey: and in his letter on the subject he especially blames the pope:—"Sed plenius indicare poterunt conservi nostri, pueri tui, quantum nobis gratiae Dominicae detrimentum faciat *Urbici Papae superba discretio.*" (Paulin. *ad* Sulpic. Severum; *Ep.* i.; *in nov. edit.* v.) For such reasons Baronius has excluded Siricius from the Roman Martyrology. Pagi (*in Baron. ad ann.* 398, I.) defends the sainted pope against the animadversions of Baronius.

Siricius died in the year 398. ("Honorio IV. et Eutychiano coss." So Prosp. Aq. in *Chron.*, speaking of the accession of his successor Anastasius.) The day of his death or burial is given in *Martyrol. Hieron.*, and also by Bede, as Nov. 26 (vi. Kal. Decemb. Romae sanctorum Sirici et Saturnini). This is the probable date, so accepted by Pagi, the Bollandists, and Bower, though according to *Lib. Pontif.* his burial was on Feb. 19, and according to some Martyrologies on Feb. 22, (Sepultus v. Kalend. Martii." *Lib. Pontif.* "In quibusdam vero martyrologiis, a Florentinio in notis ad martyrologium sancti Hieronymi ad diem xxvi. Novemb. memoratis, ejus depositio inscribitur ad viii. Kalend. Martii." Pagi.) As was observed at the beginning of this article, the 15 years given in his epitaph and by Prosper as the duration of his episcopate may be due to its first and last years, 384 and 398, being reckoned in. It would be really 13 years 11 months and some days, if the dates above accepted as probable be correct. Thus also the statement of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who gives it as 15 years 11 months and 25 days, may be accounted for by supposing a confusion between the two modes of reckoning it.

Besides the epitaph on his tomb already referred to, Baronius cites a further inscription (referring to *Antiq. Inscr. in Appen. pag.* 1171 n. 16) commemorating his reparation of the memorials of martyrs:

> "Siricius pia nunc persolvit munera sancti
> Gratia quo major sit bona martyribus
> Omnipotens Deus hunc conservet tempore multo
> Moenia sanctorum qui nova restituit."

According to *Lib. Pontif.*, he was buried in the cemetery of Priscilla on the *Via Salaria.*

Besides the extant letters that have been mentioned above, there are two others attributed to Siricius: one addressed to all bishops about admission to Holy Orders, the other to the bishops of Africa, purporting to communicate the decrees of a synod of 80 bishops which

[e] Jerome, in his "Epistola ad Principiam, sive Marcellae viduae epitaphium," thus alludes to the countenance given at Rome to Rufinus,—"Ita ut sacerdotes quoque, et nonnullos monachorum, maximeque saeculi homines, in assensum traheret, ac simplicitati illuderet episcopi, qui de suo ingenio caeteros aestimabat." (*Ep.* xvi. *in vet. ed.*; xcvi. *in ed. Benedict.*; cxxvii. in later editions.) Elsewhere he thus refers to the commendatory letter which had been given by Siricius to Rufinus, which letter the latter appears to have appealed to when condemned by pope Anastasius, the successor of Siricius.—"Siricii jam in Domino dormientis profers epistolam, et viventis Anastasii dicta contemnis" (*Contra Rufin. lib.* iii., c. 21). Again, "Tale quid et contra Papam Anastasium disputas, ut quia Siricii episcopi habes epistolam iste contra te scribere non potuerit" (*ib.* c. 24).

had been held at Rome, which decrees are said to be enunciations of ancient apostolical constitutions.

They are to the following effect: (1) No consecration (of a bishop) shall take place without the consent of the apostolic see, i.e. the primate. (2) As has been already ordered in the fourth canon of Nicaea, no single bishop shall take upon himself to consecrate another. (3) No one may be made a cleric who, after baptism, has served in war. (4) No cleric (of the lower orders) may marry a widow. (5) No one may be made a cleric who, as a layman, has married a widow. (6) No one may ordain one belonging to another church. (7) A deposed cleric may not be admitted into another church. (8) Those who come over from the Novatians and Montenses shall be received back by imposition of hands only, because they rebaptize. (The intention of this decree, as it stands, is obscure. Hefele takes it to mean that clergy (who are all along referred to) returning to the Church from sects which rebaptize their converts are to be readmitted only as laymen so returning were, not to restitution of orders). (9) Finally we advise (or exhort, *suademus*) that priests and Levites (i.e. deacons) should not live with their wives. These nine decrees are commended to universal observance under pain of "exclusion from our communion, and subjection to the pains of Géhenna." The synodal letter containing them is found among the acts of a council said to have been held at Tela in Africa at the beginning of the 5th century (c. 418, according to Hefele), as having been adopted by the council; and it is quoted by Ferrandus of Carthage (*Breviatio Canonum Ecclesiast.*) in the same century. Its genuineness is questioned by Papebrocius (*in Propylaeo Maii*, 60), by Quesnel (*Dissertatio* 5 in S. Leon.), by Blondel (*Censura in decretal. Epist.*), and Bower (*History of the Popes*). Pagi (*ad* Baron.) defends it against the objections of Papebrocius; Hefele also (*Conciliengeschichte*) accepts it as sufficiently authenticated, and open to no well-grounded suspicion. One ground of suspicion is that the council itself, the acts of which are our authority for the letter, cannot have been held, as alleged, at Tela, which was a town in Proconsular Africa, whereas all the bishops said to have attended were of another province, that of Byzacena. But this objection may be met by supposing Telense to have been erroneously written for Teleptense, which reading is actually found in some codices,—Telepte being the metropolis of the Byzacene province. Then, the mild word *suademus* in decree (9) has been thought inconsistent with the peremptory requirement of Siricius on the same subject in his decretal. But the word may be used in the sense of exhorting to observe a previous injunction which there had been a difficulty in enforcing generally. It obviously in itself affords no valid ground for rejecting the document, if otherwise trustworthy. It is to be observed that in the subsequent letters of Innocent I. to Victricius of Rouen and Exuperius of Toulouse (see art. on INNOCENTIUS), in which the injunction is repeated (with definite allusion in the latter letter to the decretal of Siricius), arguments are added in support of it, as if there was still a difficulty in getting it observed. Then decree (1), requiring the consent of the apostolic See to *all* consecrations, is not beyond what a Roman synod might have enjoined, the appended "i.e. the primate" being considered. Hefele suggests that the latter expression may have been added when the decrees, passed in the first place for the regions under the more immediate jurisdiction of Rome, were sent to Africa, where the title primate was in use. In the corresponding injunction by Innocent I. to Victricius (*Ep. ad* Victricium) the word used is "metropolitan," to suit the case of Gaul. Lastly, the fact that pope Innocent I. (*Ep. ad Victricium*) uses the same language as is found in this synodal letter is no good argument against its genuineness: for it may only be an instance of a pope adopting and repeating the synodical utterance of one of his predecessors. Indeed Innocent expressly says that the rules he sends are no new ones, but of old standing.

In the *Lib. Pontif.* Siricius is said to have ordered "ut nullus presbyter missas celebraret per omnem hebdomadam nisi consecratum episcopi loci designati susciperet declaratum quod nominatur *fermentum*." For a similar statement about Miltiades see art. on that pope; and for the meaning of *fermentum* and the custom alluded to, see art. on INNOCENT I. (note on his ep. to Decentius). [J. B—Y.]

SIRMIUM, STONEMASONS OF. The history of the martyrdom of the five stonemasons of Sirmium has of late occupied much attention. Their names were Symphorianus (*al.* Symphronianus, Simpronianus), Simplicius, Nicostratus, Claudius and Castorius; their memory is celebrated in the martyrologies on Nov. 8. Their acts have been known for centuries, being found in substance in Ado's martyrology, but it is only of late that their relation to the history of the Diocletian period has been recognised. Their story is briefly thus. They were stonemasons belonging to Pannonia; four of them were Christians, one of them alone, Simplicius, was a pagan. They were engaged in the imperial quarries, and distinguished themselves by their genius and ability, which surpassed all others. They even attracted the notice of Diocletian himself by the beauty of their carving. Simplicius was converted by his four companions, and baptized secretly by a bishop, Cyril of Antioch, who had been three years a slave in the quarries and had suffered many stripes for the faith. The pagans were jealous of the skill of the Christians, and accused them before Diocletian, who, however, continued to protect them. At last the emperor ordered them to make a variety of figures and statues, and among others, a statue of Aesculapius. The masons made all the others, but refused to carve an image of Aesculapius. The pagans took advantage of this refusal and procured an order for their execution. They were enclosed in lead coffins and flung into the Save. Their acts then proceed to narrate the martyrdom of the saints called the Quatuor Coronati, whose liturgical history has been told at length in the *Dictionary of Christ. Antiq.* t. i. p. 461. Diocletian came to Rome with his ardour for the worship of Aesculapius intensified by the refusal of his favourite masons to carve an image for him. He ordered all the troops to sacrifice to

Aesculapius, when four soldiers, Carpophorus, Severus, Severianus and Victorinus, refused to comply. They were flogged to death, and their bodies buried by pope Melchiades and St. Sebastian on the Via Lavicana at the third milestone from the city. These acts are very valuable as illustrations of the great persecution; yet they are full of difficulties which have exercised the ingenuity of many modern critics. The principal difficulty is this. The martyrdom of the masons evidently took place during the great persecution, and after the retirement of Diocletian into private life. Thus Cyril, the bishop of Antioch, to whose existence Eusebius testifies (*H. E.* vii. 32) was three years a prisoner at the mines when one of the masons was baptized. This would fix the date of their martyrdom and of the whole transaction about 306 at earliest. Now Diocletian never visited Rome as emperor after that date. His last visit to Rome was in December, 303. How then could the martyrdom of the Quatuor Coronati have followed on that of the stonemasons at Sirmium? But there is no necessary connexion between the two. The story of the masons is complete in itself. The story of the Quatuor Coronati was simply a later addition. In Ado's *Martyrol.* the death of the Quatuor Coronati is placed two years subsequent to that of the Sirmium martyrs. The whole story will be found translated in Mason's *Diocletian Persecution*, p. 259. Attention was first called to the Acts, as illustrating the Diocletian period, by Wattenbach in the *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* Bd. x. (1853) S. 118–126. They have been since discussed in Büdinger, *Untersuch. zur röm. Kaisergesch.* ii. 262, iii. 321–338, with elaborate archaeological and chronological commentaries, cf. also Petschenig's critical edition of the text in the *Sitzungsber. Wien. Akad.* t. xcvii. p. 761; Duncker's discussion of the Chronology in *Rheinischen Museum* for 1876, p. 440; De Rossi's *Bullet. Arch. Crist.* for 1879; Brieger's *Zeitsch. für Kirchengesch.* 1881–1882, p. 466. The organisation of the imperial quarries has been discussed by Borghesi and Henzen, *Annali*, 1843, p. 333; De Rossi, *Bullet.* 1868; Hirschfeld, *Untersuch.* p. 78; cf. *Rev. Archéol.* 1882, p. 294, for an abundant list of authorities on this topic. [G. T. S.]

SISEBERT, bishop of Toledo, succeeded JULIANUS, who died in March A.D. 690, and is perhaps the same person as Sisebert who signs as abbat the decrees of the 13th, 14th, and 15th councils of Toledo in A.D. 683, 684, 688. He was detected in a plot to deprive king EGICA not only of his crown but his life, and also to murder certain other persons, probably members of the royal family (one of them Liuvagotho was probably the queen of ERVIG and mother of Cixilo the queen of Egica), and was deposed at the opening of the 16th council of Toledo, in May A.D. 693, FELIX (152) being translated from Seville in his stead [EGICA (2)]. His deposition was confirmed by the ninth canon of the council, by which he was also excommunicated, and he was sentenced to banishment for life, and all his property was forfeited. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 576, 681; *Esp. Sag.* v. 297; Gams, *Kirchenq. von Sp.* ii. (2) 221). [F. D.]

SISEBUT, king of Spain, succeeded GUNDEMAR in the autumn of A.D. 612. He put down a revolt among the Asturians and the Ruccones, and also conquered part of the Basques, who had been tributary to the Franks. But his greatest successes were against the Byzantines. Their possessions in Spain consisted of two distinct portions—a small piece in what is now Algarve, including Ossonoba, and a much larger strip along the coast, from near Cadiz to Cartagena, of varying extent inland. He conquered the whole, or nearly the whole, of the larger territory, including Malaga and Asidonia, the bishops of which appear for the first time at a Gothic council at that of Seville in A.D. 618. From the obscure correspondence of Sisebut with the patrician Caesarius, probably the Byzantine governor, a peace seems to have been made, probably about A.D. 616. These successes were mostly obtained by Sisebut's generals Rechila and SUINTHILA, afterwards king, but he won two victories over the Byzantines in person. It appears also that he employed a fleet to reduce the maritime cities.

ISIDORUS (12) wrote at his request and dedicated to him his *De Natura Rerum*, in which, and in the *de Reg. Goth.* he praises him for his ability, his eloquence, his learning, and his clemency. As an instance of the last, he states that Sisebut ransomed at his own expense many of the prisoners who formed the booty of his victorious army. Besides the correspondence already alluded to, there exist four other letters of Sisebut, the first to Caecilius bishop of Mentesa, rebuking him for retiring to a monastery and neglecting his duties, the second to EUSEBIUS (85), q. v., the third to one Theudila who had become a monk, and the fourth to queen THEODELINDA and her son Adaloald is a polemic against Arianism. Sisebut also wrote the Life of DESIDERIUS (9) of Vienne, the victim of Brunichilde and Theodoric. These writings breathe the fiery zeal which early in his reign showed itself by his converting by force great numbers of the Jews (Isidorus, *Chron.* and *de Reg. Goth.*). A remarkable fact is the disapproval expressed of this policy by Isidore, the most influential churchman of the time. (*Ubi supra*, and fourth council of Toledo, canon 57.) Many Jews took refuge in Gaul, but many more outwardly became Christians, while remaining Jews at heart. The legislation against these "new Christians," again and again renewed whenever the clergy obtained the preponderating power in the State, is a dark stain on the history of Gothic Spain, and the discontent of so large and powerful a class was one of the main causes of the success of the Mahometan invaders a century later. Two laws of Sisebut renewed Reccared's prohibition of the purchase of Christian slaves by Jews. Those who had subsequently come into their possession by legitimate means (e. g. by inheritance) were to be sold or manumitted before a date named in the law. (*Liber Judicum*, xii. (2), 13 and 14).

Sisebut died early in A.D. 621. The cause of his death was unknown, some attributing it to illness, others to an overdose, and others to poison. He was succeeded by his young son Reccared II., who died shortly afterwards. (Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.* and *Chron.*; Fredegar. *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 624; Sisebut's letters

in *Esp. Sag.* vii. 309; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii., (2) 77; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 177. An inscription containing his name in Hübner, *Insc. Hisp. Chr.* 171; coins in Heiss, 103.) [F. D.]

SISENAND, king of Spain, A.D. 631–636, obtaining the crown by a successful rebellion against SUINTHILA, q.v. Hardly anything is known of his short reign, except that it represented a reaction of ecclesiastics and magnates against the independent attitude of his predecessor. The *Chronicon Albeldense* in *Esp. Sag.* xiii. 448, sums up his reign and character with the words "patiens fuit et regulis Catholicis orthodoxus extitit." The only important event of his reign was the fourth council of Toledo in A.D. 633, for an account of which see ISIDORUS (12) of Seville, Vol. III. 306. Seventy-five canons were passed at it, a summary of which is given in *Dict. Chr. Antiq.* ii. 1968. It should be added that by canon fifty-seven, while the synod expressed its disapproval of forcible conversions of Jews for the future, it declared that those who had been forcibly converted by king Sisebut must remain Christians, and proceeded to legislate with great severity against those who secretly practised the rites of their former religion. Their children were torn from them and brought up in monasteries or in the houses of Christians, and intercourse with those of their race who had remained Jews was forbidden. The converts who violated the last canon were to be given as slaves to Christians, while the Jews who did so were to be publicly flogged. Backsliding converts were also declared incapable of giving evidence. Jews were likewise forbidden to intermarry with Christians, were disqualified for office, and the prohibition of their holding slaves was repeated. Clergy and laity alike were forbidden from screening Jews against these enactments (canons 58–66). Grätz (*Die Westg. Gesetzgebung in Betreff der Juden*, 33) further identifies Sisenand with the author of the four laws in the *Liber Judicum* (xii. (2), 5–8) forbidding (converted) Jews to observe the passover, to marry any relation within the seventh degree or with Jewish rites, to practise circumcision, or to distinguish between clean and unclean meats. The *Acta* of the fourth council of Toledo in Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 261; Fredegarius, *Chron.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 651; Isidorus Pacensis; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2), 81, 90; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen* v. 187.) [F. D.]

SISINNIUS: *vid.* also SYS-.

SISINNIUS (1), one of the twelve disciples of Manes, and his immediate successor as leader of the Manichean sect. According to the *Acta Archelai*, he embraced the Catholic faith after the disputation at Caschar. All other authorities, however, are agreed that he retained his Manichean views, and became the successor of Manes. Flügel's *Mani*, p. 316, cf. pp. 14, 27, 29, 42, 97. Sisinnius wrote several epistles expository of Manichean doctrines, which Flügel describes pp. 103, 374, 375, see also Petr. Sic., *Hist. Manich.* p. 30; Toll. *Insig.* p. 144. Beausobre, *Hist. du Manich.* i. 17. [MANES, Vol. III. p. 793.] [G. T. S.]

SISINNIUS (2), a martyr at Antinoe in the Diocletian persecution, with Coluthus a priest and physician, and a great number of others whose names are given in the Acts of SS. Apater and Irai in Hyvernat's Coptic *Actes des Martyrs de l'Egypte.* Rome, 1886. [G. T. S.]

SISINNIUS (3), May 29, the apostle of the Tyrol and mart., with Alexander and Martyricus, at Anaunia, near Trent. Sisinnius was a Greek, from Cappadocia, and was ordained deacon by Vigilius, bishop of Trent. He was sent by him as a missionary to the neighbouring pagans, who were as yet devoted to the worship of Saturn. They were murdered by a pagan mob, at a festival celebrated by them in honour of that god at the end of May, A.D. 379. The details of the acts are interesting, as showing how tenaciously the rural population held to paganism. Ruinart in *Acta Sincera* gives two epistles written by Vigilius, the one to Simplicianus of Milan, the other to St. Chrysostom, narrating their sufferings. (Ceill. vi. 267.) [G. T. S.]

SISINNIUS (4), a correspondent of St. Ambrose (*Ep.* lxxxiii.). [J. Ll. D.]

SISINNIUS (5) (SYSINNIUS), a deacon who in 398 or 399 visited Jerome at Bethlehem after passing through the islands of the Adriatic. In one of these he found among the works of Augustine a letter to Jerome, but without Augustine's name. Of this he brought a copy to Jerome, whom it had not previously reached. (Jerome, *Ep.* 102, 105; Aug. *Ep.* 68, 72; *Art.* HIERONYMUS, Vol. III. p. 44, section on *Augustine.*) [W. H. F.]

SISINNIUS (6), a monk of Aquitaine, sent on a mission to Palestine and Egypt in the year 406. He had presents for the monks of Nitria, but his chief business was with Jerome at Bethlehem. To him he brought (1) The books of Vigilantius sent by Desiderius and Riparius to be answered by Jerome; (2) Letters from the monks Minervius and Alexander, asking for an explanation of St. Paul's words: "We shall all sleep but we shall not all be changed;" (3) Many similar questions from Christians of both sexes in Aquitaine; (4) Presents from Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse. He arrived in the autumn of 406, and Jerome, expecting him to remain till over the Epiphany, put off writing his answers in the most important points. But suddenly tidings arrived that the monks of Nitria were in great distress, the Nile not having risen. Sisinnius thought it his duty to depart, and Jerome had to finish his work as quickly as possible. The commentary on Zachariah, which he had promised to Exuperius, was finished in haste; the reply to Minervius and Alexander had to be written rapidly, without any attention to style, and the treatise against Vigilantius was the work of a single night before the departure of Sisinnius. (Desiderius, Riparius, Vigilantius, Exuperius. Jerome *Ep.* 109, 119; Jer. *adv. Vigilantium*, 17; Jer. *Prefaces* to Bks. i. ii. viii. of *Comm. to Zach.*) [W. H. F.]

SISINNIUS (7), a bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople, a contemporary of Chrysostom. He received his education from the philosopher Maximus, having the future emperor Julian as his fellow pupil. He was reader of the church under Agelius, who named him as

his successor. This choice not being agreeable to the Novatian laity who desired Marcian, Agelius yielded to them, with the proviso that Sisinnius should be Marcian's successor, which was carried into effect on Marcian's death in November, A.D. 395 (Socr. *H. E.* v. 21, vi. 1; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 1). On Theodosius summoning a meeting of the bishops of all parties in the church, A.D. 383, in the hope of securing unanimity by mutual discussion of the points of difference, Sisinnius, while still a reader, being consulted by his bishop, Agelius, to whom the orthodox bishop of Constantinople, Nectarius, had had recourse in the perplexity caused by the intimation of the emperor's intention, was the author of the advice that an appeal should be made on the disputed points to the testimonies of the ancient fathers recognised by all, and that each of the dissentients should be judged by the agreement of his doctrines with those there found (Socr. *H. E.* v. 10; Soz. *H. E.* vii. 12). At a later period he warmly controverted Chrysostom's impassioned language as to the efficacy of repentance and the restoration of penitents to the communion of the church, against which he published a treatise (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 21). Chrysostom taking umbrage at this, and at his claim to exercise episcopal functions in Constantinople, threatened to stop his preaching; on which Sisinnius jocosely told him he would be much obliged to him for sparing him so much trouble, and thus disarmed his anger (*ibid.* 22). Sisinnius enjoyed a great reputation for witty repartees, several of which are collected by Socrates (*l. c.*), but they do not give a very high idea of his powers. He is described as having been man of great eloquence, enhanced by the dignity of his countenance and person, the gracefulness of his action, and the tones of his voice. He had a considerable reputation for learning, being very familiar with philosophical writings, as well as with expositions of the Scriptures, and was well skilled in dialectics. His power for argument was such that the heretical writer Eunomius, himself famous for his dialectic skill, shrank from entering the lists with him (Socr. *u. s.*). He is stated to have been a copious author, but he was more successful as a speaker than as a writer. Socrates, who had a high opinion of him, criticises his composition as being too flowery and poetical. In addition to the treatise against Chrysostom, *de Poenitentia*, he, together with Theodotus of Antioch, composed a synodic letter against the Thessalians, in the name of the Novatian bishops who had assembled at Constantinople for his consecration, addressed to Berinianus, Amphilochius, and other bishops of Pamphylia (Photius, *Cod.* lii. col. 40; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 290). Though a bishop of a schismatic body, he was treated with much esteem and regard by the orthodox bishops, especially by Atticus, and was the honoured friend of the leading members of the aristocracy of Constantinople. He was as far as possible from an ascetic, keeping a sumptuous table, though not exceeding the bounds of moderation himself, dressing always in white, and visiting the bath twice a day. To one who asked why, as a bishop, he did so, he replied, "Because I have not time to bathe thrice" (Socr.; Soz. *u. s.*). He is recorded to have seen a vision declaring the eminent virtue of Eutropius, the young deacon tortured to death in Chrysostom's cause (Soz. *H. E.* viii. 24). Sisinnius died the same year as Chrysostom, A.D. 407, and was succeeded by Chrysanthus (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 6; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 290).

[E. V.]

SISINNIUS (8), patriarch of Constantinople. On the death of Atticus there was much dispute as to his successor, one party favouring the priest Philippus, another the priest Proclus, while all the laity were strongly in favour of Sisinnius, a priest of the suburb of Elaea, and who was beloved for his charity and uprightness. He was consecrated on February 28, A.D. 426, and died on the 24th of December in the following year. The only recorded act of his short episcopate was the consecration of Proclus as bishop of Cyzicus, whom the Cyzicenes refused to receive, alleging that the privilege of nominating their bishops had been granted only to Atticus personally and not to the patriarchs in general. Sisinnius was bitterly attacked by his disappointed rival Philippus in his *Historia Christiana*. (Socrates, vii. 26–28; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 215.) [F. D.]

SISINNIUS (9), bishop of Rome, elected after a vacancy of about three months, as successor to John VII., who died 17 Oct. A.D. 707. Being at the time of his appointment so afflicted with gout as to be unable to feed himself, he died after holding the see for only twenty days, and was buried in St. Peter's on the 7th of February, A.D. 708. Anastasius says of him that, notwithstanding his bodily infirmities, he was firm in character, that he had a care for the inhabitants of Rome, and had ordered the preparation of lime for restoring the walls of the city before his sudden death. The ordination of one bishop for the island of Corsica is his only recorded act. (Anastas., in *Lib. Pontif.*)

[J. B—Y.]

SISOË, solitary of Egypt. There were two of this name; one of Petra, the other from the Thebaid. One of them lived on Sinai from A.D. 356–428. Cotelerius bestows much space on abbat Sisoe in his *Monumenta*, t. i. 662–678. (Cf. Till. *Mém.* xii. 453–463.) [G. T. S.]

SIXTUS (1), first bishop of Rheims and Soissons, is said in the *Acta* of St. Sixtus and St. Sinicius, to have been consecrated and sent from Rome in the time of Diocletian to teach the Gospel to the Suessiones and Remi, c. A.D. 287 (Boll. *A. SS.* Sept. i. 118 sq.). Flodoardus (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* i. c. 3; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxxv. 32, 105) says he was an envoy of St. Peter the Apostle, but he probably belongs to the close of the third century (*Gall. Christ.* ix. 334; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 205, and note 31, ed. 1732). [J. G.]

SIXTUS (2) I., so called in the Liberian Catalogue, by Optatus (l. 2), by Augustine (*Ep.* liii.); but Xystus, Xistus, or Xestus, in *Catal. Felic.*, Irenaeus (*adv. Haer.* iii. 3), Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 4, 5, and *Chron.*), Epiphanius (*Haer.* 97, 6)—one of the early bishops of Rome, called the 6th after the apostles, and the successor of Alexander. As is the case with the other bishops of this early period, his exact date cannot be fixed with certainty, the ancient lists differing in their chronology. All, however, assign him an episcopate of about ten years, more or less, and

place him in the reign of Hadrian. According to *Catal. Liber.* he was bishop from A.D. 117 to A.D. 126; according to Eusebius (*H. E.*) from A.D. 119 to A.D. 128; according to his *Chronicle* from A.D. 114 to A.D. 124. Lipsius (*Chronol. der röm. Bischof.*) gives A.D. 124 and A.D. 126 as the earliest and latest dates assignable for his death. The Felician Catalogue and the Martyrologies represent him as a martyr, and he is commemorated among the apostles and martyrs, after Linus, Cletus, Clemens, in the canon of the mass. But Telesphorus being the first bishop of Rome designated a martyr by Irenaeus, the claim to the title of Sixtus and other early bishops of Rome, to the great majority of whom it has been since assigned, is doubtful. He is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology as a saint and martyr under Antoninus Pius (*acc.* 138) on the 6th of April.[a] Two undoubtedly spurious epistles, referring principally to the doctrine of the Trinity, to the accusation of bishops, and to the supremacy of the apostolic see, have been assigned to this pope. On the Proverbs ascribed to this pope see XYSTUS. [J. B—Y.]

SIXTUS II., pope. [XYSTUS.]

SIXTUS (3), III., bishop of Rome after Coelestinus, from A.D. 432 to A.D. 441, and the immediate predecessor of Leo the great. Two notable heresies were afloat in his day,—Pelagianism and Nestorianism. The former, repudiated from the first at Carthage, had at last, after hesitation if not approval of it, been condemned at Rome also by pope Zosimus A.D. 418. The latter had been condemned by the council of Ephesus, with the concurrence of pope Caelestine A.D. 431. Sixtus, before his accession to the popedom, had taken part in both controversies. It appears from letters addressed to him by St. Augustine, when he was still a Roman presbyter under Zosimus, that the Pelagians had claimed him as being, with the pope, on their side; but that, when the pope was at length induced to condemn the heresy, he also had written to the African church expressing his concurrence with a vigour of language that fully satisfied St. Augustine. "Deinde cum litteris Apostolicae sedis de illorum damnatione ad Africam missis tuae quoque litterae ad venerabilem senem Aurelium consecutae sunt, quae tametsi breves erant, tuum tamen vigorem adversus eorum errorem satis indicabant." Augustine further rejoices to have heard how Sixtus had been foremost in anathematising Pelagianism in a large assembly at Rome: "primo te priorem anathema eis in populo frequentissimo pronunciasse eadem fama non tacuit." (Augustin. *Epp.* 191, *al.* 104, and 194, *al.* 105). It appears also as if Sixtus had, before his accession, intervened in the Nestorian conflict; for, in his letter to John of Antioch (*Ep.* ii.), he speaks of having himself once admonished Nestorius; and this must have been before the final condemnation of Nestorius, and hence before the accession of Sixtus:—"Credo ad dilectionem tuam rerum cursus et ordo pervenerit, qualiter ei voluimus nostra admonitione succurrere: retinuimus in praeceps euntem, qui erat blasphemiarum pondere in profunda mergendus." To such action of Sixtus Gennadius probably alludes, when he says (c. 54); "Similiter etiam Sixtus, successor Caelestini, pro eadem re et ad ipsum Nestorium et ad Orientis episcopos adversus errorem ejus succidendum sententias direxit." It appears from the above instances that Sixtus had been a man of mark and influence at Rome before he became pope.

Notwithstanding his early opposition, thus evinced, to the heresy of the Nestorians, it seems that by them, as well as by the Pelagians, Sixtus was claimed as once having favoured them; and he was reported to have taken in ill part the condemnation of Nestorius. This imputation was made to rest on a letter that had been circulated as written by one Philip, a Roman presbyter, referred to in an epistle from Cyril of Alexandria to Acacius of Mytilene (*Cyr. Ep.* 29; *et in Act. Concil. Ephes.*). But Cyril in his letter declares the imputation to have been entirely groundless. It, as well as the other with respect to Pelagianism, may have arisen from his having evinced a conciliatory spirit, and a reluctance to condemn too hastily. Such a spirit, rejoicing in concord, appears in the letters written by him as pope, with respect to the differences that continued after the condemnation of Nestorius, while at the same time he then fully endorsed the condemnation, and spoke strongly against the heresiarch, whom he had once in vain endeavoured to reclaim. The differences that arose were between Cyril of Alexandria and John of Antioch. The latter, before the council of Ephesus, though not holding with Nestorius, had objected to the 12 *capitula* which Cyril had issued against him. He and his suffragans having been unavoidably delayed on their journey to Ephesus, Cyril had refused to wait for them, and in their absence condemned Nestorius. John, with his followers, on their arrival at Ephesus, had held a separate council, and the result in the end was that the members of the two assemblies stood mutually excommunicated. The emperor Theodosius intervened to bring about a reconciliation, calling on John to anathematize Nestorius, and on Cyril to withdraw his *capitula*. John complied, Cyril refused; but at length, friendly advances having been made by John, the two patriarchs came to terms and were reconciled.

There are two extant epistles of Sixtus III., written on this happy occasion to Cyril and to John, expressing his great joy; from one of which it further appears that he had written often to Maximian, the successor of Nestorius at Constantinople, on the subject previously. When he thus wrote to the reconciled partriarchs, a synod had been held at Rome on the occasion of his birthday, at which the joyful news of the reconciliation had been made known, and he was expecting the speedy arrival of a deputation of clergy from John of Antioch. These two letters are given by Baronius (A.D. 433, xii. and xvii.); from a Vatican MS., which he speaks of as corrupt but trustworthy. See also Labbe, *Concil. Eph.* vol. iii. pp. 1689, 1699. The letter to John is quoted by Vincentius Lerinensis (*adv. Haer.*).

Two previous letters also of Sixtus, conceived in a similar spirit, are given by Cotelerius from

[a] There is an evident error here, in itself raising suspicion of his martyrdom at all, since, according to all early accounts of him, his death was at least ten years before the accession of Antoninus.

MSS. in the *Biblioth. Reg.* (Coteler. *Monum. Graec. Eccles.*, vol. i. p. 42). One was to Cyril; the other was apparently an encyclic to him and the Easterns generally, sent by two bishops from the East, Hermogenes and Lampetius, who had been present at the pope's ordination. Their immediate purpose was to announce, as was usual, his accession to his see, and to declare his communion with the Eastern Churches. But in both, while he fully concurs in the condemnation of Nestorius by the council of Ephesus, he refers with regret to the dissent of John of Antioch and his adherents, whose reception into communion he desires and recommends, if they should come to a better mind, as he hopes they will do. "Sicut enim persistentes prioribus non potuerant in nostra esse communione, sic volumus eos propter unitatem et pacem ecclesiarum satisfacientes ut diximus suscipi."

Sixtus was no less vigilant than preceding popes in maintaining the jurisdiction of the Roman see over Illyricum, and that of the bishop of Thessalonica as the pope's vicar over the rest of the bishops there. Four letters of his on this subject were read in the Roman council held with reference to it under Boniface II., A.D. 531. (See Labbe, vol. v., *Concil. Rom. III. sub Bonifac. II.*) Two of these letters were written in 435, the other in 537. In the last, which is addressed to all the bishops of Illyricum, he enjoins them to submit themselves to Anastasius of Thessalonica, as being constituted, as his predecessor had been, vicar of the apostolic see, with authority to summon synods and adjudicate on all cases, except such as it might be necessary to refer to Rome. He bids them further pay no regard to the decrees of "the oriental synod," except those on faith, which had his own approval: "Nec his vos, fratres carissimi, constitutis quae praeter nostra praecepta orientalis synodus decernere voluit credatis teneri; praeter id quidem quod de fide nobis consentientibus judicavit." He probably refers to the council of Constantinople, which in its third canon had given a primacy of honour after old Rome to Constantinople. On the strength of this canon the patriarchs of Constantinople had already assumed jurisdiction over the Thracian dioceses, though it was not till the council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451; can. xxviii.), that the express power of ordaining metropolitans in Illyricum was formally given to them in spite of the protest of pope Leo's legates.

It has been seen above that Sixtus, while still a presbyter, had, eventually at least, concurred decidedly in the condemnation of Pelagianism. Towards the end of his life he showed that he was in the same mind with regard to it. For we are told by Prosper (*chron.*), that in the year 439 Julianus, the eminent Pelagian, who had been deposed from the see of Oeulanum in Campania, essayed, by profession of penitence, to creep again into the communion of the Church, but that Sixtus, under the advice of his deacon Leo, "allowed no opening to his pestiferous attempts." The Leo here spoken of was the successor of Sixtus in the see of Rome, Leo the Great, who thus appears to have been his archdeacon and adviser. It is observable that an acolyte Leo, who may have been the same person, is mentioned in the epistles of St. Augustine above referred to as the bearer of the letter written by Sixtus, while he was still a presbyter, to Aurelius of Carthage.

It is stated in the *Liber Pontificalis* that in the second year of his episcopate, Sixtus was accused of crime by one Bassus;—that the emperor Valentinian ordered a council to be assembled, at which the pope was declared innocent by 56 bishops, and Bassus excommunicated,—but with the allowance to him of the viaticum at the hour of death;—that Valentinian, with his mother Placidia, thereupon proscribed Bassus, and confiscated his property;—and that Sixtus, on the death of Bassus within three months, honourably interred him in his family burial place at St. Peter's. Acts of the council supposed to have been held at Rome on this occasion are extant, but are undoubtedly spurious. So also is a letter attributed to Sixtus (*Ep.* iii. *ap.* Labbe), purporting to be addressed to the eastern bishops, giving them an account of what had taken place. According to the Acts the crime alleged against him was the violation of a consecrated virgin; and it is therein represented that the emperor before the assembled council, acknowledging the principle that the pope could be judged by no one, called on him to pronounce judgment in his own case. Spurious also, and of no historical value, are the Acts of a council said to have been held at Rome under Sixtus for the purgation of an accused bishop of Jerusalem, Polychronius.

Three works issued under the name of Sixtus (*De Divitiis*, *De Malis Doctoribus &c.*, and *De Castitate*), appear to have been of Pelagian origin (see Baron. *ad ann.* 440, vi.). The party may have put them out in his name on the strength of the old report of his having once favoured it.

Sixtus died A.D. 440, and was buried (according to Anastasius, *Lib. Pontif.*), "ad S. Laurentium via Tiburtini." The day of his death is variously estimated and uncertain. He is commemorated as a confessor on 28 March:—"Romae S. Sixti tertii, papae et confessoris." (*Martyrol. Roman.*) Why he should be called a confessor is not obvious from anything recorded of him. The title may be supposed to rest on the spurious letter to the bishops of the East above mentioned, wherein he is made to complain of persecution.

In the *Lib. Pontif.* extraordinary activity in building, endowing, and decorating churches is attributed to Sixtus, and to the emperor Valentinian under his instigation. He is said to have built the Basilica of St. Maria Maggiore on the Esquiline (called *Ad Praesepe*),[a] and of

[a] Probably Sixtus only rebuilt the church of St. Mary, which had stood on the Esquiline before his time. Its original erection is elsewhere attributed to pope Liberius (*acc.* 352), and in the notice of its construction by Sixtus in the *Lib. Pontif.* the expression is used, "quae ab antiquis Liberii cognominabatur." The legend of St. Liberius in the Breviaries contains the following account:—John, a Roman patrician, being childless, desired to give his wealth to the blessed Virgin: he and his wife, having prayed for guidance, were admonished in a dream to build a church on a spot which they would find covered with snow: in the morning, though it was in the heat of August, they found a part of the Esquiline so covered: Liberius had experienced in the same night a similar dream: consequently a church was built by the patrician, under the pope's auspices, where the snow had fallen, and was called the church of "St. Maria ad Nives."

St. Laurence, and to have furnished both with great store of precious implements and ornamentations. Pope Hadrian, in one of his epistles to Charlemagne, written in support of image-worship (*Ep.* 3, c. 19), alludes to the former, saying, "Magis autem successor Caelestini Sixtus Papa fecit Basilicam S. Dei Genetricis Mariae, cognomento Majorem, quae et ad Praesepe dicitur: simili modo et ipse in metallis aureis quamquam in diversis historiis, sacris decoravit imaginibus." Baronius gives from an ancient record (*Antiq. inscript. in Append. pag.* 1170, *num.*7), the following inscription, formerly existing in the church, but in his time perished;—

"Virgo Maria tibi Xystus nova tecta dicavit
Digna salutifero munera ventre tuo.
Tu genetrix ignara viri, te denique foeta,
Visceribus salvis edita nostra salus.
Ecce tui testes uteri sibi praemia portant,
Sub pedibusque jacent passio cuique sua,
Ferrum flamma ferae fluvius saevumque venenum:
Tot tamen has mortes una corona manet."

A structure of gold having twelve doors, with images of the Saviour and of the twelve apostles, adorned with gems, said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have been placed by Valentinian at the request of Sixtus over the shrine of St. Peter in the Vatican, is also alluded to in the same letter of pope Hadrian. Among other decorative works of Sixtus is mentioned a structure over the font of the Lateran, consisting of porphyry columns with marble chapters, on which he inscribed verses. The verses, interesting as expressing the teaching of Sixtus on the efficacy of baptism, are thus given by Baronius,

"Gens sacranda prolis hic semine nascitur almo,
Quam faecundatis Spiritus edit aquis.
Virgineo foetu genetrix Ecclesia natos,
Quos spirante Deo concipit, amne parit.
Coelorum regnum sperate hoc fonte renati:
Non recipit felix vita semel genitos.
Fons hic est vitae, et qui totum diluit orbem,
Sumens de Christi vulnere principium.
Mergere peccator, sacro purgande fluento:
Quem veterem accipiet proferet unda novum.
Insons esse volens isto mundare lavacro,
Seu patrio premeris crimine seu proprio.
Nulla renascentum est distantia, quos facit unum
Unus fons, unus Spiritus, una fides.
Nec numerus quemquam scelerum nec forma suorum
Terreat: hoc natus flumine sanctus eris."

The columns, &c., are said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have been collected by Constantine the Great, to whom the original building of the Lateran Baptistery is attributed, but left unused by him. Two porphyry columns at the entrance, and eight forming a colonnade round the interior, still adorn the Baptistery, as they were placed there by Sixtus. The verses appear to have been renovated at some later date. "Schon Sixtus III. liess diese Säulen errichten. Aussen auf ihren antiken in spätrömischer Weise profilirten Gebälk stehen 8 auch schon von Sixtus III. angebrachte, die Wirkung des Sakraments dichterisch preisende, Distichen (jetzt in neuer Schrift)." [*Rom und Mittel-Italien, von* Dr. Th. Csell-Fels. Hildburghausen 1871, p. 296.]

Sixtus is further said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have placed a column (*platoniam*) in the cemetery of S. Callistus, inscribed with the names of bishops and martyrs buried there. [J. B–Y.]

SIXTUS (4), martyr, whose relics were sent by Gregory the Great to St. Augustine at his request (*Epp.* xi. 64). There is nothing to show whether he was one of the popes of that name, or a third person. [F. D.]

SMARAGDUS (1), exarch of Ravenna, c. 584–588 and again c. 602–610. The exact date of his appointment is unknown, but in A.D. 584 or 5 he concluded a three years' truce with the Lombards (Paulus Diac. iii. 18). We learn the date by a reference in the letter in A.D. 585 of Pelagius II. to the Istrian bishops. (Jaffé, *Reg.* 686.) He persecuted ELIAS, the schismatic patriarch of Aquileia, till he was checked by the emperor Maurice (*Lib. Episc.* in Mansi, x. 463). For his treatment of his successor SEVERUS, and his three suffragans, see that article. He was recalled probably in A.D. 588, and certainly before the middle of A.D. 590, as ROMANUS had then been exarch for some time. Smaragdus was reappointed about A.D. 602 (Paulus Diac. iv. 25). Unsuccessful in the war with the Lombards, after losing Cremona, Mantua and some smaller places, in November A.D. 603 he obtained a truce till April A.D. 605 (Gregorius, *Epp.* xiv. 12) by surrendering the king's daughter and her husband and children, who had been taken prisoners, and in the following November the truce was renewed for one, and then for three years. In June A.D. 603 Gregory the Great wrote to him (*Epp.* xiii. ind. vi. 33) to commend him for his zeal in endeavouring to terminate the schism, and to ask him to protect FIRMINUS (8) of Trieste against the machinations of SEVERUS. After the death of SEVERUS, Smaragdus compelled the bishops of Istria to elect Candidianus as patriarch in his stead, having his seat at Grado. (*Ep. Joannis* in Baronius xi. 77). The date of his recall is uncertain, but it was probably about A.D. 610 or 611. (Ersch and Gruber, *Encyc.* xxxix. 313, &c.). [F. D.]

SMARAGDUS (2), 4th abbat of St. Michael (Saint-Mihiel) in the diocese of Verdun, author and grammarian. Considering the extent of his works and the comparative lateness of his epoch, very little is known of him. He was probably born about 760, but his earliest appearance in history is in the dedication of his *Via Regia*. From the fact that Charles the Great, to whom it was addressed, appears to have been already crowned king of the Lombards, but not yet emperor, the date of its publication may be assigned to the close of the 8th century. It may have been in reward for the compliment, that, some time before 805, he became abbat of Saint-Mihiel, a monastery founded about the commencement of the 8th century, and originally known as Castellion from the mountain on which it was built, and Marsoupe, or Massoupe, from a stream having its rise in the neighbourhood. (For its history, see *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 1270 seqq., and for its legendary origin the *Chronicon Monast. S. Michaelis* in Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta*, Paris, 1723, p. 350 seqq., and Hauréau, *Singularités Historiques*, p. 100). Here he doubtless took charge of the monastery school. In 809 the church in France was agitated with the '*Filioque*' controversy, and Charles resolved to send a deputation to pope Leo III. on the subject [LEO III.]. The emperor's letter to the

pope, which marshals the arguments from the Scriptures and the fathers in favour of the addition, was composed by Smaragdus, who accompanied the mission, and reduced to writing the conference between the pope and the delegates (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcviii. 923 seqq.; cii. 971 seqq.). From the charters of Louis the Pious in favour of his monastery (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cii. 975–80), it appears that he enjoyed equal favour after Charles's death, though, with the exception of a mission to Moyen-Moûtier, to compose differences which had arisen between the abbat and his monks, in 814, and an attendance at the council of Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, he appears to have passed the remainder of his life in his monastery. This he moved from its hill-site to a more convenient place on the banks of the Meuse in 819, where it became a famous Benedictine abbey, and gave its name to a town that grew up around it. The exact year of Smaragdus's death is unknown, but the day is marked on Oct. 29 in the necrology of the monastery. He was buried in the cemetery of the old foundation, where a few monks still remained to perform the office. His epitaph, which qualifies him as 'Theologus,' survives (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 441).

Works.—His published works occupy nearly a thousand columns in Migne's *Patrologia Latina* (cii. 13–976). The first in order, though not the earliest, is the *Collectiones in Epistolas et Evangelia* (13 seqq.), consisting of commentaries drawn from the works of the Fathers upon the Epistles and Gospels for the year. Among the Fathers whom he enumerates in his preface, as the sources of his commentary, is one Figulus, who is not otherwise known to us. At the end of the volume are published some *notanda* by Dom Pitra to these *Collationes* (1111 seqq.). The Collationes are followed by the *Diadema Monachorum* (593 seqq.), a treatise of 100 chapters on the whole duty of the monk, the virtues to be aimed at and the vices to be avoided, a work of little originality or interest. The *Commentaria in Regulam S. Benedicti* (689 seqq.) are preceded by a metrical preface eulogizing the Rule. The work was undertaken to settle the meaning of certain passages in the Rule which differing commentators had rendered uncertain. It has been erroneously printed among the works of Rabanus Maurus. The *Via Regia* (931 seqq.) was probably the first, and is the most interesting, of his works. Part of the dedicatory letter being missing, there has been some discussion whether the prince to whom it was addressed is Charles or his son, Louis the Pious, but internal evidence leaves little doubt it was the former (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 441 seqq.; Ceillier, xii. 255). It consists of thirty-two chapters, each having for its subject some excellence which the good prince will seek to attain or some fault which he will avoid. Hauréau considers it one of the best writings of the 9th century, and in illustration of its originality, quotes the chapter on slavery, in which, after exhorting the king to forbid slavery throughout his realm, Smaragdus has the following remarkable words for the time, "Conditione enim aequaliter creati sumus, sed aliis alii culpa subacti" (cap. xxx., coll. 968; Hauréau, *ibid.* p. 115). For the various editions of these works, see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 441 seqq. Smaragdus also wrote a Commentary, or Gloss, on the *De octo partibus Orationis* of Donatus. This has never been published, but from the preface, printed by Mabillon in his *Vetera Analecta* (p. 357) it appears that it was composed at the instance of his companions, to whom he taught grammar, and that he had drawn his examples, not from Cicero, Virgil, and other Pagans, as his predecessors, but from the Scriptures. Honorius of Autun, who wrote in the 12th century, says "Grammaticam Majorem Donatum exponendo explicuit" (*De Script. Eccles.* iv. 6, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxxii. 230), and Hauréau, who has apparently read the work, points to the numerous existing MS. copies of the 9th and 10th centuries as attesting its early popularity. It displays a profound knowledge of the Latin language, but its philology, as might be expected, is defective (ibid. p. 103 seqq.).

[S. A. B.]

SNEDBRANUS, bishop of Kildare, died A.D. 787. (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 786; Cotton, *Fast. Hib.* ii. 224.) [J. G.]

SOBIAI. [ELKESAITES, Vol. II. p. 96 a.]

SOCRATES (1), bishop of Laodicea in Syria Prima, the predecessor of EUSEBIUS (48) (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32). [C. H.]

SOCRATES (2), one of the most interesting and valuable historians of the early Christian age, was born at Constantinople, and, as is generally supposed, about the beginning of the reign of Theodosius the younger, A.D. 408. He tells us himself that he was educated in the city of his birth under Helladius and Ammonius, two heathen grammarians, who had been compelled to flee from Alexandria in order to escape the displeasure of the emperor. They had been guilty of many acts of cruel retaliation upon the Christians there, who had risen for the overthrow of their idols and temples (*Hist.* v. 16). When the education of Socrates as a boy was completed he studied rhetoric, assisted Troilus the rhetorician and sophist, and entered the legal profession. From this last circumstance he received the name of Scholasticus, the title for a lawyer. His life was spent at Constantinople, and he himself assigns this as the reason why, in his history, he occupies himself so much with the affairs of that city. "No wonder," he says, "that I write more fully of the famous acts done in this city (Constantinople), partly because I beheld most of them with my own eyes, partly because they are more famous and thought more worthy of remembrance than many other acts" (*Hist.* v. 23). In these words we see the true spirit of the historian, and the anxiety to be correct in his narratives that distinguished their author. How sincere in this respect the desire of Socrates was, is shown by his use of similar expressions in the beginning of the 6th book of his history, when he tells us that he had a greater liking for the history of his own than of bygone times, because he had himself either seen it or learned it from eyewitnesses. A certain Theodorus, of whom nothing appears to be known, encouraged him to take up his pen as a historian of the Church. His object was to enter upon this field at the point at which it had been left by Eusebius, and to continue the

history to his own day. His work is divided into seven books, beginning with the time when Constantine was proclaimed emperor, A.D. 306, and extending to A.D. 439, a period of 133, or, as he himself calls it, in round numbers, 140 years. Love of history and admiration of Eusebius seem to have combined with the exhortations of Theodorus in leading him to devote himself to his task. In addition to this, however, it is worthy of notice that, especially in his first two books, Rufinus appears to have exercised considerable influence over him. But at that point, the writings of Athanasius and the letters of other celebrated men coming into his hands, he discovered that Rufinus had been misinformed on many points, and had misled him. His own statement accordingly seems to imply that he wrote his first two books over again, that he might have the satisfaction of knowing that he had set forth the history "in a most absolute and perfect manner" (*Hist.* ii. 1).

Of the style which Socrates thought it proper to adopt we have a most interesting account from his own pen; and, as it throws light not merely on his style, but on his whole spirit and method as a historian, it may be well to quote it. Addressing Theodorus he says, "But I would have you know, before you read my books, that I have not curiously addicted myself unto a lofty style, neither unto a glorious show of gay sentences; for so peradventure, in running after words and phrases, I might have missed of my matter and failed of my purpose and intent. . . . Again, such a penning profiteth very little the vulgar and ignorant sort of people, who desire not so much the fine and elegant sort of phrase, as the furtherance of their knowledge and the truth of the history. Wherefore, lest that our story should halt of both sides, and displease the learned, in that it doth not rival the artificial skill and profound knowledge of ancient writers, the unlearned, in that their capacity cannot comprehend the substance of the matter by reason of the painted rhetoric and picked sentences, I have tied myself unto such a mean as that, though the handling be simple, yet the effect is soon found and quickly understood" (*Hist.* vi. preface).

Such, then, was the object which Socrates had in view, and such the manner in which he proposed to accomplish it. His matter was to be chiefly the affairs of the Church, but not to the complete exclusion of "battles and bloody wars," for he thought that even in these there was something worthy to be recorded. He believed that the narrative of such events would help to relieve the weariness which might overcome his readers if he dwelt only on the consideration of the bishops' affairs, and their practices everywhere one against another. Above all, he had observed that the weal of Church and State were so closely bound up together that the two were either out of joint at the same time, or that the misery of the one followed closely the misery of the other (*Hist.* v. preface). It was the troubles of the Church, too, that he desired chiefly to record. His idea was that, when peace prevailed, there was no matter for a historiographer; and there is a sadness in the unconsciously satirical judgment pronounced by him on the times which he had reviewed when, at the end of his history, he says, "There would have been no matter for my pen if such as set their minds on sedition and discord had been at peace and unity among themselves" (*Hist.* vii. 47).

One important qualification which Socrates possessed for the task which he undertook consisted in his being a layman. This in no degree hindered his capability of forming a correct judgment on the theological controversies recorded by him, for it was around these that the main interest of lay as well as clerical Christians centred in his days, and they were thoroughly understood by all educated Christian men. At the same time his lay position and training unquestionably helped to raise him above the bitter animosities and the persecuting spirit of his age; showed him what an amount of hairsplitting there was in not a few of the disputes which then filled the world with dismay, and not unfrequently with bloodshed; and taught him that recognition of good in those from whom he differed, which forms one of the most pleasing characteristics of his history. His impartiality of spirit, indeed, has exposed him to that charge of heresy which has been brought against moderate men in every age of the Church. He saw, and ventured to own, that there was some good in the Novatians, and especially in several of their bishops. A fault of this kind ecclesiastical orthodoxy seldom pardons, and he has been accordingly often charged with Novatianism. Good grounds for the charge hardly seem to exist. His history shows little, if any, reason why we should doubt his orthodoxy, and his recognition of good qualities in his opponents ought to be ascribed to the impartiality of his spirit rather than the unsoundness of his faith. Tillemont's censure may thus be accepted as praise: "Socrates was a lawyer, and very ignorant of the spirit and discipline of the Church. Hence it comes to pass that he commends equally either Catholics or heretics when they did things which seemed to him to be commendable." (Quoted in Jortin's *Eccles. Hist.* ii. 120.) His greatest weakness was one from which even the most enlightened men of his age were not free, the giving too easy credence to miraculous stories. These he was always ready to receive, and there are many scattered throughout his pages quite as improbable and foolish as those found in the most superstitious writers of his time.

Along with all this, however, Socrates often displays a singular propriety of judgment, while the occasional reflections and digressions in which he indulges constitute one of the most interesting and instructive parts of his history. Thus his defence of the study by Christians of the writers of heathenism may to this day be read with profit, and it may be doubted if much more can even now be added to the argument (*Hist.* iii. 14). His chapter, too, on ceremonies, on their place in the Christian system, on the ground of their obligation, and on their relation to the true word of the gospel shows an enlargement and enlightenment of mind worthy of our highest admiration (*Hist.* v. 21). More than fourteen centuries have passed away since the words were written, and yet there is perhaps hardly a church on earth, there are only individual Christians scattered here and there throughout the world that practically understand or appreciate them. His whole his-

tory also shows how keen an eye he had for the mischief done by heated ecclesiastics, and for the unworthy motives by which they are frequently swayed. There is keen irony, *e.g.* in his description of the spirit that brought many of them to the council of Chalcedon summoned for the deposition of Chrysostom, "But above all other men they came thither apace which for divers quarrels owed John a displeasure" (*Hist.* vi. 14).

There are many points for which the student will find the History of Socrates valuable. Among these the following may be noted. It contains a large number of original documents, such as decrees of councils and letters of emperors and bishops. It gives many important details with regard to the councils of Nicaea, Chalcedon, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Ephesus, &c.; with regard to the emperors of the time treated of; with regard to the most distinguished bishops, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzum, Ambrose, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Cyril, &c.; with regard to the Egyptian monks and their miracles; with regard to Ulphilas, bishop of the Goths, and the famous Hypatia. It embraces also some important statements on the independence of Rome claimed by the Eastern Church, and the encroachments of the Roman see upon the latter; on the beginnings of the secular power of the Roman church; and on the introduction of some of those disciplinary arrangements by which Rome has most of all enslaved her members. The progress of the Gospel too amongst the Goths, Saracens and Persians is largely treated of; much is said of the persecutions of the Jews, and valuable chapters will be found on the progress of the Eastern controversy.

An interesting edition of the History of Socrates along with the histories of other early writers was published by R. Stephens at Paris, A.D. 1544. This was followed by an edition in Latin as well as Greek by Christophorsonus and Suffridus Petrus at Col. Allob., A.D. 1612. Another Greek and Latin edition, with notes, by Valesius, was published at Paris in 1668, and this edition was repeated at Cambridge in 1720, and in Migne's *Patrol. Graec.* (t. lxvii.) in 1859. In 1853 appeared the Greek and Latin edition of R. Hussey, Oxf., 3 vols. 8vo. There is a French translation by Ludovicus Cyaneus, Paris, 1568, a German translation by Caspar Hedio, 1645; and a translation into English, from which the extracts in this article are for the most part taken, by Meredith Hanmer, Professor of Divinity. This last was published in London by Field, A.D. 1619. [W. M.]

SOCRATITAE, given by Epiphanius (*Ancor.* 13), and after him by Joannes Damascenus (*Haer.* 26) as the name of a Gnostic sect. In the corresponding passage of the *Panarion* (*Haer.* xxvi. 3), this name does not occur. [G. S.]

SOLENNIS (SOLEMNIS, SOLEMPNIUS, SOLENNIUS, SOLEMPIUS), fourteenth bishop of Chartres, succeeded Palladius after A.D. 480, but the historical points in his life it is difficult to fix in the diffuse unhistorical *Acta*. He was made bishop of Chartres by command of Clovis I., and was associated with Remigius in Clovis' baptism, A.D. 496. He seems to have died in the beginning of the following century, after naming Adventinus his successor. His feast is Sept. 25. (There is a Life in Surius, *Vit. SS.* ix. 268 sq.; two Lives in Boll. *AA. SS.* Sept. vii. 62 sq., with *Historia Translationis reliquiarum* and *Miracula*, all being preceded by *Comment. Praev.* in 2 sections; see also *Hist. Litt. de la France*, vii. 607; *Gal. Christ.* viii. 1095.) [J. G.]

SOLOMON. [SALOMON.]

SOLIASSUS, one of Felicissimus' excommunicated partisans, a banished confessor; Cyp. *Ep.* 42 (see AUGENDUS); called in MSS. Budinarius (*conj.* Burdonarius, mule-owner; Butinarius, "a maker of Butinae, bottles." Goldhorn refers to Salmas. *ad Script. Hist. Aug.* (Lugd. 1671) ii. p. 578, who interprets a maker of *Acetabula*, small measures. See also DUCANGE. The name Soliassus seems not to be found in inscriptions. [E. W. B.]

SOLUS (SOLA), ST., hermit, an Englishman by birth, followed St. Boniface to Germany and was ordained by him during the reign of Pippin. He retired to a hermitage in the pinewoods between the hills and the Altmuhl, at the place which after him was called Solenhofen, between Nuremberg and Augsburg. His fame reached the ears of Charles the Great, who granted him the site of his hermitage. This, with the land the country people gave him, he made over to the monastery of Fulda, of which it became a cell. He died about A.D. 790 on December 3rd, on which day he is commemorated. His life was written in the next century by Ermanric, abbat of Elwangen, who professes to have received his information from an aged servant of Solus. (Mabillon, *AA. SS. Ord. Ben.* iii. 2. 429). [F. D.]

SOLUTOR, Nov. 20, martyr with Octavius and Adventor. They are regarded as the patrons of Turin, and are supposed to have belonged to the Thebaean Legion. They are praised by Maximus of Turin in cent. v. Baronius testifies that their manuscript acts were preserved at Turin. (*Mart.* Usuard.; Ceill. x. 322.) [G. T. S.]

SONNATIUS, 21st archbishop of Rheims (circ. A.D. 594–631), was deacon and archdeacon under his predecessor, who intrusted him with a mission to Childebert II., to obtain restitution of some of the lands of the see, and confirmation of his will. As archbishop, he presided over more than forty bishops at the council of Rheims, which is usually fixed in 625, and the canons of which we owe to Flodoard. He increased the possessions of the see by purchase and exchange; and by his will, the provisions of which are also given by Flodoard, he made gifts to various churches, especially that of St. Remigius, where he directed that he should be buried (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 4, 5; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 18; Ceillier, xii. 914). There have been published under Sonnatius' name some *Statuta Synodalia* (see Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 443) comprising rules of ecclesiastical discipline and practice. But Flodoard knows nothing of them, and internal evidence points to a later date for their composition (cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 538–41; Ceillier, xi. 693). In the 12th century supposed miracles at his tomb attested the sanctity of Sonnatius, and his relics were removed to the cathedral in 1204, where, however, they were afterwards burnt. He is

numbered among the Beati, his day being Oct. 20 (Boll. *Acta SS.* viii. 899–903). [S. A. B.]

SOPATER, governor of Armenia at the time of Chrysostom's banishment. Chrysostom says of him that he presided over the province like a father, being the common refuge of the poor and distressed, and that he exhibited more than fatherly kindness towards himself (Chrys. *Epp.* 64, 14). He had a son residing at Constantinople to prosecute his studies, whom Chrysostom commends to the kind offices of a bishop named Cyriacus, requesting him to introduce the young man to the magistrates and his own friends, and enable him thus through the son to repay his debt to the father. (Chrys. *Ep.* 64.) [E. V.]

SOPHIA (1) (or ACHAMOTH, Ἀχαμώθ) is a mythological person in the Ophitic and Valentinian Gnosticism. The name (Σοφία) was borrowed from the Old Testament. In the Proverbs of Solomon (c. viii.) Wisdom (the noun is feminine) is described as God's Counsellor and Workmistress (Master-workman, R.V.), who dwelt beside Him before the Creation of the world and sported continually before Him. In accordance with this description, the Jewish Alexandrine religious philosophy was much occupied with speculations about the Divine *Sophia*, as the revelation of God's inward thought, and assigned to her not only the formation and ordering of the natural universe (comp. Clem. Hom. xvi. 12), but also the communication of all insight and knowledge to mankind. The oldest, the Syrian Gnosis, which sought by an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament to ground its phantasies on holy scripture, readily appropriated these notions, and took special delight in referring to the *Sophia* the formation of the lower world and the production of its rulers the Archontes; but along with this they also ascribed to her the preservation and propagation of the spiritual seed. In accordance with the description given in the Book of Proverbs, a dwelling-place was assigned to the Sophia, and her relation to the upper world defined as well as to the seven planetary powers which were placed under her. The seven planetary spheres or heavens were for the ancients the highest regions of the created universe. They were thought of as seven circles rising one above another, and dominated by the seven star spirits (called Archontes). These constituted the (Gnostic) Hebdomad. Above the highest of them, and over-vaulting it, was the Ogdoad, the sphere of immutability, which was nigh to the spiritual world, as Clemens Alexandrinus asys (Strom. iv. 25, 161; comp. vi. 16, 138 sqq.). Now we read in Prov. ix. 1: ἡ σοφία ᾠκοδόμησεν ἑαυτῇ οἶκον καὶ ὑπήρεισε στύλους ἑπτά. These seven pillars being interpreted of the planetary heavens, the habitation of the Sophia herself was placed above the Hebdomad in the Ogdoad (*Excerpt. ex Theodot.* 8, 47). It is said further of the same divine wisdom (Prov. viii. 2): ἐπὶ τῶν ὑψηλῶν ἄκρων ἐστίν, ἀνὰ μέσον δὲ τῶν τρίβων ἔστηκεν, παρὰ γὰρ πύλαις δυναστῶν παρεδρεύει, ἐν δὲ εἰσόδοις ὑμνεῖται. This meant, according to the Gnostic interpretation, that the Sophia has her dwelling-place "on the heights" above the created universe, in the place of the midst, between the upper and lower world, between the Pleroma and the ἐκτισμένα. She sits at "the gates of the mighty," *i.e.* at the approaches to the realms of the seven Archontes, and at the "entrances" to the upper realm of light her praise is sung. The Sophia is therefore the highest ruler over the visible universe, and at the same time the mediatrix between the upper and the lower realms. She shapes this mundane universe after the heavenly prototypes, and forms the seven star-circles with their Archontes under whose dominion are placed, according to the astrological conceptions of antiquity, the fates of all earthly things, and more especially of man. She is "the mother" or "the mother of the living" (Epiph. *Haer.* 26, 10). As coming from above, she is herself of pneumatic essence, the μήτηρ φωτεινή (Epiph. 40, 2) or the ἄνω δύναμις (*Epiph.* 39, 2), from which all pneumatic souls draw their origin. This view was in the Ophitic system combined with another. In striving to reconcile the doctrine of the pneumatic nature of the Sophia with the dwelling-place assigned her, according to the Proverbs, in the kingdom of the midst, and so outside the upper realm of light, men came to the assumption of a descent of Sophia from her heavenly home, the Pleroma, into the void (κένωμα) beneath it, and were led on to inquire into the causes of this her humiliation. The first thought which suggested itself was that of a seizure or robbery of light, or of an outburst and diffusion of light-dew into the κένωμα, occasioned by a vivifying movement in the upper world. But inasmuch as the light brought down into the darkness of this lower world was thought of and described as involved in suffering, the inference was a natural one that this suffering must be regarded as a merited punishment. This inference was further aided by the Platonic notion of a spiritual fall. Alienated through their own fault from their heavenly home, souls have sunk down into this lower world without utterly losing the remembrance of their former state, and filled with longing for their lost inheritance, these fallen souls are still striving upwards. In this way the Mythus of the fall of Sophia came to be regarded as having a typical significance. The fate of the "mother" was regarded as the prototype of what is repeated in the history of all individual souls, which, being of a heavenly pneumatic origin, have fallen from the upper world of light their home, and come under the sway of evil powers, from whom they must endure a long series of sufferings till a return into the upper world be once more vouchsafed them. But whereas, according to the Platonic philosophy, fallen souls still retain a remembrance of their lost home, this notion was preserved in another form in Christian circles. It was consequently taught that the souls of the Pneumatici, having lost the remembrance of their heavenly derivation, required to become once more partakers of Gnosis, or knowledge of their own pneumatic essence, in order to make a return to the realm of light. In the impartation of this Gnosis consists, according to the doctrine common to all Gnostics, the redemption brought and vouchsafed by Christ to pneumatic souls. But the various fortunes of such souls were wont to be contemplated in those of this mythical personage Sophia, and so it was taught that the Sophia also needed the redemption wrought by Christ,

by whom she is delivered from her ἄγνοια and her πάθη, and will, at the end of the world's development, be again brought back to her long lost home, the Upper Pleroma, into which this mother will find an entrance along with all pneumatic souls her children, and there, in the heavenly bridal chamber, celebrate the marriage feast of eternity.

The Sophia-mythus has in the various Gnostic systems undergone great variety of treatment. In those described by Irenaeus, the cosmogonies of Syrian Paganism have a preponderating influence. In them, the great Mother-principle of the universe appears as the first woman, the Holy Spirit (rūḥā d'qudshā) moving over the waters, and is also called the mother of all living. Under her are the four material elements—water, darkness, abyss, and chaos. With her, combine themselves the two supreme masculine lights, the first and the second man, the Father and the Son, the latter being also designated as the Father's ἔννοια. From their union proceeds the third imperishable light, the third man, Christ. But unable to support the abounding fulness of this light, the mother in giving birth to Christ, suffers a portion of this light to overflow on the left side. While, then, Christ as δεξιός (He of the right hand) mounts upward with his mother into the imperishable Aeon, that other light which has overflowed on the left hand, sinks down into the lower world, and there produces matter. And this is the Sophia, called also Ἀριστερά (she of the left hand), Προύνεικος and the man-woman. There is here, as yet, no thought of a fall, properly so called, as in the Valentinian system. The power which has thus overflowed leftwards, makes a voluntary descent into the lower waters, confiding in its possession of the spark of true light. It is, moreover, evident that though mythologically distinguished from the *humectatio luminis* (ἰκμὰς φωτός), the Sophia is yet, really nothing else but the light-spark coming from above, entering this lower material world, and becoming here the source of all formation, and of both the higher and the lower life. She swims over the waters, and sets their hitherto immoveable mass in motion, driving them into the abyss, and taking to herself a bodily form from the ὕλη. She compasses about, and is laden with material every kind of weight and substance, so that, but for the essential spark of light, she would be sunk and lost in the material. Bound to the body which she has assumed and weighed down thereby, she seeks in vain to make her escape from the lower waters, and hasten upwards to rejoin her heavenly mother. Not succeeding in this endeavour, she seeks to preserve, at least, her light-spark from being injured by the lower elements, raises herself by its power to the realm of the upper region, and these spreading out herself she forms out of her own bodily part, the dividing wall of the visible firmament, but still retains the *aquatilis corporis typus*. Finally seized with a longing for the higher light, she finds, at length, in herself, the power to raise herself even above the heaven of her own forming, and to fully lay aside her corporeity. The body thus abandoned is called "Woman from Woman." The narrative proceeds to tell of the formation of the seven Archontes by Sophia herself, of the creation of man, which "the mother" (i.e. not the first woman, but the Sophia) uses as a mean to deprive the Archontes of their share of light, of the perpetual conflict on his mother's part with the self-exalting efforts of the Archontes, and of her continuous striving to recover again and again the light-spark hidden in human nature, till, at length, Christ comes to her assistance and in answer to her prayers, proceeds to draw all the sparks of light to Himself, unites Himself with the Sophia as the bridegroom with the bride, descends on Jesus who has been prepared, as a pure vessel for His reception, by Sophia, and leaves him again before the crucifixion, ascending with Sophia into the world or Aeon which will never pass away. (Irenaeus, i. 30; Epiph. 37, 3, sqq.; Theodoret, h. f. i. 14).

In this system the original cosmogonic significance of the Sophia still stands in the foreground. The antithesis of Christus and Sophia, as He of the right (ὁ δεξιός) and She of the Left (ἡ ἀριστερά), as male and female, is but a repetition of the first Cosmogonic Antithesis in another form. The Sophia herself is but a reflex of the "Mother of all living" and is therefore also called "Mother." She is the formatrix of heaven and earth, for as much as mere matter can only receive form through the light which, coming down from above has interpenetrated the dark waters of the ὕλη; but she is also at the same time the spiritual principle of life in creation, or, as the world-soul the representative of all that is truly pneumatic in this lower world: her fates and experiences represent typically those of the pneumatic soul which has sunk down into chaos. The name given her, Προύνικος or Προύνεικος, is probably meant to indicate her attempts to entice away again from the lower Cosmic Powers the seed of Divine light (cf. Möller, *Geschichte der Kosmologie*, p. 270 sqq.) In the account given by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 37, 6) the allusion to enticements to sexual intercourse which is involved in this name, becomes more prominent. Epiphanius mentions the name Προύνικος as used not only by the Ophites, but also by various other kindred sects—the Simonians (*Haer.* 21, 2,) the Nicolaitans (*Haer.* 25, 3 sq.), and a branch of the Valentinians (*Haer.* 31, 5 sqq.) Nigh related to this is the notion widely diffused among Gnostic sects of the impure μήτρα from whence the whole world is supposed to have issued. As according to the Italian Valentinians the Soter opens the μήτρα of the lower Sophia, (the Ἐνθύμησις), and so occasions the formation of the universe (Iren. I. 3, 4,) so on the other hand the μήτρα itself is personified. So Epiphanius reports (*Haer.* 25, 5) the following cosmogony as that of a branch of the Nicolaitans. "In the beginning were Darkness, Chaos, and Water (σκότος, καὶ βυθὸς καὶ ὕδωρ), but the Spirit indwelling in the midst of them, divided them one from another. From the intermingling of Darkness with Spirit proceeds the μήτρα which again is kindled with fresh desire after the Spirit; she gives birth first to four, and then to other four (read τέσσαρες instead of δεκατέσσαρες) aeons, and so produces a right and a left, light and darkness. Last of all comes forth an αἰσχρὸς αἰών, who has intercourse with the μήτρα, the offspring whereof are Gods, Angels, Daemons, and

Spirits." The Sethians (ap. Pseud-Origen. *Philosophum.* v. 19, p. 144 sq.) teach in like manner that from the first concurrence (συνδρομή) of the three primeval principles arose heaven and earth as a μεγάλη τις ἰδέα σφραγῖδος. These have the form of a μήτρα with the ὄμφαλος in the midst. The pregnant μήτρα therefore contains within itself all kinds of animal forms in the reflex of heaven and earth and all substances found in the middle region. This μήτρα also encounters us in the great Ἀπόφασις ascribed to Simon where it is also called Paradise and Edem as being the locality of man's formation. It is obvious that all these cosmogonic theories have their source or archetype *not* in the Σοφία of the Old Testament but in the Thalatth or Moledet of Syrian paganism, the life-mother of whom Berossus has so much to relate, or in the world-egg out of which when cloven asunder heaven and earth and all things proceed. (Lipsius, *Gnosticismus*, p. 119 sqq.) The name of this Berossian Thalatth meets us again among the Peratae of the Philosophumena (v. 14, p. 128), and is sometimes mistakenly identified with that of the sea—θάλασσα. It seems doubtful whether the name Ἀχαμώθ is originally derived from the Hebrew חָכְמָה, Σοφία in Aramaic Ḥachmūth ܚܟܡܘܬܐ or whether it signifies 'She that brings forth'—'Mother.' (Hahn, *Bardesanes Gnosticus*, p. 64 sqq.). The Syriac form Ḥachmūth is testified for us as used by Bardesanes (Ephraim, *hymn* 55), the Greek form Ἀχαμώθ is found only among the Valentinians: the name however probably belongs to the oldest Syrian Gnosis. A similar part to that of the μήτρα is played by Edem consort of Elohim in the Gnostic book Baruch (*Philosoph.* v. 26, p. 150 sqq.), who there appears as a two-shaped being formed above as a woman and from the middle downwards as a serpent.

Among the four and twenty Angels which she bears to Elohim, and which form the world out of her members, the second female angelic form is called Ἀχαμώς [Ἀχαμώθ]. Like to this legend of the Philosophumena concerning the Baruch-Gnosis is that which is related by Epiphanius of an Ophite Party that they fabled that a Serpent from the Upper World had had carnal intercourse with the Earth as with a woman (*Haer.* 45: 1 cf. 2).

Very nigh related to the doctrines of the Gnostics in Irenaeus are the views of the so-called Barbeliotae (Iren. I. 29). The name Barbelo, which according to the most probable interpretation is a designation of the upper Tetrad [Barbelo], has originally nothing to do with the Sophia. This latter Being called also *Spiritus Sanctus* and *Prunikos* is the offspring of the first angel who stands at the side of the Monogenes. Sophia seeing that all the rest have each its σύζυγος within the Pleroma, desires also to find such a consort for herself; and not finding one in the upper world she looks down into the lower regions and being still unsatisfied there she descends at length against the will of the Father into the deep. Here she forms the Demiurge (the Προάρχων), a composite of ignorance and self-exaltation. This Being, by virtue of pneumatic powers stolen from his mother, proceeds to form the lower world. The mother, on the other hand, flees away into the upper regions and makes her dwelling there in the Ogdoad.

We meet this Sophia also among the Ophians whose "Diagram" is described by Celsus and Origen, as well as among various Gnostic (Ophite) parties mentioned by Epiphanius. She is there called Sophia or Prunikos, the upper mother and upper power, and sits enthroned above the Hebdomad (the seven Planetary Heaven) in the Ogdoad (Origen, *c. Cels.* vi. 31, 34, 35, 38; Epiphan. *Haer.* 25, 3 sqq. 26, 1, 10. 39, 2; 40, 2). She is also occasionally called Παρθένος (Orig. *c. Cels.* vi. 31), and again is elsewhere identified with the Barbelo or Barbero (Epiph. *Haer.* 25, 3; 26, 1, 10).

Cosmogonic myths play their part also in the doctrine of Bardesanes. The *locus foedus* whereon the gods (or Aeons) measured and founded Paradise (Ephraim, *Hymn* 55) is the same as the impure μήτρα, which Ephraim is ashamed even to name (cf. also *Hymn* 14). The creation of the world is brought to pass through the son of the living one and the Rūḥā d' Qudshā, the Holy Spirit, with whom Ḥachmūth is identical, but in combination with "creatures," i.e. subordinate beings which co-operate with them (*Hymn* 3). It is not expressly so said, and yet at the same time is the most probable assumption, that as was the case with the father and mother so also their offspring the son of the Living One, and the Rūḥā d' Qudshā or Ḥachmūth, are to be regarded as a Syzygy. This last (the Ḥachmūth) brings forth the two daughters, the "Shame of the Dry Land" ܒܗܬܬܐ ܕܝܒܫܐ i.e. the μήτρα, and the "Image of the Waters" ܨܘܪܬܐ ܕܡܝܐ i.e. the *Aquatilis Corporis typus*, which is mentioned in connection with the Ophitic Sophia (*Hymn* 55). Beside which, in a passage evidently referring to Bardesanes, air, fire, water, and darkness are mentioned as aeons (Īthyē: *Hymn* 41). These are probably the "Creatures" to which in association with the Son and the Rūḥā d' Qūdshā, Bardesanes is said to have assigned the creation of the world. Though much still remains dark as to the doctrine of Bardesanes we cannot nevertheless have any right (with Hort—"Bardesanes—") to set simply aside the statements of Ephraim, who remains the oldest Syrian source for our knowledge of the doctrine of this Syrian Gnostic, and deserves therefore our chief attentions. Bardesanes, according to Ephraim, is able also to tell of the wife or maiden who having sunk down from the Upper Paradise offers up prayers in her dereliction for help from above, and on being heard returns to the joys of the Upper Paradise (Ephraim, *Hymn* 55).

These statements of Ephraim are further supplemented by the Acts of Thomas in which various hymns have been preserved which are either compositions of Bardesanes himself, or at any rate are productions of his school. (Lipsius, *Apocryphe Apostolgeschichten*, I. pp. 292–321.) In the Syriac text of the Acts published by Dr. Wright (*Apocryphal Acts of Apostles*, pp. 238–245) we find the beautiful *Hymn of the Soul*, which has been sent down from her heavenly home to fetch the pearl guarded by the serpent, but has forgotten here below her heavenly mission till she is reminded of it by a letter from

"the father, the mother, and the brother," performs her task, receives back again her glorious dress, and returns to her old home. Of the other hymns which are preserved in the Greek version more faithfully than in the Syriac text which has undergone Catholic revision, the first deserving of notice is the *Ode to the Sophia* (ap. Bonnet, *Supplementum Codicis apocryphi*, I. p. 8) which describes the marriage of the "maiden" with her heavenly bridegroom and her introduction into the Upper Realm of Light. This "maiden," called "daughter of light," is not as the Catholic reviser supposes the Church, but Ḥachmūth (Sophia) over whose head the "king," i.e. the father of the living ones, sits enthroned; her bridegroom is, according to the most probable interpretation, the son of the living one, i.e. Christ. With her the living Ones i.e. pneumatic souls enter into the Pleroma and receive the glorious light of the living Father and praise along with "the living spirit" the "father of truth" and the "mother of wisdom." The Sophia is also invoked in the first prayer of consecration (Bonnet, p. 20 sq.). She is there called the "merciful mother," the "consort of the masculine one," "revelant of the perfect mysteries," "Mother of the Seven Houses," "who finds rest in the eighth house," i.e. in the Ogdoad. In the second Prayer of Consecration (Bonnet, p. 36) she is also designated, the "perfect Mercy" and "Consort of the Masculine One," but is also called "Holy Spirit" (Rūḥā d' Qudshā) "Revelant of the Mysteries of the whole Magnitude," "hidden Mother," "She who knows the Mysteries of the Elect," and "she who partakes in the conflicts of the noble Agonistes" (i.e. of Christ, cf. *exc. ex Theod.* 58 *ὁ μέγας ἀγωνιστὴς Ἰησοῦς*). There is further a direct reminiscence of the doctrine of Bardesanes when she is invoked as the Holy Dove which has given birth to the two twins (i.e. the two daughters of the Rūḥā d' Qudshā ap. Ephraim, *hymn* 55).

This Mythus of the Soul and her descent into this lower world, with her various sufferings and changing fortunes until her final deliverance, recurs in the Simonian system under the form of the All-Mother who issues as its first thought from the Ἐστώς or highest power of God. She generally bears the name Ἔννοια, but is also called Wisdom (Sophia), Ruler, Holy Spirit, Prunikos, Barbelo. Having sunk down from the highest heavens into the lowest regions, she creates angels and archangels, and these again create and rule the material universe. Restrained and held down by the power of this lower world, she is hindered from returning to the kingdom of the Father. According to one representation she suffers all manner of insult from the angels and archangels bound and forced again and again into fresh earthly bodies, and compelled for centuries to wander in ever new corporeal forms. According to another account she is in herself incapable of suffering, but is sent into this lower world and undergoes perpetual transformation in order to excite by her beauty the angels and powers, to impel them to engage in perpetual strife, and so gradually to deprive them of their store of heavenly light. The Ἐστώς himself at length comes down from the highest heaven in a phantasmal body in order to deliver the suffering Ἔννοια and redeem the souls held in captivity by imparting gnosis to them. The most frequent designation of the Simonian Ἔννοια is "the lost" or "the wandering sheep." The Greek divinities Zeus and Athena were interpreted to signify Ἐστώς and his Ἔννοια, and in like manner the Tyrian sun-god (Herakles-Melkart) and the moon-goddess (Selene-Astarte). So also the Homeric Helena, as the cause of quarrel between Greeks and Trojans, was regarded as a type of the Ἔννοια. The story which the fathers of the church handed down of the intercourse of Simon Magus with his concubine Helena, had probably its origin in this allegorical interpretation. (Iren. i. 23; Tertull. *de Anima*, 34; Epiphan. *Haer.* 21; Pseudo-Tertull. *Haer.* 1; Philaster, *Haer.* 29; Philos. vi. 19, 20, p. 174 sqq.; *Recogn.* Clem. ii. 12; *Hom.* ii. 25; and thereupon Lipsius, *Quellenkritik des Epiphan.* p. 74 sqq.) In the Simonian *Apophasis* the great *δύναμις* (also called Νοῦς) and the great *ἐπίνοια* which gives birth to all things form a syzygy, from which proceeds the man-woman Being, who is called Ἐστώς (*Philos.* vi. 18, p. 172). Elsewhere *νοῦς* and *ἐπίνοια* are called the upper-most of the three Simonian Syzygies, to which the Ἐστώς forms the Hebdomad: but on the other hand, *νοῦς* and *ἐπίνοια* are identified with heaven and earth. (*Philos.* vi. 12 sqq., p. 165 sqq.)

The most significant development of this Sophia-Mythus is found in the Valentinian system (VALENTINUS). The descent of the Sophia from the Pleroma is ascribed after Plato's manner to a fall, and as the final cause of this fall a state of suffering is indicated which has penetrated into the Pleroma itself. Sophia or Μήτηρ is in the doctrine of Valentinus the last, i.e. the thirtieth Aeon in the Pleroma, from which having fallen out, she now in remembrance of the better world which she has thus forsaken, gives birth to the Christus "with a shadow" (*μετὰ σκιᾶς τινος*). While Christus returns to the Pleroma, Sophia forms the Demiurge and this whole lower world out of the *σκιά*, a right and a left principle. (Iren. *Haer.* i. 11, 1.) For her redemption comes down to Sophia either Christus himself (Iren. i. 15, 3), or the Soter (Iren. i. 11, 1, cf. *exc. ex Theod.* 23; 41), as the common product of the Aeons, in order to bring her back to the Pleroma and unite her again with her *σύζυγος*. The motive for the Sophia's fall was defined according to the Anatolian school to have lain therein, that by her desire to know what lay beyond the limits of the knowable she had brought herself into a state of ignorance and formlessness. Her suffering extends to the whole Pleroma. But whereas this is confirmed thereby in fresh strength, the Sophia is separated from it and gives birth outside it (by means of her *ἔννοια*, her recollections of the higher world), to the Christus who at once ascends into the Pleroma, and after this she produces an *οὐσία ἄμορφος*, the image of her suffering, out of which the Demiurge and the lower world come into existence; last of all looking upwards in her helpless condition, and imploring light, she finally gives birth to the *σπέρματα τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, the pneumatic souls. In the work of redemption the Soter comes down accompanied by the masculine angels who are to be the future *σύζυγοι* of the

(feminine) souls of the Pneumatici, and introduces the Sophia along with these Pneumatici into the heavenly bridal chamber (*exc. ex Theod.* 29–42; Iren. i. 2, 3). The same view, essentially meets us in the accounts of Marcus (Iren. i. 18, 4; cf. 15, 3; 16, 1, 2; 17, 1), and in the Epitomators of the Syntagma of Hippolytus (Pseudo-Tertull. *Haer.* 12; Philaster, *Haer.* 38).

The Italic school distinguished on the other hand a two-fold Σοφία, the ἄνω Σοφία and the κάτω Σοφία or Achamoth. According to the doctrine of Ptolemaeus and that of his disciples, the former of these separates herself from her σύζυγος, the θελητὸς through her audacious longing after immediate Communion with the Father of all, falls into a condition of suffering, and would completely melt away in this inordinate desire, unless the Ὅρος had purified her from her suffering and established her again in the Pleroma. Her ἐνθύμησις, on the other hand, the desire which has obtained the mastery over her and the consequent suffering becomes an ἄμορφος καὶ ἀνείδεος οὐσία, which is also called an ἔκτρωμα, is separated from her and is assigned a place beyond the limits of the Pleroma. From her dwelling-place above the Hebdomad, in the place of the Midst, she is also called Ogdoad (Ὀγδοάς), and further entitled Μήτηρ, Σοφία also, and ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, and (ἀρσενικῶς) Κύριος. In these names some partial reminiscences of the old Ophitic Gnosis are retained. The Achamoth first receives (by means of Christus and Πνεῦμα ἅγιον the Pair of Aeons within the Pleroma whose emanation is most recent), the μόρφωσις κατ' οὐσίαν. Left alone in her suffering she has become endued with penitent mind (ἐπιστροφή). Now descends the son as the common fruit of the Pleroma, gives her the μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν, and forms out of her various affections the Demiurge and the various constituents of this lower world. By his appointment the Achamoth produces the pneumatic seed (the ἐκκλησία). The end of the world's history is here also (as above) the introduction of the lower Sophia with all her pneumatic offspring into the Pleroma, and this intimately connected with the second descent of the Soter and his transient union with the psychical Christus; then follows the marriage-union of the Achamoth with the Soter and of the pneumatic souls with the angels. (Iren. i. 1–7; *exc. ex Theod.* 43–65.) The same form of doctrine meets us also in Secundus, who is said to have been the first to have made the distinction of an upper and a lower Sophia (Iren. i. 11, 2), and in the account which the Philosophumena give us of a system which most probably referred to the school of Heracleon, and which also speaks of a double Sophia (*Philos.* vi. 29–35). The name Ἱερουσαλήμ also for the ἔξω Σοφία meets us here (*Philos.* vi. 32, p. 191; 34, p. 193). It finds its interpretation in the fragments of Heracleon (*ap.* Origen. *in Joann. tom.* x. 19). The name Achamoth, on the other hand, is wanting both in Pseud-Origenes and in Heracleon. One school among the Marcosii seems also to have taught a two-fold Sophia. (Iren. i. 16, 3; cf. 21, 5.)

A special and richly coloured development is given to the mythical form of the Sophia of the Gnostic Book *Pistis Sophia* (edd. Schwartze and Petermann, 1851). The two first books of this writing to which the name *Pistis Sophia* properly belongs, treat for the greater part (pp. 42–181) of the Fall, the Repentance, and the Redemption of the Sophia. She has by the ordinance of higher powers obtained an insight into the dwelling-place appropriated to her in the spiritual world, namely, the θησαυρὸς *lucis* which lies beyond the XIIIth Aeon. By her endeavours to direct thither her upward flight, she draws upon herself the enmity of the Ἀὐθάδης, Archon of the XIIIth Aeon, and of the Archons of the XII. Aeons under him; by these she is enticed down into the depths of chaos, and is there tormented in the greatest possible variety of ways, in order that so she may incur the loss of her light-nature. In her utmost need she addresses thirteen penitent prayers (μετάνοιαι) to the Upper Light. Step by step she is led upwards by Christus into the higher regions, though she still remains obnoxious to the assaults of the Archontes, and is, after offering her XIIIth Μετάνοια, more vehemently attacked than ever, till at length Christus leads her down into an intermediate place below the XIIIth Aeon, where she remains till the consummation of the world, and sends up grateful hymns of praise and thanksgiving. The earthly work of redemption having been at length accomplished, the Sophia returns to her original celestial home [PISTIS-SOPHIA]. The peculiar feature in this representation consists in the further development of the philosophical ideas which find general expression in the Sophia-Mythus. Sophia is here not merely, as with Valentinus, the representative of the longing which the finite spirit feels for the knowledge of the infinite, but at the same time a type or pattern of faith, of repentance, and of hope (cf. Köstlin, *das gnostische System des Buches Pistis Sophia* in Baur und Zeller's theol. Jahrbücher, 1854, p. 189). After her restoration she announces to her companions the twofold truth that, while every attempt to overstep the divinely ordained limits, has for its consequence suffering and punishment, so, on the other hand, the divine compassion is ever ready to vouchsafe pardon to the penitent.

We have a further reminiscence of the Sophia of the older Gnostic systems in what is said in the book Pistis-Sophia of the Light-Maiden (παρθένος *lucis*), who is there clearly distinguished from the Sophia herself, and appears as the archetype of Astraea, the Constellation Virgo (Köstlin, l.c. p. 57 sq.). The station which she holds is in the place of the midst, above the habitation assigned to the Sophia in the XIIIth Aeon. She is the judge of (departed) souls, either opening for them or closing against them the portals of the light-realm (pp. 194–295, ed. Schwartze). Under her stand yet seven other light-maidens with similar functions, who impart to pious souls their final consecrations (p. 291 sq. 327 sq. 334). From the place of the παρθένος *lucis* comes the sun-dragon, which is daily borne along by four light-powers in the shape of white horses, and so makes his circuit round the earth (p. 183, cf. p. 18,309).

This light-maiden (παρθένος τοῦ φωτός) encounters us also among the Manichaeans as exciting the impure desires of the Daemons, and thereby setting free the light which has hitherto been held down by the power of darkness. (*Dis-*

putat. Archelai et Manetis, c. 8, n. 11; Theodoret., h. f. I. 26; Anathemat. Manich. ap. Cotelier on the *Recogn.* Clement IV., 27 *et passim*; to which add Thilo, *Acta Thomae*, p. 128 sqq.; Baur, *Manichäische Religionssystem*, p. 219 sqq.) On the other hand, the place of the Gnostic Sophia is among Manichaeans taken by the "Mother of Life" (*μήτηρ τῆς ζωῆς* and *μήτηρ τῶν ὅλων*), and by the World-Soul (*ψυχὴ ἁπάντων*), which on occasions is distinguished from the Life-Mother, and is regarded as diffused through all living creatures, whose deliverance from the realm of darkness constitutes the whole of the world's history. (Titus Bostrenus, *adv. Manich.* I., 29, 36, ed. Lagarde, p. 17 sqq. 23; Alexander Lycopolit. c. 3; Epiphan. *Haer.* 66, 24; *Acta disputat. Archelai et Manetis*, c. 7 sq. et passim; cf. Baur, l. c. p. 51 sqq. 64, 209; Flügel, *Mani*, p. 201 sq. 210, 233.) Their return to the world of light is described in the famous *Canticum Amatorium* (ap. Augustin. c. Faust. xv. 5 sqq.). [R. A. L.]

SOPHIA (2), martyr [FIDES (1).] (Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, pt. ii. vol. i. p. 490, ed. 1885.) [C. H.]

SOPHIA (3), sister of LUCIANUS (10). (Cyp. *Ep.* 21.) [E. W. B.]

SOPHIA (4), empress, wife of JUSTINUS II., was niece of the empress THEODORA (Victor Tun. *Chron.*). She became empress on her husband's accession in November A.D. 565, and exercised great influence during his reign, especially the latter part of it. It was by her advice that Justin selected Tiberius as his successor. It was said that her motive was affection for Tiberius, and the hope of marrying him after Justin's death, and thus continuing empress; but, if so, she was disappointed, as he was already secretly married to Anastasia. He, however, built a palace for her residence, and ordered her to be honoured as the emperor's mother. The story that from jealousy, she then endeavoured to make Justinianus, the grand-nephew of Justinian, emperor instead of Tiberius, comes only from a Latin source (Greg. Tur. v. 31), but that she had Justinus, the other grand-nephew of Justinian, put to death at Alexandria rests on the testimony of Joannes Biclarensis, who was then at Constantinople. Sophia lived till 601, as at Easter that year she joined the empress Constantina in giving the emperor Maurice a crown. It is probably true that she advised the recall of NARSES from Italy, but that she added the famous insult of sending a distaff seems an embellishment (Isidorus, *Chron.*; Fredegarius). Sophia in the third year of her reign caused all the bonds and pledges at Constantinople to be brought to her, and paid off all the sums secured, an act which naturally gained her great popularity (Theophanes, *Chron.*; Corippus, *de Laud. Justini*). [F. D.]

SOPHIANI (*Σοφιανοί*), heretics in the list of Sophronius, between the Sethiani and the Ophitae. (Hard. iii. 1292 A.) The name probably originated as a corruption of Ophiani. [C. H.]

SOPHIAS, of Beneventum, Jan. 24, confounded with St. Cadocus. [CADOC.] (Cf. *AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. ii. 602–606.) [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONAS, an Alexandrian, who accused St. Cyril of tyranny, and prejudiced the mind of the emperor Theodosius against him in the course of the year 430. He was assisted by three others, Queremon, Victor and Flavian, and incited by Nestorius. They are described by their opponents as condemned criminals. (Cyril. *Ep.* 10 al. 8; Ceill. viii. 258.) [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIA (SOPHRONIUM), the second of the noble Roman ladies (Marcella being the first) who made vows of virginity and poverty. She was the instructress of Paula and Eustochium and is highly praised by Jerome (*Ep.* 127 ed. Vall.). [W. H. F.]

SOPHRONIUS (1). Cyp. *Ep.* 42. See AUGENDUS. One of Felicissimus' excommunicated partisans. [E. W. B.]

SOPHRONIUS (2), bishop of Pompeiopolis, in Paphlagonia, and one of the semi-Arian leaders at the synod of Seleucia, A.D. 359. He was deposed for avarice by the Acacian party at a subsequent synod of Constantinople (Socrates, *H. E.* ii. 42; Sozom. *H. E.* iv. 24). [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIUS (3), a disciple of Eustathius of Sebaste, received with his companion Basilius by Basil had into his house on the recommendation of Eustathius in A.D. 372, or 373. Sophronius repaid Basil's hospitality and confidence by a clandestine departure and the spreading of base and unfounded charges against him, which Basil begs Eustathius will check, otherwise there will be an end of their friendship (Basil, *Ep.* 119, [307].) [E. V.]

SOPHRONIUS (4), a native of the Cappadocian Caesarea, an early friend of Gregory Nazianzen and of his brother Caesarius (*ὁ σὸς Καισάριος*, Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 18) and of Basil, whose fellow student he was at the University of Athens. (Basil, *Ep.* 272 [330].) Sophronius devoted himself to an official life, rising from one position to another (*ἀεὶ προΐων ἐπὶ τὰ ἔμπροσθεν*, Greg. Naz.) until he reached the high rank of "Praefectus Urbis" (*Cod. Theod.* vi. p. 385). He was a secretary, in 365, and earned his advance to the praefectship by his promptitude in conveying intelligence of the usurpation of the imperial dignity at Constantinople by Procopius, Sept. 28, 365, to the emperor Valens who was then staying at Sophronius' birthplace, Caesarea, and thus enabling him without delay to prepare for an effective resistance (Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xxv. c. 9). Sophronius is chiefly known to us from letters of his former intimates, Basil and Gregory, soliciting his good services for themselves or others. On the death of Caesarius, the brother of the latter, in A.D. 368, leaving his property to the poor, the administration of it devolving on Gregory, both Gregory and Basil appealed to Sophronius to protect them from the harpies who were threatening by the claims they made on the estate, to leave but little for charity, hardly enough, indeed, to afford his old friend honourable interment (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 18; Basil, *Ep.* 32 [84].) Gregory also wrote to Sophronius on behalf of his nephew Nicobulus, (*Ep.* 107) of Eudoxius, the son of a rhetorician of the same name, his father's equal in eloquence (*Ep.* 108) of his friend Amazonius (*Ep.* 109), and of a young man named Amphilochius.

charged with some malversation of money (*Ep.* 110). After Gregory's return from Constantinople to Arianzus, he writes in A.D. 382 to his old friend complaining that the pleasures of his retirement will hardly compensate for the loss of his society (*Ep.* 59), and again in the same year, on the summoning of the fresh council, imploring him to use his influence to heal the dissensions of the church which arose more out of private pique than from zeal for the truth (*Ep.* 60). Basil's letters include one painting in vivid colours the alarm and distress caused by the proposed division of Cappadocia in A.D. 371, and the loss of dignity which his native city of Caesarea would suffer, and begging Sophronius to use his influence to prevent the measure (Basil, *Ep.* 76 [331]), and another lamenting the loss of Therasius as governor in A.D. 372. (*Ep.* 96, [352].) In others he commends to his kind consideration Eusebius, the victim of an unfounded charge (*Ep.* 177, [334]), and Eumathius who had fallen into great trouble, whose petition he begs he will forward to the emperor. (*Ep.* 180, [333].) It is evident that these requests generally met with a favourable reception and that Sophronius felt pleasure in gratifying his old friend's wishes. (*Ep.* 192, [329].) But towards the close of his life a cloud came over their intercourse. Sophronius had listened too readily to unfounded slanders charging Basil with opposing his wishes in some transaction, and preferring the friendship of a wealthy man named Hymetius to his own. These calumnies Basil indignantly denies, assuring Sophronius that there was no one whose friendship he esteemed more highly, both on account of his personal kindnesses and the benefits he has conferred on his country. (*Ep.* 272, [330].) [E. V.]

SOPHRONIUS (5), possibly the same as the preceding, a supporter of St. Basil against Eunomius [EUNOMIUS (3)] Photius (*Biblioth. Rom.* 5), celebrates his book in defence of St. Basil for its perspicuity, brevity and acumen. Fabricius (*Bib. Graeca*, t. ix. p. 158, ed. Harles), identifies him with SOPHRONIUS (7). [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIUS (6), a monk at Rome, whose discreditable proceedings there are described by Jerome in 384 (*Ep.* 22, § 28). [C. H.]

SOPHRONIUS (7), a learned Greek friend of Jerome, who was with him in the years 391–2, and finds a place in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers. He had, while still young, composed a book on the glories of Bethlehem, and, just before the catalogue was written, a book on the destruction of the Serapeum, and had translated into Greek Jerome's letter to Eustertrium on virginity, his life of Hilarion, and his Latin version of the Psalms and Prophets. These last may be said to owe their existence to him, for Jerome records that it was at his instance that he undertook them. Sophronius had, in dispute with a Jew, quoted some passages in the Psalms, but was met by the reply that the passages were read differently in Hebrew. He therefore urged Jerome to give a version direct from the Hebrew. Jerome yielded, though knowing that the alterations from the received version would cause him some obloquy. The importance of these alterations led Sophronius to translate the versions into Greek. They were well received, and were read in many of the Eastern churches instead of the Septuagint. The translations have not come down to us; but a Greek version of the catalogue of ecclesiastical writers bears the name of Sophronius. It is not quite accurate, but appears to have been the version used by Photius. The presence of his name on this book probably gave rise to its insertion in some MSS. between the names of Jerome, who, however, does not appear to have adopted it. (Jerome *De Vir. Ill.* 134; Jer. *Cont. Ruf.* ii. 24.) For the questions relating to Sophronius, see Ceillier vi. 278, and Vallarsi's preface to Jerome *De Vir. Ill.*) [W. H. F.]

SOPHRONIUS (8), a deacon of Constantinople, a prisoner in the Thebaid for Chrysostom's sake. (Pallad. p. 196.) [E. V.]

SOPHRONIUS (9), a monk, and correspondent of St. Nilus, of Mount Sinai (St. Nili, *Epist.* 34, ed. Allat. [NILUS.] (Ceill. viii. 216.) [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIUS (10), bishop of Tella or Constantina in Osrhoene, first cousin of Ibas, bishop of Edessa. He was present at the synod of Antioch which investigated the case of Athanasius of Perrha, in 445 (Labbe, iv. 728). At the "Robbers' Synod" of Ephesus in 449 (Evagr. *H. E.* 10), he was accused of practising sorcery and magical arts, on the testimony of a boy whom he had initiated in hydromancy, and of collecting astrological books. He had a son named Habil who was charged with introducing a Jew into the episcopal palace, and eating with him, and admitting him into the sanctuary during the celebration of the holy office. The popular indignation caused by this impiety created a disturbance, which ended in the massacre of a large number of persons who had taken refuge in a church by the pagan governor Florus (Martin, *Actes du Brigandage d'Éphèse*, p. 90–93). Sophronius was also accused of Nestorian doctrine. He was not, however, deposed, but on the motion of Thalassius, bishop of Caesarea, his case was reserved for the hearing of the orthodox metropolitan of Edessa, to be appointed in the place of Ibas (*ibid.* p. 94). No further steps appear to have been taken in the matter, and at the council of Chalcedon he took his seat as bishop of Constantia. (Labbe, iv. 81.) His orthodoxy, however, was not beyond suspicion, and in the eighth session, after Theodoret had been reluctantly compelled by the tumultuous assembly to anathematize Nestorius, Sophronius was one of those who were forced to follow his example, with the addition of Eutyches (Labbe, iv. 623). Theodoret wrote a letter to him in favour of Cyprian, an African bishop, driven from his see by the Vandals. (Theod. *Ep.* 53.) (Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 202, 404; *Chron. Edess.*; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* xv. 258, 579, 686; Martin, *le Pseudo-Synode d'Ephèse*, p. 184; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 967.) [E. V.]

SOPHRONIUS (11), a layman of Alexandria, who, with three others, successfully accused the patriarch Dioscurus, in the third session of the general council of Chalcedon. He charged him with violence, adultery, and treason (Mansi, vi. 1030; Hefele's *Councils*, iii. 326, Clark's translation). [G. T. S.]

SOPHRONIUS (12) (SOPHRONUS, Phot.; SOPHISTA), patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 633–637 (Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, ii. 558), the unwearied champion of the orthodox faith against the Monothelitic heresy, not unworthy to be ranked with Athanasius and Cyril among the defenders of the truth against successive depravations. According to the Greek Menaea, Sophronius was born at Damascus, his parents' names being Plintos and Myzo. From the title "Sophista," by which he is usually designated, it is probable that in early life he may have been a teacher of rhetoric. He was the pupil and intimate friend of the celebrated Joannes Moschus, the author of the *Pratum Spirituale*, and accompanied him in his wanderings among the Lauras and ascetic settlements of Egypt and the East. Photius (*Cod.* 198) speaks of Sophronius as the οἰκεῖος μαθητής of Moschus, by whom he is styled ἱερὸν καὶ πιστὸν τέκνον. Moschus was the first to embrace a religious life, which he did c. A.D. 575 in the laura of St. Theodosius, near Jerusalem. At a somewhat later period Sophronius followed his example (*Pr. Spir.* c. 110). He had previously accompanied Moschus in a visit paid by him to Egypt and the Oasis, apparently on monastic business (*Pr. Spir.* c. 112). From the frequent references to Sophronius in Moschus' work, we may gather that the greater part of the next five and twenty years, during which Moschus was principally resident in Palestine, was spent in his society. When the Persians under Chosroes II. were beginning to overrun Syria, c. A.D. 605, the two friends quitted the Holy Land for Alexandria, where they appear to have spent eight years, with frequent journeys to the Thebaid and the Oasis to visit famous ascetics (*Pr. Spir.* 13, 69–73, passim). At Alexandria they formed intimate relations with the patriarch, the celebrated Joannes Eleemosynarius. John, who was more distinguished for his charity and piety than for learning, regardless of the difference of age admitted the two friends to the most unrestricted intimacy, looking up to them as his spiritual fathers and counsellors, and availing himself of their aid in combatting the Severians and other heretics, large numbers of whom they were successful in bringing back to the orthodox faith (Leontius 616, *Vit. Joann. Eleemos.* c. x. num. 60). On John's death, in A.D. 616, we are informed by the *Menaea* that Sophronius delivered his funeral oration. The advance of the Persians about this time drove the friends from Alexandria. They visited Cyprus, Samos, and other islands of the Mediterranean, and finally settled in Rome, where Moschus completed his *Pratum*, which, according to the Latin *Elogium* prefixed to it (Photius, *Cod.* 199), and John of Antioch (*In Monast. Donat.* c. 5, Cotel. *Mon. Graec.* i. 167), he dedicated to his friend, and committed to his keeping on his deathbed. After his decease Sophronius, with twelve fellow-disciples, sailed with the body to Palestine, c. A.D. 620. Sophronius now devoted himself to theological study and literary composition. To this period we may ascribe his *Life of St. Mary of Egypt*, the *Typicon*, the inordinately long and tedious *Lives of St. Cyrus and St. John*, and the greater part of his hagiological and ritual works, as well as the publication of his friend Moschus' *Pratum Spirituale*, Λείμων πνευματικός, or Λειμωναρίοι, which by a singular literary blunder has been ascribed to him as its author by Joannes Damascenus in several places in his book *Pro Imaginibus* (lib. i. p. 238; ii. p. 344; iii. p. 352), as well as by the Fathers of the second Nicene council (Labbe, vii. 759 sq.), and by Nicephorus (*H. E.* viii. 41, ad fin.).

The measures taken by Cyrus, the newly-appointed patriarch of Alexandria, to carry into effect the much desired reunion of the Monophysites with the orthodox church, which was the price of his elevation by Heraclius to so high a dignity (A.D. 630), gave the occasion to Sophronius to appear as the undaunted champion of orthodoxy against the combined power of the chief civil and ecclesiastical rulers of the Christian world, contributing no little by his learning and his courage to the eventual triumph of the faith over the Monothelite heresy. The expression borrowed by Cyrus from the Pseudo-Dionysius of one "divine-human activity," μιὰ θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια, as the instrument of reconciliation, appeared to Sophronius fraught with danger to the truth of our blessed Lord's nature as declared at Chalcedon. To deny the human will in Christ, or even the natural operation of that will, was to detract from his perfect Humanity, and to bring in the old error of Apollinaris under a new and specious form. When, on the summoning of the Synod destined to carry out this compromise, May A.D. 633 (Labbe, v. 1695), the document of nine articles on which the reconciliation was to be based was put into Sophronius' hands by Cyrus for examination, the seventh article asserting that "the one and the same Christ and Son of God wrought both the Divine and the Human actions by one theandric operation," appeared to him so impious that he is recorded to have flung himself with Oriental vehemence at the patriarch's feet, and to have entreated him by the life-giving sufferings of the Saviour not to attempt to impose it on the church (*Disput. S. Maximi cum Pyrrho*, Labbe, v. 1817). His impassioned remonstrances were fruitless. The instrument of reconciliation —the "watery union," ἕνωσις ὑδροβαφής, as the Greeks contemptuously termed it—was rapturously accepted, and thousands of Monophysites in Egypt and the adjacent provinces were brought back into formal union with the orthodox church. Sophronius, shocked at this sacrifice of truth to the peace of the church by an "economy" which he foresaw could only lead to direct Monophysitism—indeed, the Monophysites were everywhere boasting that the church had come over to them, not they to the church—resolved to make a personal appeal from the traitorous patriarch of Alexandria to the patriarch of Constantinople, Sergius. On his arrival at Constantinople Sophronius found that Sergius had already received letters from Cyrus, containing his view of the controversy, and calculated to prejudice the mind of Sergius against him. Sergius fully awake to the peril involved in any attempt dogmatically to define a point of such a mysterious nature when Holy Scripture was silent, endeavoured at once to suppress the controversy. He expressed his dissatisfaction that Sophronius should oppose measures calculated to promote the salvation of thousands now separated from the church, and appealed to him

to substantiate his doctrine of a single will and a single operation by testimonies from the fathers. This Sophronius was not as yet prepared to do. Sergius entreated him to cease from so perilous a controversy, the issue of which could not fail to be injurious. He himself allowed the orthodoxy of the test term "theandric operation" as describing one will and one operation, but he deprecated its introduction into the ordinary language of the church as likely to cause offence to many. When the object sought had been gained, and the Jacobites had become reconciled to the church, he recommended that no further mention should be made of either a single or a twofold will and operation, but that it should be firmly held that the one and the same Christ, the true God, worked both the Divine and the Human, and that all His divine and human operations proceeded equally and entirely from, the same Incarnate Logos. Sophronius, silenced if not satisfied, was in the end induced to promise to cease from prosecuting the discussion. He sailed back to Syria, bearing with him a letter of Sergius' containing his definition of faith (Serg. *Epist. ad Honor.* Labbe, vi. 922). A few months made a great change in Sophronius' position, and rendered him a more formidable adversary. At the end of A.D. 633 (Clinton), or early in 634, he was, much against his will, raised to the patriarchal throne of Jerusalem, as successor of Modestus. His changed position he regarded as releasing him from his promise to Sergius. Silence, which might be pardonable in a private individual, was traitorous in a ruler of the church. The "honey-tongued champion of the truth," μελίγλωσσος τῆς ἀληθείας πρόμαχος (*Lib. Syn.*), at once gathered a synod of his clergy, which pronounced dogmatically for the two wills and the two operations. The acts of this synod he sent to Sergius and to Honorius, bishop of Rome, accompanying them with his own synodical letter, a λόγος ἐνθρονιστικός, announcing his election and declaring his faith (*Liber Synodalis* ap. Labbe, v. 1697; Theophr. *Chronogr.* 274). The length of time required for the production of this prolix and elaborate document—it occupies no fewer than 22 columns in Labbe's *Concilia* (pp. 851 sq.)—caused a delay in the transmission to his brother patriarchs of the usual intimation of his consecration, which gave umbrage to both of them. The letter embodies a detailed profession of faith at great length, which is followed by an elaborate dissertation on the mystery of the Incarnation, and the various heretical views regarding it, which he states minutely and confutes severally. He then states his own belief as to the nature of Christ, which he identifies with that of the Catholic church. The Hypostasis or composite Personality subsists by means of a mixture without composition, and of a conjunction which knows no division. Both natures act each in its own way; they have neither precisely the same modes of action, nor merely one mode of action. But they work in conjunction for one result or work, and so the one Son was known who evolved every activity both divine and human out of Himself, nor can anyone divorce the collective activity from the one Sonship. Dorner remarks (*Person of Christ*, div. 11, vol. i. p. 173 Clark's translation) that "it is clear that Sophronius, with whatever zeal he might assert the duality of the ἐνέργειαι, placed above them the will of the Hypostasis, and in a strict sense attributed to it the sole decision. In reality, therefore, if not in words, he asserts one Will which carries out its volitions by means of the modes of action of both natures, and allots this Will to the One Christ. A duality of wills he never mentions; nor could he in any case have regarded a will of the human nature as, strictly speaking, a free will; he could only have viewed it as an active power which derived its impulse from another source." The document concludes with an immensely long catalogue of heresies, and their several authors, bristling with anathemas, and catathemas and denunciations of eternal perdition, reminding one of Epiphanius. The whole is written in a very turgid, bombastic style, abounding in novelties of expression, which he shows off, as Photius remarks (*Cod.* 231), as a young colt does its prancings, γαυρώμενος τοῖς σκιρτήμασιν. It may be remarked that he asserts Creatianism, and that the bodies with which men will rise will be the same with those in which they lived on earth, and against Origen (whom, strangely enough, he splits into two persons), that the torments of the lost will be never ending (Labbe, *Concil.* vi. 851 sq.; Baron. *Annal.* viii. 310). Before the receipt of the synodical letter Sergius, in alarm at the probable consequences of the elevation of so vehement and uncompromising an opponent to one of the chief sees of the Christian world, applied by way of precaution to Honorius of Rome, informing the pontiff of what had recently occurred, and asking his judgment. Honorius replied on the whole approvingly. But he expressed his alarm at the application of dialectics to such divine mysteries. Refinements of this kind were injurious to the interests of true religion. His own decision was in favour of two natures, each working in its own way, not one only ἐνέργεια, but both governed by one will, producing perfect harmony of action, to which he assigns the Personality. In his second letter to Sergius, written after Stephen of Dor's embassy, Honorius said that instead of teaching one operation it ought rather to be taught that there is one Operator, Christ, Who works by means of both natures, each performing what belongs to it (Labbe, vi. 927 sq.). In the meantime Sophronius had busied himself in compiling a vast body of testimonies to the twofold will of Christ from the writings of the fathers. These, filling two volumes, he sent by the hands of his intimate friend and confidant, Stephen of Dor, to Honorius. He had previously bound Stephen by a tremendous vow, taken in the church of the Resurrection, to maintain the orthodox faith at all risks (Labbe, vi. 103 sq.). Sophronius was prevented from carrying the controversy forward personally by the advance of Omar and his Mahometan forces, who were rapidly making themselves masters of Syria. Honorius returned answer to Sophronius through Stephen that he desired him no longer to insist on the two activities, δύο ἐνέργειαι. Stephen gave this promise in Sophronius' name, but on the proviso that Cyrus also would desist from teaching the μία ἐνέργεια. The rapidly increasing calamities of the Holy Land, however, forbad the patriarch taking any further personal interest in the great question. He had probably died before the

attempted settlement of the controversy by the publication of the "Ekthesis" of Heraclius, probably the work of his old antagonist Sergius. At the Lateran council under Martin I. A.D. 649 Sophronius was most unfairly charged with being the author of the whole of the long-protracted and embittered dispute (Labbe, vi. 103 sq.). We may rather honour him as a courageous and unwearied defender of a vital truth endangered by worldly policy, which sought for seeming strength in an unreal union based on compromise. The last days of Sophronius were overclouded by the ravages of the Mahometans. In A.D. 635 Omar took Damascus, and made himself master of the rest of Palestine with the exception of Jerusalem. Bethlehem being in the hands of the infidels, the inhabitants of Jerusalem were precluded from resorting thither for devotion on Christmas Day, according to their usual custom. Sophronius delivered an impassioned homily on the occasion, graphically describing the calamities which had overtaken the land, and calling the people to repent of the sins which had brought so terrible a punishment on them. Worse was still in store. The Mahometan commander led his army against the Holy City itself. The siege lasted four months. The courage of the defenders, stimulated by the fervent exhortations of the patriarch, inflicted great losses on the assailants. The inevitable issue came at last. Sophronius appeared on the walls, and proposed a capitulation on the condition of Omar himself coming to receive the surrender. Theophanes (*Chron.* p. 282) describes the arrival and demeanour of "the sternly frugal" Omar, who imposed on the patriarch the humiliating duty of acting as his guide to the various sacred sites. Sophronius obeyed, secretly muttering to himself the words of Daniel, concerning "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place," of which he now beheld the fulfilment, when by Omar's command the hallowed site of the Temple was prepared for the erection of the world-famous mosque bearing his name, which some in the present day have so strangely sought to identify with Constantine's church of the Resurrection. The aged patriarch did not long survive the humiliation of that day. The date of his death is uncertain. Baronius places it in 636, the year of the fall of Jerusalem; Pagi and Clinton at the close of 637, and Papebroch in 638. After his death the see continued vacant for 29 years.

Sophronius was a very voluminous writer in various departments of literature, both in prose and poetry. A large number of his productions, some of which exist only in Latin translations, are printed, in Migne's *Patrologia* (Series Graeca, vol. 87, part 3). The following is a list of them:—i. *Epistola Synodica ad Sergium et Honorium;* ii. *Orationes VIII.:* (1) *In Christi Natalitia,* (2) *In Sanctae Deiparae Annuntiationem,* (3) *De Hypante sive Occursu Domini,* (4) *In Exaltationem Sanctae Crucis,* (5) *In Adorationem Crucis,* (6) *De Angelis et Archangelis,* (7) *In S. Joann. Bapt.* (8) *Elogium in Apost. Petr. et Paul.* [of these, 1, 3, 6 exist only in Latin]; iii. *De Peccatorum Confessione,* a penitential chiefly for the use of bishops and priests; iv. *Fragmentum de Baptismate Apostolorum;* v. *Laudes in SS. Cyrum et Joannem;* vi. *Eorundem Miracula* [immensely long narratives filled with stories of the usual ecclesiastical miracles]; vii. *Eorundem Epitome;* viii. *Vita eorundem Acephala;* ix. *Vita S. Mariae Aegyptiacae;* x. A collection of sacred Anacreontic verses: (1) On the *Annunciation,* (2) *Nativity,* (3) *Adoration of the Magi,* (4) *Presentation in the Temple,* (5) *Baptism,* (6) *Raising of Lazarus,* (7) *Christ's Entry into Jerusalem,* (8) *The Lord's Supper,* (9) *St. Paul,* (10) *St. John,* (12) *St. Stephen,* (13) *St. Thecla,* (14, 15, 16 lost), (17) *Moses, Bishop of Ascalon,* (18) *The Holy Cross,* (19, 20, 21) *Description of the sacred places, his longing to return to them,* (22) *On the false accusation of Menes,* (23) *Dialogue between St. Mary and St. Paul;* xi. *Triodium;* xii. *Commentarius Liturgicus,* a spiritual interpretation of the whole ritual and of the instruments of the liturgy; xiii. *Oratio,* extracted from Goar, *Rit. Graec.* p. 456; xiv. *Troparium horarum;* xv. *Epitaphia,* two on Joannes Eleemosynarius; xvi. *Fragmentum dogmaticum contra Eunomium et Aetium;* x.–xvi. were first published by Mai. (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 264 sq.; Baronius, *Annales,* tom. viii.; Papebroch, *in Act. Sanct. ad* xi. *Mart.* tom. ii. p. 51; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* tom. i. p. 579; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* lib. v. c. 24; Neander, *Church History,* vol. v. pp. 229 ff. Clark's Translation; Dorner's *Person of Christ,* div. ii. part 1, pp. 156–154; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* livre 37; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall,* c. 31; Theophanes, *Chronic.*)

[E. V.]

SORANUS, JULIUS, dux of Scythia and a relative of St. Basil, who in 373 exhorted him (ep. 155 *al.* 241) to befriend those who were suffering persecution in Scythia, and begged of him some relics of the martyrs. In 374 Basil wrote to thank him for his fidelity in the persecution, and for having honoured Cappadocia by sending the body of a recent martyr. The martyr is not named, but is believed to be SABAS (1). (Tillem. ix. 8, 194, x. 7; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas,* 83.) [C. H.]

SOSIPATER, a presbyter, to whom one of the pretended letters of Dionysius, the Areopagite, is addressed. [DIONYSIUS (1) in Vol. I. p. 846.] (Ceill. x. 551.) [G. T. S.]

SOTAS (Σωτᾶς), bishop of Anchialus in Thrace, is stated in the letter of Aelius Publius Julius, bishop of Debeltum, quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 19), to have tried to cast the demon out of Priscilla, the Montanist prophetess. Lightfoot suggests (*Ignatius,* ii. 111) that the Sotas of Euseb. v. 19, is possibly identical with the Ζωτικός of the preceding chapter, the interchange of the initial Σ and Z being a common variety of spelling. [MONTANUS, Vol. III. p. 938, a.] [F. D.]

SOTER, bishop of Rome after Anicetus, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, during eight or nine years. As is the case generally with the early bishops, his dates are given variously by ancient authorities. Lipsius (*Chronol. der röm. Bischöf.*) concludes A.D. 166 or 167, and A.D. 174 or 175, to have been probably those of his accession and death. In his time the Aurelian persecution afflicted the church, though there is no evidence of the Roman Christians having suffered under it. But they sympathized with those who did. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 23) quotes a

letter from Dionysius bishop of Corinth to the Romans, in which he acknowledges their accustomed benevolence to sufferers elsewhere, and the fatherly kindness of their bishop Soter: "From the beginning it has been your custom to benefit all brethren in various ways, to send supplies to many churches in every city, thus relieving the poverty of those that need, and succouring the brethren who are in the mines. This ancient traditional custom of the Romans your blessed bishop Soter has not only continued, but also added to, in both supplying to the saints the transmitted bounty, and also, as an affectionate father towards his children, comforting those who resort to him with words of blessing." Eusebius adds that this primitive and laudable custom of the Roman church was continued during the Diocletian persecution. Dionysius of Alexandria also alludes to it in a letter to pope Stephen (253–257), speaking of all Syria and Arabia having been indebted to the liberality of Rome. St. Basil, too, writing to pope Damasus (ep. 70 *al.* 220), speaks of money having been sent by Dionysius bishop of Rome (*circ.* 260) to Caesarea in Cappadocia for the redeeming of captives, with a letter of consolation preserved to the writer's time. Still later, pope Leo I. mentions the custom of making collections at Rome on the Lord's Day for the like benevolent purpose. A further extract given by Eusebius from the letter of the Corinthian Dionysius to Soter informs us that the epistle of the latter which had accompanied the bounty of the Romans had been read in the church of Corinth on the Lord's Day, and would be preserved and continued to be read as that of the Roman Clement to the same church had been.

Montanus advanced his pretensions and views in Asia Minor during the pontificate of Soter; but there is no good evidence of their having been known so far in the west, or of any bishop of Rome before Eleutherus having been called upon to pronounce on them. It is true that the unknown author of the book called *Praedestinatus* (c. 26) states that Soter wrote a treatise against the Montanists.[a] It has been suggested that Soter may have been here written in mistake for Sotas of Anchialos, who is mentioned by Eusebius, though Soter is not, among the opponents of the new sect. But the anonymous writer appears to be generally so unworthy of credit that his testimony is of no value. [MONTANUS; PRAEDESTINATUS.]

With regard to the Easter question, on which Rome was at issue with the Asiatic Quartodecimans, it seems probable that Soter was the first bishop of Rome who was unwilling to tolerate the difference of usage. His immediate predecessor Anicetus had communicated with Polycarp when at Rome, notwithstanding the difference; but Victor, who succeeded Soter's successor Eleutherus, incurred the reproof of St. Irenaeus and others for desiring the general excommunication of the Asiatic churches on account of it; and Irenaeus in his letter of remonstrance to Victor (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24) refers only to the bishops of Rome before Soter, mentioning them by name, and ending his list with Anicetus, as having themselves maintained communion with the Quartodecimans (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24).

Two spurious epistles, one on the doctrine of Incarnation, the other prohibiting females from touching the vessels of the altar, and several decrees, are assigned to this pope. He is said in the Felician Catalogue to have been a Campanian "e civitate Fundis," his father's name being Concordius, and to have been buried beside the body of St. Peter on the Vatican. He is thus noticed in the Roman Martyrology: "Decimo Kal. Maii (Ap. 22) Romae via Appia natalis S. Soteris papae et martyris." [J. B—Y.]

SOTERICUS, archbishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia. He and Philoxenus presided at the Monophysite council of Sidon in the year 511 or 512. (Mansi, t. viii. 371; Hefele's *Councils*, section 225.) [G. T. S.]

SOTERIS, called also SOTHERIS, SOTHERES, and SOTHERA, Feb. 10 (*Mart. Rom.*), May 12 (Adon.), virgin and martyr at Rome in the Diocletian persecution. She was of noble birth, and seems to have been a member of the family from which St. Ambrose was descended. It is to his writings we owe our knowledge of her history. (Ambros. lib. *De Exhortat. Virginit.* cap. 12, and *De Virginibus*, lib. iii. cap. 7.) In this treatise he adduces her example to justify his view that suicide was justifiable on the part of a christian virgin to avoid violation. (Ceill. iii. 28.) [G. T. S.]

SOTION (Σωτίων, Ζωτίων), deacon of Magnesia and one of the deputies of his church who visited Ignatius at Smyrna. In the received text of Ignatius the name occurs as Zotion, though one authority gives Sotion, which also is the usual form of the word in inscriptions, where it is not uncommon. (Ignat. *Ep. ad Magnes.* c. 2 and Lightfoot's note.) On the interchange of the two letters, see SOTAS. [C. H.]

SOZOMEN, author of a well known *Ecclesiastical History*, born about A.D. 400. His full name appears to have been Hermias Sozomenus, to which is sometimes prefixed the epithet Salamanes or Salaminius. The last mentioned designation has led not a few to the idea, that Sozomen was born at Salamis in Cyprus, a place with which the name has absolutely no connection. With much more probability, the name is traced by Valesius to one of the brothers of a family with which Sozomen stood in the closest relation by the ties of spiritual, if not also of earthly, kindred. Fortunately in one of the passages of his ecclesiastical history, Sozomen has left us some notices both of his birth and of the circumstances amidst which he was brought up (v. 15). His family belonged to a small town named Bethelia, near Gaza, in Palestine, where his grandfather had been one of the first to embrace Christianity. An inhabitant of the same place named Alaphion had become possessed with a devil, and had applied in vain to both pagan and Jewish sorcerers or physicians, as the case might be, to deliver him from his plague. At last he besought the

[a] "Vicesima et sexta haeresis Cataphryges orti sunt; qui hoc nomen a provincia non a dogmate adsumpserunt, quorum auctores fuerunt Montanus Prisca et Maximilla. . . . Scripsit contra eos librum Sanctus Soter papa urbis, et Apollonius Ephesiorum antistes." (*Praedestinatus, sive Praedestinatorum haeresis.* Galland. vol. x. p. 357.)

aid of a Christian monk named Hilarion, and he by simply calling upon the name of Christ expelled the demon. The immediate effect was the conversion of the families both of Alaphion and of the grandfather of Sozomen to Christianity. The conversion was genuine. It stood the test of the many discouragements, if not persecutions, which Christians had to encounter at the hands of the emperor Julian, and the faith then embraced was handed down faithfully by one generation to another. Thus Sozomen was born in a Christian family, and nurtured amidst Christian influences. These latter must also have impressed him at an early age with an admiration of the monkish life of the time, for Hilarion the monk had, after curing Alaphion, become the instructor of his family, and of them Sozomen says long afterwards that, when he knew them in his youth, no one could speak in adequate terms of their virtues, and that the first churches and monasteries erected in that country had been founded and supported by their liberality. There is indeed in Sozomen's remarks upon these bygone days something not only exceedingly pleasing, but highly calculated to impress us with a belief in his own sincerity, as when he tells us, in the chapter of his history above referred to, that his grandfather was endowed with great natural ability, which he consecrated especially to the study of the Sacred Scriptures, that he was much beloved by the Christians of these parts, and that his counsel was there looked upon as necessary to the explanation of the Word of God and the unloosing of its difficulties. Certain it is that Sozomen came to the writing of ecclesiastical history in no spirit of indifference. He rather believed in Christianity, and even in the more ascetic forms of it, with a genuine faith; "for I would neither," he says, "be considered ungracious, and willing to consign their virtue (that of the monks) to oblivion, nor yet be thought ignorant of their history; but I would wish to leave behind me such a record of their manner of life that others, led by their example, might attain to a blessed and happy end" (i. 1).

Sozomen was in all probability educated in the first instance, if not in Bethelia itself, at the neighbouring town of Gaza, for some of the memories of his youth, mentioned by himself in his history, are connected with the latter place (vii. 28). From this he would seem to have gone to Berytus, a city of Phoenicia, that he might be trained for the practice of the civil law at its famous school. His education finished he proceeded to Constantinople, and there entered on the studies of his profession (ii. 3).

It was while thus engaged that he formed the plan of his Ecclesiastical History (ii. 3). To this subject he had been attracted both by his own taste and by the example of Eusebius. Preparatory studies had been made by him for his larger work, and at length the latter appeared in nine books, extending over the period from A.D. 323 to A.D. 439. The history was dedicated to Theodosius the Younger. As the work thus covers the same period as that of Socrates, and as both were written about the same time, and bear many resemblances to each other, a question has been raised as to which was the original and which not unfrequently the copyist. Valesius, upon apparently good grounds, gives his verdict against Sozomen, although he allows at the same time that in many passages he both adds to and corrects his authority. Like Socrates, too, Sozomen is habitually trustworthy. Like him he is a conscientious and serious writer; and in his account of the council of Nicaea, which may be taken as a favourable specimen of the character of his work as a whole, he seems to have drawn from the best sources, to have proceeded with care, and to have made a sufficiently good choice among the apocryphal traditions and innumerable legends which in the fifth century obscured the reports of what had passed at this great council (comp. De Broglie, iv. siècle, ii. 431). At the same time it must be allowed that Sozomen has inserted in his history not a little that is trifling and superstitious. His devotion to the monks may account for this. In style he is generally allowed to be superior, but in judgment inferior, to Socrates.

From what has been said it may be gathered that the history of Sozomen is more than usually valuable for the accounts contained in it of the monks. That these are given by an admirer is true, but they are not for that reason to be despised; or, for the same reason, and with the same degree of propriety, we should be entitled to set aside the accounts given by their detractors. Sozomen may have viewed the monastic institutions of his time in the most favourable light, and he may have been indisposed to receive the charges made against them; but it is impossible to read either his repeated notices of them, or his long account of their manners and customs in chap. 12 of book i. of his history, without feeling that we have in such passages statements in regard to the nature and influence of monasticism in that age, which cannot be neglected by any one who would form an impartial judgment upon the point. In addition to this, the history before us is of great moment for not a few important particulars concerning both the events and the men of the time to which it relates. Mention may be made in particular of the council of Nicaea, of the persecutions of the Christians, of the general progress of the gospel, of the conversion of Constantine, of the history of Julian, of the illustrious Athanasius, and of many bishops and martyrs of the age. It contains also a number of original documents.

An edition of Sozomen's history was published in Greek at Paris in 1544; and another, with a Latin translation, by Christophorsonus and Suffridus Petrus, at Cologne, in 1612. The best edition, that of Valesius, appeared at Paris in 1668, and was followed by one, with the notes of Valesius, at Cambridge, in 1720. The edition of Hussey (Oxon. 1860) ought also to be mentioned. Various Latin translations are also in existence, and a translation into English for Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library, 1855, deserves high commendation. [W. M.]

SPARTIANUS, AELIUS, one of the six writers of the Augustan history. In the *Dictionary of Classical Biography* there will be found an account of these writers under the names CAPITOLINUS and SPARTIANUS. Their writings are also of very great value to the ecclesiastical historian, and often form his only source of information upon the relations of the church to the Roman state, though now likely to be largely

supplemented by the series of edicts from Domitian to Heraclius lately found in the Fayûm in Egypt (cf. *Contemp. Review*, Dec. 1884, p. 908). Of the six writers, three wrote under Diocletian. They were Spartianus, Volcatius Gallicanus and Trebellius Pollio. Spartianus was probably an officer of the imperial chancery. He began apparently with the intention of writing the lives of all the emperors from Nerva to Diocletian. We now possess, however, mere fragments of his work. And indeed it is only with difficulty we can designate the biographies which are due to him, as there is considerable confusion between the names Aelius Lampridius and Aelius Spartianus. He certainly wrote the lives of Hadrian, Aelius Verus, Septimius Severus, and Pescennius Niger. He probably wrote those of the Antonines, Pius and Marcus, L. Aur. Verus, Albinus and Macrinus. Interesting particulars about the early church can be gleaned from all these writings. The following are some of the principal references to Christianity in the Augustan historians. Lampridius tells us of Alexander Severus that he placed images of Christ and of Abraham in his private oratory. He also wished to erect temples to Christ and enroll him among the gods, an attempt which Hadrian is also said to have made. Hadrian went so far as to build temples without images for the worship of Christ, which were still in existence, and were called Hadriani; but was dissuaded from proceeding farther by the representations of persons, who told him that all men would become Christians, and all other temples would be deserted. Lampridius also tells of the concession by Severus of a site for a Christian church in opposition to the corporation of cooks, who claimed the ground as their property; and of his reference to the care taken by the Christians in ordaining only men of good character to the ministry. Flavius Vopiscus of Syracuse tells us about Saturninus, whom Aurelian sent as ruler of the East. The emperor, knowing his ambitious character, directed him never to enter Egypt because the population was turbulent and revolutionary, being composed of Christians, Samaritans, and other explosive elements. Vopiscus then quotes an epistle of Hadrian from a lost work by his favourite Phlegon (cf. Spartian, *Hadriani*, 16), to prove that the Egyptians had the same character a century and a half earlier. This epistle, which was addressed to the consul Servianus, speaks of Christian bishops and presbyters. It is of considerable interest as bearing on the organization of the Egyptian church, in the earlier years of cent. ii. Hadrian says, "Devoti sunt Serapi, qui se Christi episcopos dicunt, nemo illic Archisynagogus Judaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum Presbyter, non Mathematicus, non Aruspex, non Aliptes." Spartianus tells us about Sept. Severus, that on his journey into Palestine he interdicted Jews and Christians from making converts to their religion. Vopiscus tells us of Aurelian's reproof of the senators for their delay in consulting the Sibylline books, describing them as acting more like men in a Christian church than believers in the gods. Many other passages have proved very useful to the historian in determining dates and localities of persecutions; cf. a series of articles by Görres in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie* for years 1877–1880. A good instance of the use which may be thus made of them will be found in an article by the same writer in the *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie* for 1878, p. 273, where he discusses the relations between Christianity and the Roman empire under the emperor Septimius Severus; especially in reference to the flogging of a playmate of Caracalla "ob Judaicam religionem," mentioned by Spartianus in his *Antonin. Caracall.* c. i. [CARACALLA.] Görres thinks the word "Christianam" should be here substituted for "Judaicam;" cf. another article by him on "*Alexand. Severus u. das Christenthum*" in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1877, s. 49; and for the opposite view, see Harnack in *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1877, s. 167. Cf. for another good instance of the value of Spartianus' narrative, another article by Görres in the same review for 1884, p. 408, on *Christianity and the emperor Commodus.* The sources of the Augustan History have been discussed at great length of late by Enmann in *Philologus, Supplement*, t. iv. fasc. iv., p. 335–501. He endeavours to trace in Vopiscus the outlines of a general history of the empire composed in Gaul under the rule of Constantius A.D. 292–306. The text of all the Augustan historians is very corrupt. It is now one of the favourite fields for critical emendations and conjectural improvements. Those who delight in such attempts will find a full list of them in *Philologus* for 1880, p. 741, s. v. *Scriptt. Hist. August.*; for 1881, p. 600, s. v. *Spartianus*, p. 679, s. v. *Vopiscus Flavius.* The entire literature of the subject for the last twenty years is accurately set forth in *Philologus* for 1883, t. xliii. p. 137. A good account of the Augustan historians will be found in Teuffel's *Hist. of Roman Literature*, t. ii. p. 320, English trans., and in Simcox, *Hist. of Lat. Literat.* t. ii. p. 225–306. Teuffel gives an accurate account of editions, MSS., and essays on the historic value of those writers. The best edition of the *Scriptt. Hist. August.* is by Herm. Peter, Leipzig, 1865, republished in 1884. [G. T. S.]

SPECIOSUS (1), priest, Gregory the Great's authority for the story of ROMULA (*Dial.* iv. 15). [F. D.]

SPECIOSUS (2), monk, disciple of St. Benedict. His brother Gregorius at Terracina saw the soul of Speciosus, who was then at Capua, leaving his body, and found afterwards that Speciosus had died at the moment of the vision (Greg. *Dial.* iv. 8). [F. D.]

SPECIOSUS (3), subdeacon of Catana, was married, and when pope Pelagius II. ordered Sicilian subdeacons, either to relinquish their office or to abstain from intercourse with their wives, chose the former alternative, and acted as a notary till his death, which took place before A.D. 594 (Gregorius, *Epp.* iv. 36). [F. D.]

SPERANTIUS (1), one of the Numidian bishops, addressed by Constantine I. in a letter concerning building a church in place of one occupied illegally by the Donatists (Baronius, *Ann.* 316. lxii). [H. W. P.]

SPERANTIUS (2), a deacon, who accompanied Caecilianus to the council of Arles (Baron. *Ann.* 314. lii; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. 95). [H. W. P.]

SPERANTIUS (3) (Σπειράντιος, SPIRANTIUS), a gentleman at Rome (ὁ πιστότατος) who received Athanasius on his visit there in 339, and was afterwards put to death by Magnentius (Athan. *Apol. ad Const.* § 6; Tillem. viii. 76). [C. H.]

SPERATUS JULIUS. To a poet of this name, otherwise unknown, the small elegiac poem *de Philomela*, which is to be found in Riese's *Anthologia Latina* (568), has been attributed. The poem has also been assigned, with some probability, to Eugenius, bishop of Toledo, and to Dracontius. [H. A. W.]

SPES (1), an inmate of Augustine's monastery at Hippo, whose variance with the presbyter Bonifacius is described by Augustine in or about 404 (*Ep.* 78 al. 137; Tillem. xiii. 155, 227, 408, 411, xiv. 121). [C. H.]

SPES (2), abbat of a monastery founded by himself at Comple, six miles from Nursia, had been blind for forty years, and then miraculously recovered his sight, it being revealed to him that his death was at hand, and that he must first visit the neighbouring monasteries. Having done so, he died fifteen days after recovering his sight. His brethren saw his soul issue from his mouth in the form of a dove and ascend to heaven (Gregorius, *Dial.* iv. 10). He is commemorated on March 28 (*AA. SS.*, March iii. 717). [F. D.]

SPESINA. See MACARIUS (20); Christian woman at Rome, Cyp. *Ep.* 22; probably a Carthaginian. The name occurs as that of an African martyr in the African calendar on 7 Id. Jun, ap. Morcelli, vol. ii. p. 369; does not occur in Muratori or Gruter; but is found in five inscriptions in Mommsen, all of them Numidian—an indication of the genuineness of the list as against Shepherd, "Letters on the genuineness of the writings ascribed to Cyprian," p. 12. [E. W. B.]

SPES-IN-DEO, praeses of Sardinia, was in A.D. 601 asked by Gregory the Great to assist Victor, bishop of Phausiana, in his missionary work (*Epp.* xi. 22). [F. D.]

SPEUSIPPUS, Jan. 17, martyr, together with his twin brothers Eleusippus and Melasippus, under Marcus Aurelius in France. They were the grandchildren of a St. Leonilla who had been converted by St. Benignus, who had been in turn sent by Polycarp on a mission to Gaul. They suffered at Langres with Neon and Turbon, the official reporters of their examination, who were converted by the example of their constancy. Their story has given rise to a considerable controversy, as many have been inclined to reject their acts as spurious, among whom was Ruinart, who refused to accept them among his *Acta Sincera*. The true state of the case is probably this,—they embrace some historical elements, but have been plainly worked up in later times into the shape they at present present. Baronius regarded their acts as genuine, and inserted a portion of them in his *Annals*, A.D. 179, sec. 37. Tillemont discussed them in his *Mém.* t. iii. p. 43 and 603; cf. *AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. ii. p. 73. In modern times the Abbé Bougaud has discussed the original character and authenticity of the Acts in a work on the mission of St. Benignus published at Autun in 1852. He specially discusses whether they were originally Cappadocians as one tradition has it or born in France, deciding in favour of the latter view. Their acts will be found in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* t. lxxx. col. 186. Benignus, who baptized Leonilla and Speusippus, is regarded as the apostle of Burgundy. His martyrdom is described in Greg. Turon. *Gloria MM.* i. 5; in the last edition as published in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptt. Rer. Meroving.* t. i. pars i. p. 522, Hanover, 1883–1885. (*Mart.* Adon.) [G. T. S.]

SPLENDONIUS, a deacon employed in Gaul, and there condemned for some offence not known, but admitted into the Donatist community, rebaptized by them, and ordained a presbyter by Petilianus, but afterwards rejected by him. The case was related by Fortunatus at a meeting of Catholic bishops at Constantina, and Augustine quotes it to vindicate the church from the charge of retaining in its service unworthy persons by fastening a similar charge on the opposite party (Aug. *Petil.* iii. 38). [FORTUNATUS (10).] [H. W. P.]

SPORACIUS (ASPORACIUS), a man of high rank in the court at Constantinople, Comes Domesticus, A.D. 451, and consul in 452, orthodox and pious, and a warm supporter of Theodoret, who at his request wrote his work on heresies (*Haereticarum fabularum compendium*), which he dedicated to him in a laudatory preface. There is also a distinct short treatise *Adversus Nestorium* (sometimes called *Epistola ad Sporacium*), addressed to Sporacius, in which the author goes over much the same ground as in Lib. iv. c. 12 of the *Haer. Fab.* The genuineness of this treatise has been called in question by Garnier and Dupin and other authorities, but is maintained by Sirmond. Theodoret wrote by the Oriental deputies in 449 to thank Sporacius for his zeal in his behalf and in defence of the truth. (Theod. *Ep.* 27.) Sporacius attended the council of Chalcedon as "comes domesticorum" (Labbe, iv. 77). He may be the same with Asparacius whom pope Leo calls "his son," a member of whose family, Count Rhodanus, was employed by him in June, 453, to carry letters to Julian of Cos, and to the emperor Leo and others (Leo. M. *Ep.* 124 [98]), and also with Sporacius, by whom Leo desired, that his letters addressed to Constantinople, against Timothy Aelurus, Sept. 457, should be presented and supported by his personal advocacy (*Ibid. Ep.* 153 [121]). [E. V.]

SPYRIDON (SPYRIDION, SPIRIDION), bishop of Trimithus in Cyprus, one of the most popularly celebrated of the bishops attending the council of Nicaea, although his name is not found in the list of signatures. He was the centre of many legendary stories which Socrates tells us he heard from his fellow islanders, one or two of which he has preserved (Socr. *H. E.* i. 12). Spyridon was a married man, with at least one daughter, named Irene. He was a sheep farmer, and continued to exercise his calling after for his many virtues he had been called to the episcopate. One of the stories tells how some thieves, attempting to rob his fold by

night, found their hands miraculously tied behind their backs, and were set free in the morning, by Spyridon, who, after many exhortations to give up their bad ways, good-humouredly made them a present of a ram, "lest they should have been up all night for nothing." Another legend, which has its counterpart in Mussulman folk-lore narrates how, after the death of his daughter Irene, he went to her grave and learnt from her where she had hidden a valuable ornament, which was reclaimed by the person who had entrusted it to her keeping (Socr. *u. s.* Soz. *H. E.* i. 11; Rufin. i. 5). Other stories record how he threw open his storehouses to those who were in want, giving to some and lending to others without interest (Soz. *u. s.*), and how on a wayfarer seeking shelter during Lent, when there was no food in the house save some salt pork, he desired his daughter to dress it and sat down with his guest at table. The traveller declining to taste meat on the ground that he was a Christian, Spyridon replied, "so much the less reason have you for abstaining, for to the pure all things are pure" (*ibid.*). On another occasion, when his pupil Triphyllius, the learned bishop of Ledra, had been called upon to address a gathering of the Cypriote bishops, and out of deference to his audience in a quotation from the Gospels (Matt. ix. 6) altered the homely word "bed," κράββατον, into the more refined "couch," σκίμποδα, he interrupted the preacher with the pertinent question, "whether he thought himself better than Christ, that he was ashamed to use his words" (*ibid.*). The well-known story of the heathen philosopher at the council of Nicaea, whose taunts against the faith were silenced, and he himself converted by the recitation of the articles of the creed by an unlearned bishop, "a proof of the magnetic power of earnestness and simplicity over argument and speculation" (Stanley, *Eastern Church*, p. 134), has been fathered by the late writers, Glycas and Metaphrastes, on Spyridon. The silence of Rufinus when narrating the incident is a sufficient proof that the identification is erroneous (Rufinus, i. 3; Niceph. *H. E.* viii. 15). Spyridon is mentioned by Athanasius as among the orthodox bishops at the council of Sardica (Athanas. *Apol.* ii. p. 768). According to dean Stanley his body, which had been buried in his native island, was removed to Constantinople, whence, on the taking of the city by the Turks, it was again transmitted to Corfu, where it is annually carried in procession round the capital as the patron saint of the Ionian islands (Stanley *u. s.* p. 126). His life, written in iambics by his pupil, Triphyllius of Ledra, is spoken of by Suidas as "very profitable." Spyridon is commemorated in the Latin Church on Dec. 14, and in the Greek, on Dec. 12 (Suidas *sub voc.* Triphyllius, ii. 947) (Rufin. 1, 3–5; Socr. *H. E.* i. 8, 12; Soz. *H. E.* i. 11; Niceph. *H. E.* viii. 15, 42; Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* vi. 643, 679; vii. 242–246; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, vol. i. p. 284, Clark's trans.; Stanley, *Hist. of East. Ch.* pp. 124–126; 132). [E. V.]

STAGIRIUS, a sophist, at Constantinople, under whom Nicobulus sent his son to study, without having previously consulted his uncle, Gregory Nazianzen, who however, on the arrangement having been completed, wrote to Stagirius, commending the lad to his care (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 188). Eustochius, the sophist, Gregory's early friend, took great umbrage at the young Nicobulus not being placed under his care, and in his anger brought serious charges against his rival before a magistrate, a course against which Gregory remonstrated, but in vain. (*Ib. Ep.* 61.) [EUSTOCHIUS (3).] [E. V.]

STAGIRUS (STAGIRIUS), a young friend of Chrysostom. He was of noble birth, and against the wishes of his father, whose favourite son he was, embraced a monastic life. He joined the brotherhood of which Chrysostom was a member, and continued there after the failure of health compelled Chrysostom to return to his home at Antioch. The self-indulgent life he had led was a poor preparation for the austerities of monasticism, and he proved a very unsatisfactory monk. The nightly vigils were intolerable to him, and reading was hardly less distasteful. He spent his time in attending to a garden and orchard. Besides this, he manifested much pride of his high birth. His health broke down under the strain of so uncongenial a life. He became subject to convulsive attacks, which we may identify with epilepsy, but which were then considered as indicative of demoniacal possession. Stagirius employed all the recognized means for expelling the evil spirit. He applied to persons of superior sanctity, often taking long journeys to obtain the aid of those who had the reputation of healing those afflicted with spiritual maladies. He visited the most celebrated martyrs' shrines, and prayed long and fervently both there and at home. But all in vain. He was more than once tempted to commit suicide. At the same time his religious character sensibly improved. He rose at night and devoted much time to prayer, and became meek and humble. Chrysostom's state of health forbidding his personally visiting his young friend, he wrote to him at length. His counsels are embodied in the three books *ad Stagirium a daemone vexatum*, or *de Divina Providentia* (Socr. *H. E.* vi. 3). What the issue was as regards Stagirius we do not know. Nilus, who in one of his letters highly commends his piety and humility and contrition, uses language which would lead us to believe that his attacks did not entirely pass away. (Nilus, *Epp.* lib. iii. *Ep.* 19). [E. V.]

STASIMUS, a count to whom Theodoret wrote commending to his liberality Celestiacus, a senator of Carthage, who having had to flee his country on the taking of the city by the Vandals was reduced to extreme poverty. (Theod. *Ep.* 33.) [E. V.]

STATIUS, confessor of Carthage in the Decian persecution; fled to Rome, was received by NUMERIA, Cyp. *Ep.* 21. [E. W. B.]

STAUROS. (See HORUS; VALENTINUS (1), p. 229; Iren. I. iii. 5; Hippol. *Ref.* vi. 31.) [G. S.]

STELECHIUS, designated by Chrysostom "a holy man of God," to whom that writer dedicated the second book of his treatise on "Compunction," περὶ κατανύξεως, of which the former was inscribed to Demetrius. (Chrysost. *Opp.* tom. iv. p. 121 sq.) [E. V.]

STENNIUS, bishop of Ariminum (Rimini), present at Rome at the judicial enquiry under Melchiades, A.D. 313 (Opt. i. 23). [H. W. P.]

STEPHANUS (1) I., bishop of Rome, after Lucius, from 12th May, A.D. 254, to 2nd Aug. A.D. 257, during 3 years, 2 months, and 21 days. These are the dates arrived at by Lipsius (*Chron. der röm. Bisch.*) after careful examination. The dates given by the ancient catalogues are erroneous and conflicting. The Liberian Catalogue assigns to him a reign of 4 years, 2 months, and 21 days, and gives Valerianus III. and Gallienus II. (255) as the consuls of the year of his decease, the same as had been assigned to the decease of Lucius. Here some confusion is evident. Other old authorities differ from this, and from each other. But the Liberian Catalogue appears to be correct in the date of the martyrdom of Xystus, successor of Stephen, about which, as a memorable event, the tradition was likely to be more certain, viz. 6th Aug. A.D. 258, this date being confirmed by Cyprian's letter to Successus (*Ep.* 80). Reckoning back from this ascertained date, and aided by the letters of Cyprian and the course of contemporary events, Lipsius arrives with high probability at the dates above given, which, as far as the duration of Stephen's episcopate is concerned, require the account of the Liberian Catalogue to be altered only by reading 3 years for 4, the number of months and days being regarded as a correct tradition. If Lucius died, as is supposed, on the 5th of March, 254, Stephen was appointed after a vacancy of 61 days.

At the time of his accession the persecution of the church, begun by Decius, and renewed by Gallus, had ceased for a time under Valerian. The internal disputes with respect to the reception of the *lapsi*, which had given rise to the schism of Novatian [Novatianus], still continued.

In the autumn of the year 254 a council of Carthage, being the first during the episcopate of Stephen, replied to letters from Spain, brought by Felix and Sabinus, two bishops who had been ordained in the place of Basilides and Martialis, deposed for compliance with idolatry. Basilides had in the mean time been to Rome to represent his case to Stephen, and through him procure reinstatement in his see; and Stephen had apparently supported him. The synodical letter of the council (drawn up, without doubt, by Cyprian) confirmed the deposition of the two idolatrous prelates and the election of their successors, on the ground that compliance with idolatry incapacitated for resumption of clerical functions, though not for reception into the church through penance. The action of Stephen in the matter was put aside as of no account, though excused as due to the false representations of Basilides. (Cypr. *Ep.* 67.) A letter from Cyprian to Stephen himself, probably written soon after the council and in the same year, is further significant of the relations between Carthage and Rome being less concordant than had been the case under Cornelius and Lucius. Stephen from the first seems to have been determined to act independently in virtue of the supposed prerogatives of his see, while Cyprian shews himself equally determined to ignore any such prerogative. The subject of the letter is one Marcian, bishop of Arles, who had adopted the views of Novatian and joined himself to him, and whose deposition on this account Stephen is urged to bring about by letters to the province and to the people of Arles. It appears from the letter that Faustinus of Lyons had again and again written to Cyprian on the subject, having also, together with other bishops of the province in question, solicited Stephen to take action, but in vain. The tone of the letter is affectionately admonitory, not to say piously dictatorial. While allowing that it rested with the bishop of Rome to influence with effect the Gallic provinces, Cyprian is far from conceding to him any prerogative beyond that of the general *collegium* of bishops, by whose concurrent action, according to his theory, the true faith and discipline of the church catholic was to be maintained. And in praising the late bishops of Rome, Cornelius and Lucius, whose example he exhorts Stephen to follow, he seems to imply a doubt whether the latter was disposed to do his duty. (Cypr. *Ep.* 68.)

But it was a new question of dispute, that of the re-baptism of heretics, that brought about an open rupture between the churches of Rome and Carthage, in which the Asiatic as well as the African churches were arrayed with Cyprian in antagonism to Rome. The question came to the front in connexion with the schism of Novatian, the point being raised whether his adherents, who had been baptized in schism, should be re-baptized when reconciled to the church. (Cypr. *Ep.* 69 *ad Magnum.*) But it soon took the wider range of all cases of heretical or schismatical baptism. It had been long the practice of the Asiatic churches to re-baptize heretics, and the practice had been confirmed by synods; in Africa it was also the prevailing custom, and had been enjoined by the first Carthaginian synod under Agrippinus, though not apparently resting then on so strong a traditional basis as in Asia. Augustine says that Agrippinus had been the author of the African custom, and that it had not been universal since his time. Cyprian himself (*Ep.* 73, *ad Jubaianum*) does not trace the African custom further back than Agrippinus. However, on the question coming up as aforesaid, he insisted uncompromisingly on the necessity of re-baptism, and was supported, after a little hesitation at first on the part of some, by the whole African church. At Rome, on the contrary, admission by imposition of hands only, without iteration of baptism, seems to have been the immemorial usage, the only alleged exception being what Hippolytus states (*Philosophum.* p. 291) about re-baptism having been practised in the time of Callistus. Stephen accordingly maintained a view on the subject totally opposite to that of Cyprian. While Cyprian would baptize all schismatics whatever, whether they had been heretical in doctrine or not, Stephen would apparently baptize none who had been baptized already, let their heresies have been what they might, and whatever might have been the form of their baptism. (Cypr. *Ep.* 74.) The first shot in preparation for the battle that ensued may be detected in a letter (A.D. 255) from Cyprian to one Magnus, who had consulted him about the re-baptism of persons coming over from Novatianism; in which, after expounding and supporting at great

length his views on the subject, he may be taken to mean a hit at Roman laxity when he says "this is a subject of wonder, indignation, and grief, that Christians should support anti-christs, and that prevaricators of the faith and betrayers of the church should stand within the church itself against the church."

The first council of Carthage on the subject having been held in the same year (255), and having, in reply to certain Numidian bishops issued a synodal letter supporting Cyprian's position, he wrote soon after a letter to Quintus, a bishop of Numidia, notifying to him the decision of the council, and enforcing it by argument. In this letter, though names are not mentioned, there is an evident reference to the bishop of Rome, and those who held with him: "But," says he, "some of our colleagues (*i. e.* fellow bishops) had rather give honour to heretics than agree with us; and while on the plea of one baptism they are unwilling to baptize those who come, they either themselves make two baptisms by allowing that of heretics to be one, or certainly, which is worse, prefer the wicked and profane ablution of heretics to the legitimate baptism of the Catholic church." In answer to the plea of ancient custom, the only one he acknowledges is that of not re-baptizing those who, having been baptized in the church, had left it for heresy and returned. But he alleges further that reason, not custom, affords the rule to go by. That he is hitting at Stephen appears more plainly from his reference to St. Peter, who in his dispute with St. Paul about circumcision made no insolent and arrogant claims, or said that he held the primacy; but by yielding to the reasons of St. Paul set an example to bishops of giving up their own views in deference to the true and legitimate suggestions of their brethren. (Cypr. *Ep.* 71.) Cyprian's next step was to send a formal synodal letter to Stephen himself, agreed on in a synod at Carthage, probably at Easter, A.D. 256, in which the necessity of baptizing heretics, and also of the exclusion from clerical functions of apostate clergy on their re-admission into the church, is pressed upon him. But the tone of the letter is not dictatorial. It is allowed at the end that Stephen may retain his own views if he will without breaking the bond of peace with his colleagues, every prelate being free to take his own line, and responsible to God. (*Ep.* 72.) The answer of the previous council of Carthage to the Numidian bishops, and Cyprian's letter to Quintus, were sent to Stephen along with this synodal letter.

The next letter before us, that of Cyprian to Jubaianus, was written before an answer from Stephen had been received, and still deprecates any wish to break communion with any bishop who might continue to take a wrong view. At the same time Cyprian supports his own view at great length, and replies to arguments against it which had been advanced in a letter transmitted to him by his correspondent. (*Ep.* 73.) But the tone of his next letter, that to Pompeius, is less pacific. Stephen's reply to the synodal letter had now been received, written, according to Cyprian's account of it, "unskilfully and inconsiderately," and containing things "either proud, or irrelevant, or self-contradictory." The letter charges Stephen with "hard obstinacy," "presumption and contumacy," and refers, by way of contrast, to St. Paul's admonition to Timothy, that a bishop should not be "litigious," but "mild and docile." The arguments which had been advanced by Stephen are also replied to in the letter. It does not appear that Stephen had so far broken off communion with those who differed from him. (*Ep.* 74.) This, however, he did soon afterwards, as appears from the letter of Firmilian, bishop of Neo-Caesarea, to Cyprian (*Ep.* 75), as well as from the fragment of a letter to Xystus from Dionysius of Alexandria, preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 5), of which hereafter. Before Firmilian's letter was written, Cyprian had summoned a plenary council of African, Numidian, and Mauritanian bishops, to the number of 87, with presbyters and deacons, in the presence of a large assembly of laity, which met on the 1st of September, 256, the occasion being apparently considered too urgent to allow waiting for the customary Easter synod. In this memorable council Cyprian and other bishops in succession separately gave their opinions, being unanimous in asserting the decision of the previous synod. At the same time Cyprian is careful, in his opening address, to repudiate any intention of judging others, or breaking communion with them on the ground of disagreement. And his ironical reference to Stephen's more imperious attitude is evident when he says, "For not one of us constitutes himself a bishop of bishops, or forces his colleagues to the necessity of compliance by tyrannical threats; since every bishop has his own liberty and power of action, and can no more be judged by another than he can himself judge."[a] The acts of the council are given by Augustin (*de Bapt. contra Donat.* lib. vi. and vii.) also in *Cypriani Opp.* It was after this great council, probably towards the winter of the same year (*hibernum tempus urgebat*), that Firmilian wrote his long letter in answer to one received from Cyprian. It appears from this letter (as might be gathered also from Cyprian's introductory address to the great council) that Stephen had by this time renounced communion with both the Asiatic and African churches; also that he had refused to admit even to an interview the legates sent to him from the previous Carthaginian synod; had forbidden all Christians to receive them into their houses, and had called Cyprian a false Christ, a false apostle, a deceitful worker. The question has been raised whether Stephen's action amounted to excommunication of the Eastern and African churches, or only to a threat. H. Valois and Baronius say the latter only; but Firmilian's language seems to imply more; and Mosheim (*Commentt. de Rebus Christian.* p. 538 sq.) contends for more against Valois. Routh also and Lipsius hold that excommunication was pronounced. Firmilian writes as follows: "Which thing Stephen has now dared to do, breaking against you the peace which his predecessors have always kept with you in mutual love and honour."—

[a] "Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus, pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suae, arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare."

"How great sin hast thou heaped upon thyself in severing thyself from so many flocks? For thou hast cut thyself off: do not deceive thyself."—"Seeing that he is really a schismatic who makes himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity."—"For, while thou thinkest that all can be put apart from thee, thou hast put thyself alone apart from all."—"Very patiently indeed and gently did he receive the episcopal envoys in not even admitting them to an ordinary interview; nay, moreover, in being so mindful of love and charity as to enjoin the universal brotherhood of Christians that no one should receive them into his house, that not only peace and communion, but even shelter and hospitality, should be denied them."[b] Dionysius of Alexandria, also, in his letter to Xystus, above referred to, says of Stephen, that before his breach with Cyprian, "he had sent word concerning Helenus (of Tarsus) and concerning Firmilian, and all those of Cilicia, and Cappadocia, and Galatia, and all the adjoining nations, that neither with them would he communicate, on this very same account, because (says he) they rebaptize heretics." (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 5.) Dionysius further implies that he himself had disapproved of Stephen's proceedings, and remonstrated with him by letter:—"And concerning all these doings of his I sent to him, entreating." (*ib.*) Firmilian's language in disapproval of Stephen's conduct, and in repudiation of his assumption of authority over the church at large, is very strong. He says: "And I, on this head, am justly indignant at Stephen's open and manifest folly; that, while he boasts so of the rank of his see, and contends that he holds the succession of Peter, on which the foundations of the church were laid, he brings in many other rocks (*petras*), and constitutes new buildings of many churches, while he defends, by his authority, the position that there is baptism there." Again: "Nor fearest thou the judgment of God, when thou bearest testimony to heretics against the church, it being written, 'A false witness shall not be unpunished.'" Again: "It is manifest that the ignorant are also violent and angry, their lack of reason and of anything to say easily turning them to anger, so that to no one more than to thee does the Scripture apply which says, 'An angry man stirreth up strife, and a furious man aboundeth in transgression.'"[c] The whole letter is so little to the taste of the partisans of the Roman see that, though extant in twenty-six codices, it was purposely omitted in the edition of Cyprian (*Romae ap. Paul. Manutium*, 1563), and first printed in that of Guil. Morelli, Paris, 1564, who is bitterly censured for it by Latinus Latinius and Pamelius. Christ. Lupus (*ad Tertull. libr. de praescr.* Bruxell. 1675) first denied the authenticity of the letter. (Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* div. iii. ch. iv. 3). There is, however, no reason, except objection to its contents, for doubting its genuineness. It is evident from it, as well as from Cyprian's expressions in his own letters, above referred to, that, while Stephen on the one hand claimed authority beyond that of other bishops as being St. Peter's successor, and took much amiss Cyprian's independent action, Cyprian, on the other hand, supported by all the African and Asiatic churches, utterly ignored any such superior authority, his well-known position being that, though Christ's separate commission to St. Peter had expressed the unity of the church, yet this commission was shared by all the apostles, and transmitted to all bishops alike in their several spheres. Unity, according to his theory, was to be maintained, not by the supremacy of one bishop over the rest, but by the consentient action of all, with the concession of considerable differences of practice without breach of unity. The extent to which he would allow such differences appears strikingly in the case before us, where he expressed himself willing to continue in full communion with Rome, though continuing a practice condemned by him in such unmeasured terms. Stephen, on the contrary, seems already to have taken the position, carried out to its full extent by subsequent popes, of claiming a peculiar supremacy to the Roman see, and requiring uniformity as a condition of communion. It would appear also, though it is true we have only the account of his opponents, that in asserting such claims he evinced a spirit of irritability and arrogance that caused additional offence.

With respect to the subject of the controversy itself, and the arguments adduced on both sides, we have to gather those of Stephen from the Cyprianic correspondence, where they are referred to and answered. The arguments of Stephen, and those who held with him, were mainly these: "We have immemorial custom on our side, especially the tradition of St. Peter's see, which is above all others. We have also Scripture and reason on our side; St. Paul rejoiced at the preaching of the gospel, and recognised it, though preached out of envy and strife. There is but one baptism; to reiterate it is sacrilege, and its efficacy depends, not on the administrators, but on the institution of Christ; whoever, then, has been once baptized in the name of Christ, even by heretics, has been validly baptized, and may not be baptized again."

[b] "Quod nunc Stephanus ausus est facere, rumpens adversum vos pacem, quam semper antecessores ejus vobiscum amore et honore mutuo custodierunt."—"Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti? Excidisti enim teipsum: noli te fallere."—"Siquidem ille est vere schismaticus qui se a communione ecclesiastiae unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstineri posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti."—"Legatos episcopos patienter satis et leniter suscepit, ut eos nec ad sermonem saltem colloquii communis admitteret; adhuc insuper dilectionis et caritatis memor praeciperet fraternitati universae ne quis eos in domum suam reciperet; ut venientibus non solum pax et communio, sed et tectum et hospitium negaretur."

[c] "Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor in hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephanis stultitiam, quod qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta ecclesiae collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat, et ecclesiarum multarum nova aedificia constituat, dum iste illic baptisma sua auctoritate defendit." "Nec metuis judicium Dei, haereticis testimonium contra Ecclesiam perhibens, cum scriptum sit, Falsus testis non erit impunitus." "Nisi quod imperitos etiam animosos atque iracundos esse manifestum est, dum per inopiam consilii et sermonis ad iracundiam facile vertuntur, ut de nullo alio magis quam de te dicat Scriptura divina, Homo, animosus parit lites, et vir iracundus exaggerat peccata."

Cyprian's answer to such arguments was: "As to your custom, however old, it is a corrupt one, and not primitive; no custom can be set against truth, to get at which we must go back to the original fountain. Scripture is really altogether against you; those at whose preaching of the gospel St. Paul rejoiced were not schismatics, but members of the church acting from unworthy motives; he re-baptized those who had been baptized only unto St. John's baptism, without acknowledgment of the Holy Ghost; he and the other apostles regarded schism and heresy as cutting men off from Christ; the Catholic church is one, 'a closed garden, a fountain sealed'; outside it there is no grace, no salvation, consequently no baptism; people cannot confer grace if they have not got it; we do not reiterate baptism, for those whom we baptize have not previously been baptized at all; it is you that make two baptisms in allowing that of heretics as well as that of the church. Again, you are inconsistent with yourselves; for you lay hands on those who come over from heresy, to give the Holy Ghost, thus acknowledging that the heretics cannot confer it; but, if so, neither can they baptize, for the operation of the Holy Ghost is essential to baptism." It is to be observed in this controversy that, though Stephen was narrower and more domineering than Cyprian in his demand of universal conformity to the traditions of his own see, yet, on the main question at issue, he was broader and more tolerant in allowing the operation of grace beyond the strict limits of ecclesiastical organisation. And, notwithstanding the unanimous opposition at the time of so large a portion of the church, the broader view upheld by Rome was, in the main, accepted finally; not, however, to the full extent apparently allowed by Stephen. The council of Arles, held in the time of pope Sylvester (A.D. 314), eventually endorsed the intermediate rule that converts from heresy, who could show that they had been baptized in the name of the Trinity, should be received by laying on of hands only, that they might receive the Holy Spirit; but those who could not should be baptized. (*Can. Arelat.* 8.) And this has since been the received orthodox view.

Stephen is honoured as a martyr in the Roman Calendar on Aug. 2. But though his martyrdom under Valerian is asserted in the Felician Catalogue and later editions of the Pontifical, and in Jerome's Martyrology, and though the acts of St. Stephen (dating probably from the 7th century) give particulars of it;—that he was beheaded in the cemetery, sitting on his chair, and there buried;—yet the probabilities are strongly against the alleged fact. His martyrdom is not mentioned in the earlier Liberian Catalogue, though that of his successor Xystus is; his name appears in the Liberian "depositio episcoporum," not "martyrum"; Augustin, who, in his controversy with the Donatists often mentions Stephen, makes no mention of his martyrdom; nor does Vincentius of Lerins. There is no allusion to it in the Cyprianic correspondence, nor in the life of Cyprian by Pontius, though there is in both to that of Xystus. Further, it was not till the middle of the year 258 that Valerian so far departed from his early fairness towards the Christians as to issue the edict visiting them with death (Cypr. *Ep.* 80). The origin of the story about Stephen's martyrdom is traced conclusively by De Rossi to a mistaken application to him of a Damasine inscription in the cemetery of Callistus which really referred to Xystus. The latter having been, according to authentic tradition, beheaded in another cemetery, that of Praetextatus, it was supposed that he had been also buried there, and hence that the chair of his martyrdom found in that of Callistus and the accompanying inscriptions belonged to another bishop, who was concluded to have been his predecessor, Stephen; the real fact being that the body and chair of Xystus had been removed after his martyrdom to the usual burial-place of the Roman bishops. [XYSTUS II.]

Stephanus is said in the Felician Catalogue to have been a Roman by birth, "ex patre iobio," and to have ordained that priests and Levites should not use their sacred vestments for daily wear, but only in church. Anastasius states that his father's name was Julius, that he was exiled, and after his safe return committed to prison by Maximinianus, together with nine presbyters, two bishops and three deacons; that there he held a synod, and that, after committing the treasures of his church to his deacon Xystus, he was beheaded. The Roman martyrology, celebrating him as saint and martyr on Aug. 2, says he was beheaded in his chair during the persecution under Valerian, before the altar, while saying mass, which he persisted in continuing, undeterred by the arrival of the soldiers. There is no reason to doubt the statement of the Felician Catalogue and the Martyrologia, that he was interred in the usual burial-place of the popes of his day, the cemetery of Callistus.

Three spurious decreta, addressed to a friend, Hilarion, and twelve to all bishops, have been assigned to Stephanus, their main purport being to direct proceedings against accused clergy, with reservation of appeals to Rome. [J. B—Y.]

STEPHANUS (2) II., pope elect, but not ordained, A.D. 752. Pope Zacharias having been buried on the 15th of March, this Stephen, a presbyter, was elected, and conducted to the Lateran palace: but after rising from sleep on the third day after his arrival there, he suddenly lost speech and consciousness, apparently from a stroke of apoplexy, and died on the following day. Another Stephen was then elected in his room. In modern lists of popes this latter is called Stephen III., the former, though he was never ordained, being, in virtue of his election, reckoned as Stephen II. So Baronius, though Pagi (*Critic. ad ann.* 752, xiii.) denies the claim of Stephen II. (so called) to a place among the popes. Onuphrius Panvinius (in *Chronic. Ecclesiast.*) is said to have been the first to give him one. Anastasius, and the ancients generally, speak of the pope now usually known as Stephen III. as the immediate successor of Zacharias.

[J. B—Y.]

STEPHANUS (3) III. (commonly so called: see foregoing article), bishop of Rome after Zacharias, chosen, after the sudden death of Stephanus the pope elect, unanimously in the church of St. Mary ad Praesepe, carried thence to the Lateran, and there ordained 26 March, A.D. 752, the see having been vacant for twelve days (Anast. *in Vit. Steph.*). He and his younger

brother Paulus, who succeeded him in the see, having been left orphans in childhood by their father Constantine, had been educated together in the Lateran under Gregory II. and succeeding popes, and ordained deacons by Zacharias.

His episcopate was of great political importance, being marked by the commencement of the temporal sovereignty of the popes over the Exarchate of Ravenna, and their ceasing to be, in any practical sense, subjects of the Greek emperors. The first step towards this important result was when pope Gregory III. (A.D. 741), despairing of succour from Constantinople or Ravenna, and being further estranged from the emperor through the iconoclastic controversy, had appealed to Charles Martel for aid against the invading Lombards. Afterwards pope Zacharias had carried on the policy of courting the favour of the Carolingian dynasty by giving the solemn sanction of the Apostolic see to the deposition of Childeric and the assumption of royal rank by Pippin. Thus the Frank monarch was already disposed by gratitude, as well as political and religious motives, to take the popes under his protection, and strengthen their position as his allies in Italy. The state of things was as follows. Before the accession of Stephen, pope Zacharias had concluded a treaty of peace for twenty years with Luitprand, the Lombard king; which had been confirmed by Luitprand's successor, Rachis, and (A.D. 749) by Aistulph, who succeeded Rachis. But Aistulph had already shown no disposition to observe the treaty. Stephen, therefore, in the third month after his ordination, sent to him his brother Paul and the Primicerius Ambrose, with many presents, to plead for observance of it; and they obtained from the king a confirmation of it for forty instead of twenty years. But this was a mere blind on the part of Aistulph, who only four months afterwards invaded the Exarchate, got possession of Ravenna, threatened Rome, and demanded from the Romans submission and tribute. Two venerable abbats, those of St. Benedict and St. Vincent, sent to him by Stephen, were contemptuously sent back to their monasteries with orders not to return to the pope. At this juncture John, one of the *Silentiarii* of the emperor Constantine Copronymus, came to Rome from Constantinople, with an injunction to Aistulph that he should restore the territory he had seized, and to the pope that he should move him to do so. The emperor, unprepared to do anything effective by force of arms, reckoned on the pope's spiritual influence, such as had been brought to bear with such effect by Gregory II., and by Zacharias too, on Luitprand. But Aistulph was not equally amenable to such influences. Hence, when Stephen sent his brother Paul, along with the imperial emissary, to Aistulph at Ravenna, they effected nothing, except that the king consented to send an ambassador to Constantinople. John then returned to his imperial master, accompanied by messengers from the pope, charged with letters in which the emperor was implored to send aid for the rescue of Rome from the invader. Stephen meanwhile exhorted and encouraged the Roman people, instituting processions, litanies, and continual devotional exercises, for imploring the aid of heaven. He himself, with naked feet, accompanied by the people with ashes on their heads, walked to the church of St. Mary ad Praesepe, bearing on his shoulder the image of the Saviour, and with the treaty that had been agreed to by the Lombard king attached to the cross which he carried. Every Saturday processions were made to the churches of St. Mary, or St. Peter, or St. Paul. But he did something still more practical. Despairing of redress from Constantinople, he contrived to send, through a pilgrim, a message to Pippin, appealing to him for succour. Pippin at once sent an abbat Droctegang (called by Anastasius "Rodigang") with a favourable reply; by whom, on his return, the pope sent further letters into France. He addressed on this occasion not only the king, but also the Frank nobles, urging them to further Pippin's pious designs, and holding out to them the prospect of remission of their sins and eternal reward in return for their defence of St. Peter (*Cod. Carolin. Ep.* 10, 11). Other emissaries were accordingly sent by Pippin, a bishop Chrodigang, and a duke Antcar, who on their arrival at Rome found there John the Silentiarius, who had been sent again by the emperor with a command to the pope to go in person to Aistulph, and obtain from him the cession of Ravenna and the Exarchate. Stephen accordingly proceeded to Pavia, where Aistulph was, accompanied by John and Pippin's messengers, intending, if possible, to escape to France in case of the probable failure of his mission to the Lombard king. He left Rome on the 14th of October, amid the tears and remonstrances of the people of the city and neighbourhood, and, though weak in body, resolutely proceeded on his way. He was encouraged by the serenity of the weather, which he regarded as betokening the favour of heaven, and by the sight of a globe of fire in the air, which seemed to pass from the direction of France into the Lombard territory. Arrived at Pavia, he implored the king, proffering gifts, to restore the Lord's sheep to their rightful owner, and John presented the letters of the emperor; but all in vain. Aistulph felt himself strong in his position, fearing neither the arms of the emperor nor the displeasure of St. Peter, and probably not then anticipating the action which Pippin was prepared to take. The Frank ambassadors then earnestly requested him to give the pope leave to retire with them to France. This demand seems to have surprised and alarmed him. Having interrogated Stephen whether this was his own wish also, and having found that it was, he is said by Anastasius to have ground his teeth like a lion; and he in vain sent messengers to dissuade the pope. At length, fearing, we may suppose, to provoke the wrath of the warlike Pippin, he gave his consent; and Stephen, with a company of clergy and others, left Pavia on the 15th of November for France. He travelled in haste, having received intelligence of a design of Aistulph to stop him after all, and did not feel safe till he was in Pippin's territory. It was an arduous undertaking for him, in his weak state of health, thus to cross the Alps in the winter season. In a subsequent letter to Pippin he speaks of the hardships and perils of his journey;—how he had been "afflicted in snow and frost, inundations of waters, violent rivers, most atrocious mountains, and divers dangers" (*Cod. Carolin. Ep.* 7). He rested a

length in the convent of St. Mauricius, in the valley of the Rhone above the lake of Geneva. A few days after his arrival there, the abbat Falrad and a duke Rothald came from Pippin to invite him to his palace at Pontico (Pontyon, near Langres); the queen, Bertrada, and the two princes, Charles and Carloman, with a company of ecclesiastics and nobles, were sent forward to escort him on his way; and at a distance of three miles from the palace the king himself met him, descended from his horse, prostrated himself, and proceeded on foot at the stirrup of the pope: and thus, amid "hymns and spiritual songs," Stephen arrived at Pontyon on the 6th of January, A.D. 754. It was there, the two potentates sitting together in the oratory of the palace, that Pippin is said to have first promised with an oath to recover the Exarchate for Rome. Thence they departed for Paris, with the intention that the pope should repose in the abbey of St. Dionysius till the termination of the winter season. When there, he fell dangerously ill, so that his life was despaired of; but he recovered unexpectedly through the special intervention, as was supposed, of St. Dionysius. He himself gave the following account of a vision which assured him of his recovery: "When the physicians despaired of me, I was praying in the Church of the Blessed Martyr under the bells, and I saw before the altar the good shepherd, the lord Peter, and the teacher of the Gentiles, the lord Paul, whom I recognised *de illorum surtariis*[a], and also the thrice blessed lord Dionysius to the right of the lord Peter, thin and tall, with beautiful face and white hair, clothed in a most white colobium bordered with purple, and a mantle all of purple starred with gold; and they conversed together joyfully. And the good shepherd, lord Peter, said, 'This our brother desires health': and the blessed lord Paul said, 'He will soon be healed': and he put his hand in a friendly manner on the breast of the lord Dionysius, and looked to the lord Peter, and the lord Peter said pleasantly to the lord Dionysius, 'His healing is thy boon.' And forthwith the blessed Dionysius, holding a censer of incense and a palm, with a priest and a deacon who were standing by, came to me and said, 'Peace be with thee, brother; fear not; thou shalt not die till thou hast returned prosperously to thy see. Rise whole, and dedicate this altar to the honour of God and of his apostles Peter and Paul whom thou beholdest, celebrating masses of thanksgiving.' There was at the same time inestimable brightness and sweetness. And being made presently whole by the grace of God, I desired to fulfil what had been enjoined me, and those who were present said that I was mad. Wherefore I related to them, and to the king and his nobles, what I had seen, and how I had been made whole: and I fulfilled what had been commanded me. Blessed be God." (*Apud Hilduin. in Areopagit.* See Baron. *ad ann.* 754, iii.; Labb. *in* Stephan. II.) A still more important function than the dedication of the altar was performed at the same time by Stephen in the church of St. Denys; viz. the anointing of Pippin and his two sons, Charles and Carloman, as kings of the Franks, the queen Bertrada being anointed also. Stephen is said on this occasion to have charged the Frank nobility, under the authority of St. Peter, that neither they nor their posterity should ever choose or accept any king but one of the Carlovingian race (*Ap. Hilduin. in Areopagit.*). A similar ceremony of anointing had been previously performed at Soissons under the authority of pope Zacharias. It appears to have been repeated on the occasion before us by the pope in person. The Frank annalists speak of both anointings, though Anastasius, Theophanes (*lib.* 22), and Paulus Diaconus (*lib.* 6, c. 5) refer only to the second. The anointing by Stephen took place (according to Hilduin) on the 28th of July, A.D. 754. From Paris Pippin proceeded to Carasiacum (*Chiersi*, near Noyon on the Oise, to the north-east of Paris), where he laid before his assembled nobles his design of invading Italy in fulfilment of his promise to the pope. Thither also came Carloman, the king's brother, who had a short time previously become a monk in Mount Cassino, and who was now sent by his abbat at the command of Aistulph, to dissuade Pippin from his purpose. Leo Ostiensis (*lib.* i. c. 7) asserts that he had undertaken this mission unwillingly, in obedience only to the order of his superior. Still, according to Anastasius, he pleaded earnestly against the proposed expedition; but in vain. Pippin and the pope, having taken counsel together about him, resolved on preventing his return to Italy by confining him in a monastery at Vienne, where he died in the following year. Before proceeding further, Pippin (at the earnest desire, Anastasius says, of Stephen) sent embassies once and again to the Lombard king, and it was not till the latter had shown himself determined to keep what he had got, that the Franks, late in the season, set forth, accompanied by the pope. They marched down the valley of the Rhone, by way of Lyons and Vienne. A detachment sent forward to secure the passes of the Cottian Alps was attacked there by Aistulph with a superior force, but routed the assailants: Aistulph fled, and shut himself up in Pavia: the main army of the Franks entered the Lombard territory, devastated it as they proceeded, and took Pavia after a short siege. Aistulph now sued for peace, which was granted him on easy terms. He was

[a] Al. *Surcariis*. The same word, with the same variation of the spelling in the MSS., occurs in a letter of Gregory I. to Secundinus (*Epp. Lib.* ix. *Indict.* ii. *Ep.* 52, *al.* 54):—"Ideoque direximus tibi surtarias (*al.* surcarias) duas imaginem Dei Salvatoris et sanctae Dei genetricis Mariae, beatorumque apostolorum Petri et Pauli, continentes." Baronius (*ad ann.* 754, iii.) interprets thus; "Surtaria idem quod scuta ubi sunt pictae imagines." So also Du Cange, who suggests *scutarias* as the original word. Stephen's meaning apparently is that he recognised the apostles from pictures of them preserved at Rome. The representations he was familiar with would naturally suggest the form of his dream or vision, the appearance and dress of S. Denys being probably suggested further by some picture of him in the church or convent. The whole story is perfectly natural and probable, not involving, as told by the pope himself, any miraculous intervention. A favourable turn after a crisis in his disease may have favoured the happy impressions experienced, probably in a dream, after prayer; and these impressions, strengthening his faith, might well hasten his recovery so as to surprise those who had been every day expecting him to die. Hence the sneers of Bower (*Lives of the Popes*) as though the whole story had been an invention of the pope's, are singularly out of place.

required only to pledge himself by solemn oath to surrender to the pope Ravenna and all the cities of the Exarchate, and to give hostages. With the latter Pippin returned to France, the abbat Fulrad, and Jerome, a son of Charles Martel, being left behind to accompany the pope to Rome. Anastasius, who throughout his narrative speaks of the pope's repeated attempts to avoid the necessity of warfare, attributes the peace thus concluded to his intercession with Pippin, and his deprecation of any further shedding of Christian blood. But the Frank continuator of the annals of Fredegarius, who tells the story of the campaign with more detail than Anastasius, says nothing of this, referring all to the clemency and compassion of Pippin, who, as he further significantly says, received, as well as his nobles, large gifts from the Lombard king. And that Stephen had not really been the instigator of the easy terms granted after conquest appears plainly enough from a letter of his own, written to Pippin after Aistulph had broken his engagement, in which he says, "They (i.e. Aistulph and his associates) deceived your prudence through bland discourses and persuasions and oaths, and you believed them, speaking falsehood, rather than us, who spoke the truth. For with great grief and sadness, most excellent king, our heart was filled, that your goodness would not hear us."—Again, "We truly forewarned you of all the lying and falseness of that impious king, and what we told you is now manifest" (*Cod. Carol. Ep.* 7). This evident inconsistency between Stephen's own language and the assertions of his panegyrist much invalidates what the latter tells us of the pope's unwillingness to avail himself of the armed intervention of his protector. No such unwillingness appears from any of his extant letters. On the contrary, he passionately adjures him, when in subsequent straits, to bring his arms to bear.

After the departure of the French army, Aistulph, as Stephen seems to have expected, entirely disregarded the treaty he had been compelled to swear to. He refused to cede any part of his previous conquests, and, further, began to harass the Roman territory. Stephen wrote to France to represent the state of things, which he says would be attested by Fulrad, who accompanied his envoy. His letter is addressed to Pippin and his two sons, and implores them in the most earnest language to complete quickly the work they had promised Peter, the doorkeeper of heaven, to accomplish for him. It reminds them of their high privilege in having been chosen by the apostle as his champions, and of their confusion at the day of judgment if he should exhibit against them the handwriting of their unfulfilled promise. This letter appears to have been despatched before the close of the year 755; for it was evidently before the siege of Rome by Aistulph, which appears from a subsequent letter to have been commenced on the 1st of January in the following year.[b] This second letter was sent by Warner, a Frank abbat, who had been with the pope in Rome, and who, after keeping guard in armour by day and night on the walls of the beleaguered city, had managed with difficulty to escape by sea to Marseilles. It is full of most lamentable complaints, and most impassioned appeals. The state of things is described as so desperate that even the stones might be said to weep; Rome had been closely invested for fifty-five days; the Lombards, with worse than heathen ferocity, had devastated the country, burnt the houses, slain the inhabitants, robbed churches, burnt sacred images, carried away in bags the consecrated hosts, which they had eaten while gorged with food, beaten monks, and violated nuns; Aistulph, confident of success, had called on the Romans to give the pope into his hands under pain of having their walls battered down and being all killed with one sword: Pippin is both affectionately entreated and solemnly warned; the writer represents himself as falling at his feet and clinging to his robes, and adjuring him by the divine mysteries, by the living God, and by Peter the prince of the apostles, to come to the rescue without the least delay: and the king is more than once reminded of the day of judgment, when, if he came not, the Lord would say to him, "I know thee not, because thou hast not helped the church of God, and defended his peculiar people in the hour of danger"; whereas, if he came at once, he might hope for success in arms and all prosperity in this life, and eternal glory in the next (*Cod. Carol. Ep.* 6). A more extraordinary letter was sent after this, addressed to Pippin, his sons, the bishops, clergy, abbats, monks, nobles, generals, and people of France, in the name of St. Peter himself. The apostle is made to speak throughout in his own person, beginning, "I, Peter." He adjures and commands his adopted sons to come to the rescue of his church and people, promising to be with them and help them, though unseen, to befriend them in the day of account, and prepare for them "most bright and beautiful tabernacles, and eternal rewards, and infinite joys of Paradise," in return for their services. He threatens them, should they disobey him, with "torments of body and soul in the eternal and inextinguishable fire of Tartarus, with the devil and his pestiferous angels"; and, finally, in case of any delay whatever in coming to the deliverance of his own Roman church and its vicar, he declares them by the authority of the holy and undivided Trinity, to be alienated from the kingdom of God and eternal life. He also tells them, in the course of his address, that the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, sent her commands and adjurations also, together with the whole heavenly host, and the martyrs of Christ (*Cod. Carol. Ep.* 3). It may be that the pope intended Pippin to accept this as a real communication from the courts of heaven, and that he did not, in doing so, overrate the king's simplicity of faith. No such tremendous appeal, however, seems to have been needed. Pippin, as soon as he had heard of Aistulph's treachery, "moved with exceeding anger and fury" (says the Frank annalist), set out on his march by the same

[b] Baronius and Pagi suppose the siege of Rome by Aistulph to have been at the beginning of the year 755. Mansi sees reason for concluding that the year was 756. Independently of the documentary evidence which he adduces, the later date seems in itself more likely, since it gives the Lombard king more time to have recovered himself for aggressive action after the departure of the Frank army.

route as before, again penetrated the Lombard kingdom, driving Aistulph's opposing hosts before him, and again besieged him in Pavia. Meanwhile emissaries from the emperor (John the Silentiarius and another) came to Rome, intending to proceed to Pippin's court, and could hardly believe the news that he was already on his march to Italy. They went on by sea to Marseilles, a messenger from the pope accompanying them, and found that the Frank army had already entered Lombardy. Thither they followed, having schemed, without success, to leave the pope's messenger behind them, and found Pippin approaching Pavia. They pleaded with him, offering bribes, that to the emperor, and not to the pope, the Exarchate, when recovered, should be restored. But he is said by Anastasius to have replied to this effect: "By no means will I suffer these cities to be in any way alienated from the power of the blessed Peter, of the Roman church, and the pontiff of the apostolic see. I swear that not for the favour of any man have I twice given myself to this contest, but for the love of the blessed Peter and the pardon of my sins; and no amount of treasure shall induce me to take away from the blessed Peter what I have once offered to him." There is no reason to doubt that Pippin was sincere in such a declaration of his motives, though, human motives being usually mixed, other considerations may have impelled him also. He doubtless fully believed in the religion he had been taught; and he regarded with peculiar awe, as well as gratitude, the bishop of Rome, who was to him the representative of the prince of the apostles and the doorkeeper of heaven, and who had given the sanction of heaven to his own assumption of royalty. The result of this second compaign was that Aistulph was compelled to surrender all and more than he had previously promised; the abbat Fulrad was left in Italy to receive the cession of the various cities, and to take hostages from all; and with these he proceeded to Rome, and laid the donation of Pippin, with the keys of the ceded cities, on the tomb of St. Peter. It is to be observed that this memorable donation did not imply the entirely independent sovereignty of the popes. At first, the theory at least of the emperor's supremacy over the Exarchate seems to have been retained; and afterwards, under Charlemagne, the popes were still regarded as owing homage and allegiance to their Frank suzerain, such as had been previously due to the Greek emperor, though the conquered territories were thenceforth made over to St. Peter as his inalienable possession. (See under HADRIANUS (8), with respect to the subsequent confirmation of this donation by Charlemagne.) It is to be observed also that Rome was now regarded politically as a republic under the pope as its head, and is so spoken of in the transactions with Pippin. The forms of the ancient republic had been reverted to under Gregory II. Pippin received the title of *Patricius* of Rome.

While measures were still in progress and incomplete for the cession to the pope of the recovered territories, Aistulph was killed by a fall from his horse in hunting, probably at the end of the year 756, leaving no issue. Desiderius, a Lombard duke, who was in command in Tuscany, thereupon collected an army of Tuscans with a view of seizing the throne, but was opposed by Rachis (Aistulph's elder brother, who, after reigning for a short time, had abdicated and retired into a monastery), and by the Lombards generally. Desiderius then had recourse to Stephen, who, with Fulrad, took up his cause, having obtained from him a promise, on oath and in writing, to cede the territory without delay. They were prepared to aid him with an army of Franks and Romans; and he thus obtained the kingdom without further conflict. How far he kept his promises will be seen under PAULUS (43). Stephen announced to Pippin what had been done in a letter written in his usual extravagant style. It is full of most exuberant expressions of exultation, gratitude, and laudation of the Frank king and his family. It calls him a new Moses, and a most illustrious David. Dominion and prosperity through lengthened life, and eternal crowns at last, reserved for them from the beginning of the world, are prayed for in behalf of him, his most sweet and most Christian wife, and his most sweet sons, who are the pope's also. At the same time the necessity of Pippin's completing his work by making Desiderius fulfil his promises is strongly intimated thus: — "I beg thee, my son, I beg thee before the living God, and strongly conjure thee, to continue more perfectly this good work, and not be moved to decline to another side (which God forbid) by the blandishments, persuasions, or promises of men." The king is also implored, as if there were a little fear on this head, for the sake of his own soul, to maintain the holy catholic and apostolic faith uncontaminated by the pestiferous malice of the Greeks. The allusion is probably to the iconoclastic controversy. The death of Aistulph is referred to thus:—"That tyrant and follower of the devil, Aistulph, that devourer of the blood of Christians, that destroyer of the churches of God, has been smitten by a divine blow, and sunk into the gulf of hell." (*Cod. Carol. Ep.* 8.)

In the year 754 the emperor Constantine Copronymus had assembled a council at Constantinople, purporting to be a general one, and called by its adherents the 7th ecumenical, by which image-worship was condemned. But it was not attended by the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, or Alexandria, and of course the bishops of Rome repudiated it. We have no record of any action of Stephen with respect to it; he was at the time, as has been seen, otherwise occupied; but he is referred to in a letter of pope Hadrian to Constantine VII. and Irene as having, as well as other popes during the controversy about images, remonstrated with the emperor on the subject.

When Stephen was at Chiersi, the monks of a neighbouring monastery called Brittaniacum appear to have applied to him for instruction on certain questions about which they were in doubt; and he replied to them under nineteen heads. Some of his answers refer to conjugal relations, others to baptism, others to clerical and monastic discipline. One of those relating to baptism is interesting, as showing that immersion was then so much the rule that even the validity of aspersion had been doubted among the Franks. Stephen rules that baptism by aspersion from a shell or the hands in cases

of sickness was allowable and valid. Among the letters of Stephen there is one, granting to the abbat Fulrad the possession during his life of a house and hospital at Rome, and another to the same, giving him licence to found monasteries anywhere in France, exempt from all episcopal jurisdiction except that of the apostolic see. Anastasius describes Stephen as a swift succourer of Christ's poor, a visitor of widows and orphans, and a steadfast preacher of the word of God, and speaks of his having restored and enriched four hospitals in Rome. He was buried, according to Anastasius, in St. Peter's, on the 26th of April, A.D. 757, having held the see a little more than five years. The authorities for his life are Anastasius (*in Lib. Pontif.*), the Frank annalists, and his own letters, preserved principally in the *Codex Carolinus*. [J. B—Y.]

STEPHANUS (4) IV. (commonly so designated, though more properly STEPHANUS III., as he is called by Anastasius: see under STEPHANUS II. and III.), bishop of Rome, from 7 August, A.D. 768, to the beginning of February, A.D. 772, during three and a half years. An account of the usurpation of the see after the death of pope Paulus (A.D. 767) by Constantine, and the overthrow of the usurper after a reign of thirteen months will be found in other articles [CONSTANTINUS II., and PHILIPPUS (19)]. Christophorus the primicerius, who, with the aid of certain Lombards, had been the main agent in the deposition of Constantine, assembled without delay the clergy, military, notables, and general population of Rome, who elected Stephen presbyter of the church of St. Caecilia. He was a Sicilian, who had come to Rome in the time of pope Gregory III., and by him been placed as a monk in the newly founded monastery of St. Chrysogonus; had been taken by pope Zacharias into his own service in the Lateran palace, and made presbyter of the church of St. Caecilia aforesaid; had been similarly retained in the service of popes Stephanus and Paulus; and had waited on the last-named pope during his last illness till his death. Between his election (5 Aug.) and his consecration (7 Aug.), horrible barbarities, sadly significant of the savagery of the time, were perpetrated by his supporters on the leaders of the vanquished party. Passivus, brother of the usurper Constantine, had his eyes put out, and was confined in the monastery of St. Silvester; a bishop Theodore was deprived of his tongue as well as his eyes, and left to die of hunger and thirst in a monastery on Mount Scaurus, crying in vain for water; Constantine himself, having been publicly exhibited on horseback on a woman's saddle, with great weights tied to his feet, was secluded in the monastery of Cellae Novae, whence he was brought before a conclave of clergy in the Lateran Basilica on the day before the consecration of Stephen, finally deposed, and sent back to his confinement. The ordination of the new pope was accompanied by a general act of penitence of the Roman people for having allowed the recent usurpation, their confession being read out in a loud voice from the ambo of St. Peter's church. Even after this the cruelties were continued, though not, it is to be hoped, with the pope's sanction, whom Anastasius, who relates them, acquits of complicity. Gracilis, a tribune, who had supported Constantine, was brought by the soldiery from Aratrum in Campania to Rome, imprisoned, and deprived of his eyes and tongue; Constantine, the deposed usurper, was dragged from the monastery of Cellae Novae by a band of soldiers, blinded, and left lying in the street; Waldipert, the Lombard priest, who, after aiding Christophorus the primicerius against Constantine, had taken upon him to set up the monk Philip as pope [PHILIPPUS (18)], having been accused of treating with Theodicius, duke of Spoleto, for the assassination of Christophorus and the betrayal of Rome to the Lombards, was seized in the church of St. Mary ad Martyres (the Pantheon), where he had taken refuge, had his eyes and tongue torn out, and died in prison from the treatment he had received.

Stephen, after his consecration, pursued at first the policy of his predecessors, who had sought with such good effect the protection of the king of the Franks. He sent a messenger to Pippin and his sons, to ask for divines from France, who might assist in a council at Rome for restoring canonical order. Pippin was dead when the messengers arrived in France, but his sons Charles and Carloman received them graciously, and sent twelve bishops for the purpose indicated. A council of Italian prelates was held in the Lateran basilica, at which the bishops from France assisted, under the pope's presidency, A.D. 769. Its proceedings, according to Anastasius (*in vit. Stephan.*), were as follows:—

The recent usurpation was first brought under review. The blinded Constantine was brought in, and asked how, being but a layman, he had dared to usurp the popedom. He pleaded compulsion on the part of the Roman people, resorted to with the view of remedying the grievances they had suffered under pope Paul; he prostrated himself on the pavement, confessed his guilt, and implored pardon. Introduced on the following day, and again questioned, he pleaded other instances of laymen having been advanced at once to the episcopate—Sergius of Ravenna, Stephen of Naples, and others; but he was interrupted by the indignant bishops, beaten on the neck, and cast out of the church. Pope Stephen, as president, however innocent he might be of complicity with former atrocities, cannot but have sanctioned this unseemly violence. The culprit being thus summarily disposed of, the written acts of his episcopate, and those of the council that had confirmed his election, were burnt in the church; and the pope himself, with the rest, performed an act of penitence, falling on the ground and crying, "Kyrie eleison," for having received the communion at his hands. The council proceeded to decree that all ecclesiastical acts performed by Constantine during his usurpation, except baptism and holy chrism, should be accounted null and void, and that all bishops, priests, and deacons, ordained by him should, if re-elected, be consecrated anew,[a] and, even so, be debarred from

[a] Holy orders conferred by a bishop being regarded as indelible, and Constantine, however irregularly appointed, having received episcopal consecration, Baronius

rising to higher rank in the church. It was further ordained, under anathema, that in all future time none should be eligible for the popedom but such as had already risen regularly through the inferior orders to the rank of Cardinal priest or deacon.[b] In certain fragments of the acts of this council (edidit Romae Lucas Holstein: see Labbe, tom. viii. p. 484). a further decree appears that none of the laity, whether of the army or otherwise, should take part in the future election of popes; that no persons should be present armed, or carrying clubs; and that none from the camps of Tuscany or Campania should be invited or introduced into the city at the time of an election. The council proceeded to pass decrees in support of the worship of images, and to anathematize the council under Constantine Copronymus at Constantinople (A.D. 754), in which their use had been condemned. It appears that, among other arguments in favour of their retention and adoration, there was adduced, by Sergius of Ravenna, the testimony of St. Ambrose as to his having recognised one of the apostles, seen in vision, from a picture; and also the story of our Lord having sent a representation of himself to Agbarus, king of Edessa (Anastas. *in Vit. Stephan.*; also *Ep. Hadrian. pap. ad Carol. Magn. de imaginibus, Post act. Concil. Nicaen.* ii.: Labbe). After the council, there was a procession of pope, clergy, and people, chanting hymns and with bare feet to St. Peter's, where the decrees were read publicly from the pulpit, and then, by three bishops, an anathema against all who should at any time transgress them.

The Lombard king, Desiderius, who still failed to give up all the cities ceded to Rome under the treaty of Pavia [STEPHANUS (3) and PAULUS (43)], was a cause of continual trouble to the pope, most, if not all, of his recorded action being with reference to difficulties due to him. Sergius, archbishop of Ravenna, already alluded to us an instance, cited by Constantine, of a layman having been made a bishop, and also as having taken part in the proceedings of the Roman council, died soon after its conclusion. One Michael, scriniarius of the church of Ravenna, himself also a layman only, obtained the aid of an armed force from Mauritius, duke of Ariminum, with the support of Desiderius, to take possession of the see,—Leo, the duly elected successor of Sergius, being removed to Ariminum, and there confined. The bishops of Ravenna, in virtue of its being the seat of the exarchate, had previously claimed an autocephalous position against the claims of Rome [VITALIANUS (6)]; and the Lombard king was probably glad of the chance of getting a bishop placed in that important see, who, being indebted to himself for his elevation, would not be likely to support the pope against him. But if so, the project failed. It was at this time, though not always in former times, acknowledged at Ravenna that the new patriarch must receive consecration from the pope. Though solicited with bribes by Mauritius and the magistrates of Ravenna, Stephen refused to acknowledge or consecrate Michael; and at length, after protracted negociations, having the important support of ambassadors from the court of France, he prevailed on the people of Ravenna to rise against the intruder and recall Leo, who was consecrated by himself, and obtained possession of the see (Anastas. *in Vit. Stephan.*). More serious was the trouble in which the pope was involved through the action of Desiderius at Rome. There Christophorus and his son Sergius (who had been the leading opponents of the usurper Constantine) had been instant with the Lombard king for the fulfilment of his promises under the treaty of Pavia. Their ascendancy, therefore, Desiderius was in the first place desirous to put down. With this view, having bribed one Paulus, surnamed Asiarta, the pope's chamberlain, to further his schemes, he went himself with an armed force to Rome, but found an army from Tuscany and Campania collected to resist him, and the gates of the city closed against him. He then took possession of the Vatican, which was outside the walls, and sent for the pope to visit him there on the plea of treating with him about the cession of the territories which he still retained. The pope went, and after pleading for the rights of St. Peter, returned to the city. Meanwhile, Paul Asiarta had raised a party among the people against Christophorus and Sergius, who collected also an armed party of their own: conflict ensued; the party of Paul, getting the worst of it, took refuge in the Lateran; the other party attacked them there, but were reprimanded by the pope, and ordered to return. Stephen again visited Desiderius in the Vatican, who now insisted on his dismissing his two advisers, Christophorus and Sergius. He closed also all the gates of the Vatican, allowing none of the pope's followers to escape till his desires were complied with. The pope accordingly sent two bishops to Christophorus and Sergius, desiring them either to retire into a monastery for the salvation of their souls, or to come at once to the Vatican. They, naturally fearing the consequences of putting themselves into the power of Desiderius, refused to come, sending word that they would rather surrender themselves to their own fellow citizens than to a foreigner. But, as they now appeared to be in the pope's, as well as the Lombard king's, disfavour, their adherents began to fall off; and one Gratiosus especially, a duke who was related to them, deserted their cause, and, with others of the Romans, repaired by night to the pope in the Vatican. Christophorus and Sergius, finding themselves thus deserted by their friends, made their escape over the walls of Rome, but were captured by the Lombard guards and taken to the king, who delivered them to the pope. He, after ordering them to become monks, left them in the Vatican, and returned into the city. After this, they were seized in St. Peter's church by Paulus Asiarta and his followers, after conference of the latter with Desiderius, and had their eyes put out,

is unwilling to believe an actual repetition of ordination to be intended. But the word used by Anastasius is *consecrandi*, which elsewhere means ordination; and he expressly says, "Statutum est ut omnia quae idem Constantinus in ecclesiasticis sacramentis ac divino cultu egit iterari debuissent, praeter sacrum baptisma ac sanctum chrisma."

[b] Cardinal priests and deacons were those appointed as permanent ministers of churches with cure of souls, such being still so designated, not at Rome only, but elsewhere. Hence the ordinance did not, in virtue of this expression, confine eligibility to the Roman clergy.

after the savage custom of the time. Christophorus, carried to the monastery of St. Agatha, died there after three days; Sergius remained in a prison of the Lateran palace during the remainder of Stephen's reign.

Such is the account given by Anastasius of what occurred. A different one is given by pope Stephen himself in a letter written by him to queen Bertrada, Pippin's widow, and her son Charles (*Charlemagne*). In this letter he asserts that Christophorus and Sergius had conspired against his life with Dodo, the emissary of Charles's brother Carloman; that they had invaded the Lateran with an armed force in order to kill him; that he had escaped to the Vatican, and put himself under the protection of Desiderius, who had come to Rome in order to render justice to St. Peter, that the conspirators had thereupon raised sedition in Rome, and closed the gates; that numbers of the people had, notwithstanding, escaped to the Vatican, and had at length brought Christophorus and Sergius thither; that the latter would have been slain there by the incensed multitude, had not he (the pope) protected them; and that they had been afterwards attacked and deprived of their eyes; but, he calls God to witness, against his own will and purpose. He attributes his own escape from assassination, after God and St. Peter, to his most excellent son Desiderius, who, he adds, had fully satisfied all the claims of St. Peter; and he further intimates his belief that Carloman would not approve of the iniquity of his emissary Dodo. (*Cod. Carolin.* ep. 46.) This account of things is so different from that given by Anastasius, and the assertion that Desiderius had fully satisfied the claims of St. Peter so inconsistent with known facts, and with what Stephen himself says in other letters, that he is supposed by some to have written on this occasion under intimidation or compulsion, while he was confined in the Vatican by the Lombard king.[c] The plan of the latter evidently was to force the pope into submission to himself, as his only available protector, and to alienate him from his Frank allies. With this view Christophorus and Sergius, who had been the strenuous supporters of the Frank alliance, were got rid of; and the pope himself was artfully induced to concur in degrading them, and to accuse also Carloman's emissary in his letter to Charlemagne, who, being already at variance with his brother, was not at that time likely to co-operate with him, especially when assured by the pope himself that Desiderius was friendly. His general design appears from pope Hadrian's statement (Anastas. *in Vit. Hadrian.*), that, when Stephen afterwards demanded from him the fulfilment of his promise, he replied,—"Sufficit apostolico Stephano quia tuli Christophorum et Sergium de medio, qui illi dominabantur, ut non illi sit necesse justitias requirendas. Nam certe, si ego ipsum apostolicum non adjuvero, magna perditio super eum eveniet. Quoniam Carolomannus rex Francorum, amicus existens praedictorum Christophori et Sergii, paratus est cum suis exercitibus ad vindicandum eorum mortem Romam properare, ipsumque capiendum pontificem." But whether or not Stephen had for a time really trusted Desiderius, or been inclined to the policy of alliance with him, he soon found occasion to adopt a very different one: for the royal brothers, Charles and Carloman, having been reconciled to each other, sent not long afterwards an embassy to Rome to announce the fact; and Stephen replied, expressing his great joy, and calling on the two kings in the name of St. Peter, and in view of their prospects at the day of judgment, to lose no time in completing what they and their father had undertaken by compelling the Lombard king to fulfil his engagements; imploring them also to believe no one who might tell them that he had already done so. (*Cod. Carolin.* ep. 47.) But Desiderius now plotted against him by courting on his own part the friendship of the reconciled brothers, and proposing even a matrimonial alliance, viz.: that Adalgisus, his son, should marry Gisila, the daughter of Pippin, and that either Charlemagne or Carloman should marry his own daughter Desiderata. The fact that both the French kings had wives already does not seem to have been any serious difficulty. For, notwithstanding this impediment, Bertrada, the Frank queen-mother, took up and furthered the scheme, so far at least as the marriage of one of her sons to the Lombard princess was concerned. But Stephen, on being informed of it, opposed it earnestly. He wrote a long letter to Charles and Carloman, using every argument he could think of to dissuade them from it. He urged, among other considerations, the unlawfulness of their putting away their existing wives,—two most beautiful ladies of their own nation, to whom their father Pippin had espoused them, and to whom they ought to be bound in love; but still more forcibly he enlarged on the degradation and pollution that would ensue, if royal scions of the glorious Frank nation, which was the first of all nations, should unite themselves to strange women,—and these of the perfidious and most fetid Lombard race, which could not even be numbered among the nations, and from union with which a leprous progeny would be sure to spring. "No one in his senses (he says) "would even suspect that such most illustrious kings could be implicated in such a detestable and abominable contagion." He pressed also the fact, that the Lombards were the persistent enemies of himself and of St. Peter, whom the two kings had sworn to defend, and whose favour, so important for their eternal interests, would be forfeited by the proposed alliance. Finally, he informs them that he had placed this his exhortation and adjuration, before sending it, on the tomb of St. Peter, and had offered the holy sacrifice over it, and that whosoever should act in opposition to it would be under the anathema of the prince of the apostles, and alienated from the kingdom of God, and condemned to burn eternally in hell. (*Cod. Carol.* ep. 45.) But not even this tremendous fulmination deterred queen Bertrada from her purpose. The energetic lady, in the interests of peace, went in person first to her son Carloman, at a place called Salossa, to cement his reconciliation with his brother; thence to Thassilo, duke of Bavaria and nephew of Pippin, who

[c] So Le Cointe maintains (*Annal. Eccles.* ad ann. 769); and Pagi (*Critic. in Baron.*). Mansi, on the contrary, sees no sufficient ground for the supposition, inasmuch as neither Stephen in any subsequent letters, nor pope Hadrian afterwards, say a word about any compulsion.

had been inclined to throw off his allegiance to the Frank kings; and from him to Desiderius in Italy; and, after visiting Rome, returned to France with Desiderata, who was married to Charlemagne, though only to be repudiated by him, and sent back to her father, in the following year. Neither Charlemagne nor his brother had, it may be gathered, any great liking from the first for the matrimonial scheme, which seems to have been accomplished entirely through Bertrada, whom Charlemagne held in great reverence, being said never to have had any difference with her, except when, against her will, he divorced Desiderata. "Mater quoque ejus Berthrada in magno apud eum honore consenuit. Colebat enim eam cum summa reverentia, ita ut nulla unquam invicem sit exorta discordia praeter in divortio filiae Desiderii regis, quam illa suadente acceperat." (Einhard. *in Vit. Caroli M.* c. 18.) It may excite surprise that the widow of Pippin, who had himself evinced such great reverence for St. Peter's see, should after his death have so entirely disregarded the pope's anathema, and worked so resolutely in defiance of him. Usually queens, rather than the male members of royal houses, have been found most amenable to spiritual influences; but it was evidently not so in this case. She was plainly a strong-minded woman with a will of her own; and Stephen's previous conduct had not been such as to inspire her with respect for his personal character or consistency; for he had once (whether under intimidation or not) lauded Desiderius as being his excellent friend. Her action, however, seems to have been intended for the pope's advantage, as well as for the promotion of general peace: for her visit to Desiderius is said by the Frank annalists to have had the further result of inducing him to cede some at least of the cities claimed by St. Peter's see. "Hoc anno Domna Berta fuit in Italia propter filiam Desiderii regis; et redditae sunt civitates plurimae Sancti Petri." (*Annal. Petavian.* ad ann. 770.) Stephen's opposition to the match may have thus been mitigated. There is no record of any further protest from him. The part of the original proposal of Desiderius, which consisted in the marriage of his son to Gisila, was not carried into effect. Bertrada probably herself ejected it. The princess, who had been adopted by pope Paul I. at the time of her baptism as his spiritual daughter, and who had been early devoted to a religious life, entered a convent afterwards, and became an abbess. The ancient authorities for the life as above given are, Anastasius (*Vit. Stephani III.* and *Vit. Hadrian.*), Einhard (*Vit. Caroli M.*, and *Annales*); the Frank annalists generally; and the *Codex Carolinus*, containing letters, some of which have been referred to. [J. B—Y.]

STEPHANUS (5), African bishop, Cyp. *Ep.* 44, 45. See POMPEIUS (1). [E. W. B.]

STEPHANUS (6), seventh in the list of the mythical British bishops of London. For authorities, *vid.* OBINUS. [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (7), bishop of Laodicea in Syria Prima, succeeded Anatolius shortly before the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution. He was very celebrated for his knowledge of philosophy and general secular culture; but in the persecution he turned coward, and concealed his faith. (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (8), a bishop among the Eusebian party mentioned in the synodal letter of the council of Sardica (Theod. *H. E.* ii. 8). Tillemont (vii. 270) thinks he may have been bishop of Antioch after FLACCILLUS. [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (9), bishop of Germanicia, in the province of Euphratensis, ordained to the see by Meletius of Antioch, to correct the erroneous teaching of Eudoxius the Arian, who, before his successive elevation to the patriarchal thrones of Antioch and Constantinople, had been bishop of that city. The event proves the wisdom of the choice. The orthodox faith triumphed, and, according to Theodoret, "by his spiritual teaching wolves were changed into sheep." (Theod. *H. E.* v. 4; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 940.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (10), a Libyan bishop ordained by SECUNDUS (2), bishop of Ptolemais in the Libyan Pentapolis, by both of whom the presbyter Secundus was murdered (Athan. *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 65). He is mentioned again by Athanasius (*De Synod.* § 12) as accused with Serras and Polydeuces of various crimes. (Tillem. viii. 176.) [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (11), bishop of Jamnia or Jabne in Palaestina Prima, 440–457 (Gams), frequently mentioned in the life of St. Euthymius. He was one of the three brothers, natives of Melitene, the other two being Andrew and Gaianus, kinsmen of Synodius by whom Euthymius himself had been brought up, who became disciples of that celebrated ascetic (*Vit. S. Euthym.* c. 41, *ap.* Coteler, *Mon. Graec.* ii. 233). Synodius having visited his former pupil at his Laura, after the council of Ephesus, took him back with him to Jerusalem, where he induced Juvenal to ordain him deacon at the same time with Cosmas (*ibid.* c. 54, p. 245). Juvenal subsequently ordained him to the see of Jamnia (*ibid.* c. 57, p. 247). Stephen attended the council of Chalcedon in 451, when he subscribed the decrees (Labbe, iv. 82, 585, 788), and personally joined in the condemnation of Dioscorus (*ibid.* 445). As soon as the council was over, he and John, bishop of the Saracens, returned with all speed to Euthymius to communicate its decrees to him, reserving their own judgment until they were put in possession of his (*Vit. S. Euthym.* c. 78, p. 260; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* iii. 588). [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (12), bishop of Ephesus, at the time of the Robber Synod and of the fourth general council of Chalcedon. The whole of the eleventh session of that council held on Oct. 29, 451, was taken up with an investigation of the complaint brought forward against Stephen by Bassianus, formerly bishop of Ephesus [BASSIANUS]. From the pleadings in that trial we learn that Stephen had been then during fifty years one of the clergy of Ephesus, which would fix his ordination about the year 400, so that he must have been a man of very advanced years at the time of the council. Stephen was substituted as bishop in place of Bassianus, who was expelled by violence

about A.D. 448. Stephen and Bassianus were both deprived of the bishoprick by decree of the Synod, but allowed a pension of two hundred gold pieces. (Mansi, t. vii. 271–294; Hefele's *Councils*, t. iii. p. 371, Clark's trans.) The name of Stephen of Ephesus is attached to a MS. collection of sermons in the imperial library at Vienna (Lambecii *Commentar.* iii. 66; Fabric. *Bib. Graec.* xii. 183, ed. Harles). [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (13), bishop of Tripolis in Phoenicia Prima, in the 5th century, mentioned in the life of St. Euthymius, as the founder of a monastery in honour of the martyr Leontius, which he presided over for twenty-one years. He was succeeded by his nephew Leontius (*Vit. S. Euthym.* cc. 128, 129, *apud* Coteler. *Mon. Graec.* ii. 309, 310). A Syriac translation of a letter of Severus of Antioch to Stephen is among the MSS. of the British Museum (Wright, *Catalogue*, dcxcii. 9). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 824.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (14) I., bishop of Hierapolis, succeeded John in 445, Domnus of Antioch coming in person to enthrone him (Labbe, iv. 658). Immediately afterwards (according to the Latin Subscriptions (*ibid.* 644) he attended the Synod summoned by Domnus at Antioch, at which Athanasius of Perrha was deposed, and the complaints against Ibas of Edessa were first entertained. In obedience to the injunctions of this Synod, Stephen proceeded to the ordination of a successor to Athanasius in the person of Sabinianus (*ibid.* 719, 722). In August, 459, he took part in the "Robbers' Council" at Ephesus (*ibid.* 117, 261, 308), where he followed the majority in rehabilitating Eutyches and condemning Flavian. We find him again at Chalcedon in 451 (*ibid.* 79, 373, 450) repudiating his former acts, and joining in the condemnation of Eutyches. The encyclical of the emperor Leo in 547 was addressed to Stephen among other metropolitans (*ibid.* 890), but his reply does not appear. According to Le Quien he signed the synodal letter of Gennadius *de Simoniacis* in 459, but his name is not among the few preserved in the mutilated list given by Labbe (*ibid.* 1029). (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 928.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (15) II., bishop of Hierapolis, c. 600, who, according to Evagrius, wrote the life of Golanduch, a Persian female martyr under Chosroes I. (Evagr. *H. E.* v. 20; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 930). [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (16) I., patriarch of Antioch A.D. 478–480 (Clinton, *F. R.* ii. 536, 553). On the deposition of Joannes Codonatus, of Apamea, after his three months' occupancy of the see of Antioch (JOANNES (35)) Stephen (ἀνὴρ εὐλαβής) was elected to succeed him by the same synod, summoned by the decree of Zeno (*lib. Synod.* ap. Labbe, iv. 1151; Theophan. *Chronogr.* p. 107). Stephen immediately sent a synodic letter to Acacius, bishop of Constantinople to announce his consecration to the see, and to acquaint him with the circumstances connected with it. Acacius thereupon convened a synod, A.D. 478, by which the whole transaction was confirmed. The partisans of Peter the Fuller accused Stephen to Zeno of Nestorian heresy, and demanded to have his soundness in the faith made a matter of synodical investigation. Zeno yielded to their importunity, and a synod was called for the Syrian Laodicea (Labbe, iv. 1152). The charge was declared groundless, and Stephen returned victorious (Theophan. 108). His enemies, rendered furious by their defeat, made an onslaught on the church of St. Barlaam, in which he was celebrating the Eucharist, and violently dispersed the worshippers, wounding many and killing some. Stephen himself they dragged from the altar, and (according to Evagrius, on the authority of the contemporary writer, Joannes Rhetor) in brutal mockery gave him over to the boys and lads of their party, by whom he was tortured to death with spear-like reeds, and his body thrown into the Orontes. (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 10; Niceph. *H. E.* xv. 18.) His martyrdom is commemorated on the 25th of April.

The emperor, indignant at the murder of his nominee, despatched a military force to apprehend and punish the Eutychian party, at whose instigation the crime had been committed. (*Simplicii Epist. xiv. ad Zenonem*, Labbe, iv. 1033; *Lib. Synod. ibid.* 1152.) According to some authorities it was Stephen's successor, also a Stephen, who was thus murdered, his predecessor having died a natural death. This is the statement of Theophanes (p. 116), and Joannes Malalas (lib. xv. p. 91), in which they are followed by Le Quien, Clinton and others. Valesius, however, and Seb. Binius take the view given above, which is also that of Tillemont (*Mém. Eccles.* xvi. 315; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 726). [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (17) II., patriarch of Antioch, succeeded his namesake A.D. 480 (Clinton, *F. R.* ii. 536, 553). On account of the disturbed state of Antioch after the murder of his predecessor as a precautionary measure to avoid fresh tumults and bloodshed Zeno chose the new patriarch without consulting the bishops of his province, and had him consecrated by Acacius A.D. 480 at Constantinople (Labbe, iv. 1032). This step being entirely uncanonical, Zeno and Acacius felt it essential at once to write to pope Simplicius to justify their conduct. Simplicius in his reply firmly remonstrated against so direct a violation of the canons which he only consented to sanction on the ground of necessity. [CALANDIO.] (Simplicii *Epistolae*, xiv. xv. ap. Labbe, iv. 1034–5.) The newly elected prelate only survived his consecration a few months, dying A.D. 481 (Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles.* xvi. 317; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 727.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (18) III. patriarch of Antioch. Theophanes (p. 349) relates that after the see of Antioch had been vacant for forty years, in consequence of the Mahometan dominion, Isam, the chief of the Arabians (d. A.D. 744) allowed the Christians to elect as their bishop a monk named Stephen, with whom he was intimately acquainted, "rustic in demeanour but conspicuous for his piety." The Christians joyfully accepted the permission as a Divine interposition in their behalf, and made Stephen their bishop. Eutychius (ii. 379) places his ordination in the first year of Leo the Isaurian, A.D. 717, and states that his episcopate lasted thirty-seven years. This, however, is more than doubtful. [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (19), bishop of Lyons, was written to by Avitus, bishop of Vienne (Avitus, *Epp.* no. 24; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lix. 240), and by Ennodius, bishop of Pavia (Ennodius, *Epp.* no. 17; Migne, t. lxiii. 63), and held the see between Lupicinus and Viventiolus at the close of the 5th century (Gams, *Ser. Episc.* p. 570, but with no date). In the year 499 he took part with Catholic bishops in the conference held between the Arian and Catholic bishops in the presence of the Burgundian king, Gundobald, at his palace near Lyons. If Stephanus was formally the head of the conference, Avitus of Vienne was the chief speaker, and is said to have convinced Gundobald [AVITUS, GUNDOBALD] (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxi. 1154; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 678–82; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 559, 566). [J. G.]

STEPHANUS (20), bishop of Bostra, is mentioned as the author of a treatise *Contra Judæos* quoted in the appendix to Joann.-Damasceni *de Imaginibus*, lib. iii. (Fabric. *Bibl. Graeca* vi. 747; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 858). [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (21), bishop of Salona, at whose solicitation Dionysius Exiguus published his collection of canons, and to whom the epistle prefixed to them is addressed [DIONYSIUS (19)]. Ceill. xi. 122. [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (22), bishop of Larissa, and metropolitan of Thessaly, A.D. 531. He was a layman and a soldier when elected. After his consecration two bishops, Probianus and Demetrius, with Antonius, a presbyter, appealed to EPIPHANIUS (17) of Constantinople against the election. Stephen appealed to pope Boniface, asserting the claims of the papal see to supremacy over the churches of Thessaly. The pope held a synod on the subject, but its decrees are lost. The patriarch of Constantinople deposed Stephen. (Hefele's *Councils*, sec. 244; Ceill. xi. 841.) [BONIFACIUS II.] [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (23), Jacobite bishop of Cyprus, known to us from his persecution in the reign of Justin II., as narrated by John of Ephesus (transl. by Dr. R. Payne Smith). The persecution broke out in 571 [PAULUS (11)], and Stephen, provoking the hostility of the patriarch John Scholasticus by denouncing his practice of annulling the Jacobite ordinations, was banished to the island of Platea, off the Cyrenaic coast. Thither John sent a party of his clergy to fetch him to Constantinople, and in their company a number of excubitores with orders to beat him with clubs until he consented to receive the communion with them. Under these severities he submitted, and when arrived at Constantinople he made further submission to the patriarch; but when John proposed that he should be sent back to Cyprus to have his orders annulled, and to be reconsecrated "to the bishopric of Cyprus," he refused with the greatest indignation, and burst out of the church where the proceedings were going on into the imperial palace, and there remonstrated with Justin for permitting such iniquities, saying he had been a bishop for twenty years since his consecration by Theodosius, patriarch of Alexandria. Justin, won by the appeal, had an edict against such severities drawn up, but before it was published the patriarch contrived to get it suppressed. Great enmity ensued between Stephen and John all their days. The emperor, however, took Stephen's part, appointed him bishop of Cyprus without his orders being interfered with, and even for his sake granted the island some fiscal alleviation. Stephen continued in union with the synod of Chalcedon, employing all his influence to mitigate the severities employed against the Jacobites. (Smith, pp. 18–22.) [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (24), bishop, is congratulated by Gregory the Great on the conversion of the patrician lady Maria by his preaching (*Epp.* vii. 8). [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (25), bishop in Bruttii, was with Venerius of Vibona, appointed visitor of the churches of Taurianum and Turris in A.D. 600, *sede vacante*, by Gregory the Great, who two years later asked him to help SABINUS in getting timber (*Epp.* x. 17; xii. 23). [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (26), bishop of an unknown see in southern Spain, mentioned in the letter of Gregory the Great (*Epp.* xiii. 45) in August, A.D. 603 (Jaffé, *Reg.* n. 1530) to John the defensor, which also deals with the case of JANUARIUS (26) of Malaga. Stephanus had been accused of treason and condemned by the synod of another province, as he alleged. As no sentence of John, like that in the case of JANUARIUS exists, it is supposed that Stephanus was really guilty. His treason, no doubt, consisted in some dealings with or leaning to the Goths as against the Byzantines. Gams (*Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2) 35) from the missing signatures to the councils of 589 and 590, concludes that the sees in Byzantine hands were Carthagena, Malaga, Asidonia and Urci, and perhaps Ilici, Dianium, and Saetabis. Of these Gams considers Asidonia, or more probably Urci, to have been the see of Stephanus. The statement that he had no metropolitan is explained by Gams by the probable death or absence of LICINIANUS of Carthagena, and he conjectures from the statement that he had been tried before an alien synod, that bishops from other parts of the imperial dominions, *e.g.* Mauritania or the Balearic Islands, had been summoned. Florez (*Esp. Sag.* xii. 313), on the grounds there stated, denies the genuineness of the letter. [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (27), bishop of Dor, in Palaestina Prima, in the first half of the 7th century, originally a monk of the monastery of St. Theodosus, who, after the death of Sophronius the patriarch of Jerusalem whose disciple he was, carried on, almost single-handed, his master's uncompromising struggle against the rising Monothelite heresy. In another article it has been narrated how Sophronius, prevented from quitting his diocese by the Saracen invasion, led Stephen into the church on Calvary, and in the most solemn manner, adjured him, by the memory of the sufferings of Christ and the prospect of the final judgment, to repair to Rome, and never to rest till he had obtained from the apostolical see a formal condemnation of the doctrine of the single will in Christ, by which the faith was imperilled. [SOPHRONIUS.] Stephen,

in obedience to this tremendous adjuration, departed to Rome, A.D. 633. (Baron. *Annal. ad ann.*) Honorius, the then pope, had fully accepted the doctrine of a single will in Christ; and had enjoined the abstinence from all discussion on such a mysterious subject. Stephen's first appeal was therefore entirely fruitless. He persevered, however, in the fulfilment of Sophronius' charge, and after the death of the latter, c. 637, he repaired once more to Rome to make his appeal to the apostolic see. This was in 645. Theodore I., who had succeeded after the two short popedoms of Severinus and John IV., was as zealous in repudiating Monothelitism as Honorius had been in accepting it. He received Stephen with the utmost courtesy, listened to his complaints of the irregular consecration of bishops in Palestine by Sergius of Joppa [SERGIUS], who, supported by the authority of Paul, the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople, had usurped the vicariate of the vacant see of Jerusalem, and sent him back to Palestine with full vicarial powers, authorising him to depose the uncanonical bishops unless they professed repentance and submitted to lawful authority, and to ordain others in their room. This Monothelite party, who had done all in their power to prevent his presenting his appeal, lying in wait for him on the way with the intention of loading him with fetters and throwing him into prison (Labbe, vi. 101), now took measures to reduce his delegated powers to an absurdity. Having got the papal commission, which had followed Stephen, into their hands, they are charged by Stephen with suppressing the part which conveyed authority to appoint new bishops, only transmitting that relating to the deposition of the existing ones, hoping thus, by keeping so many sees empty, to raise the cry of a widowed church against the orthodox party. (Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* xxxviii. 34; *Epist. Martini*, 5, 9, *ap.* Labbe, vi. 22, 34.) Stephen was once more in Rome in 649, on the summoning of the first Lateran council by Martin I. On this occasion he presented a lengthy "memorial" in which, after recounting the whole history of his antagonism to Monothelitism, from the solemn vow imposed on him by Sophronius' commands, his visits to the apostolic see, the plots of his enemies, &c., he denounced the heresy of the single will, and asserted the truth of the combination of the perfect God and the perfect man in the same Christ, which could not have been if he had not possessed both an essentially human and an essentially divine will. The like holding good of the "energy." (Labbe, vi. 101, ff.) The issue was a triumphant success for Stephen and the cause for which he had so perseveringly contended. The Monothelite heresy was unanimously repudiated by the whole West, Stephen having the satisfaction of uniting his signature to those of the 104 brother bishops who joined in the condemnation. (Labbe, vi. 79, 367.) On his first arrival his enemies had done their best to weaken his credit with the pope and the council, by urging accusations against him which on investigation proved groundless. He was sent back to Palestine with the confirmation of his vicarial authority, commissioned to admit the penitent among the heretical bishops to communion, and to recognise their episcopal "status," by reason of the present distress. (Martin. *Epistola ad Pantaleonem*, *Ep.* 9; Labbe, vi. 34. Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 858; iii. 129, 278 ff; *Fabr. Bibl. Graec.* xii. 236; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 167, 182, 193; Schröckh, xx. 426; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* livre xxxviii.) [E. V.]

STEPHANUS (28), a person to whom Eusebius addressed his *Questions and Solutions on the Genealogy of the Saviour.* [EUSEBIUS (23) of CÆSAREA, ii. 338.] [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (29), an adherent of Chrysostom, banished to Arabia, but taken from his custodians by the Isaurians and sent into mount Taurus (Pallad. *Dial.* c. 20, *P. G.* xlvii. 72; Tillem. xi. 329). [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (30), a monk, punished in the persecution of Chrysostom's friends for bringing letters from Rome (Pallad. *Dial.* c. 20, *P. G.* xlvii. 72; Tillem. xi. 329). [C. H.]

STEPHANUS (31), an ascetic, Libyan by birth, who lived not far from Marmarica, near the Mareotic lake. He was intimate with St. Antony, and followed the ascetic life for sixty years. Instances of his patience and fortitude are recorded. (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 30; Heracl. *Parad.* c. 12, ap. Rosweyd. *Vitae Patrum*; Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 29; Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* xi. 36.) [I. G. S.]

STEPHANUS (32), deacon, author, with Messianus presbyter, of the older Life of Caesarius, of Arles, c. A.D. 542. He and Messianus are said by the authors of the other Life to have served Caesarius from their youth (*Pat. Lat.* lxvii. 1001; Boll. *AA. SS.* Aug. vi. 65; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 242; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 128). [J. G.]

STEPHANUS (33), priest at Auxerre, was probably a native of Gaul, but had newly returned from Africa, when he was asked by Annarius, bishop of Auxerre, to write the lives of his predecessors, Amator and Germanus, the former in prose and the latter in verse (see the correspondence in Boll. *AA. SS.* 1 Mai. i. 51; Sept. vii. 85). The latter, if ever written, is lost; but the *Life of Amator* is given by the Bollandists, *l. c.* He flourished at the close of the 6th century (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 361, 362; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 323, 324). [J. G.]

STEPHANUS (34) BARSUDAIL, correspondent of St. James of Batna. He lived at Edessa, in cent. 6. There exists in MS. at the Vatican a letter addressed to him by St. James, on the eternity of future punishment. [JACOBUS (13), p. 328.] He afterwards lapsed into heresy, and was refuted by Philoxenus Mabugensis (Assem. *Bib. Orient.* t. i. p. 303; Ceill. x. 641). [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (35), priest in the province of Valeria, of whom Gregory the Great relates a strange story (*Dial.* iii. 20). [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (36), abbat of a monastery near Reate, highly praised by Gregory the Great for his patient and unworldly disposition. (Gregorius, *Dial.* iv. 19, *Hom. in Ev.* ii. 35, in Migne

Patr. Lat. lxxvii. 352, lxxvi. 1263.) He is commemorated on February 13th (*AA. SS.*, Feb. ii. 674). [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (37), vir illustris, related to Gregory the Great a strange account of his apparent death and return to life. (*Dial.* iv. 36.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (38), one of those at Naples, who, having from certain doubts separated from communion, afterwards desired to be received back into the church. (Gregorius, *Epp.* i. 14.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (39), deacon of Thebes in Thessaly. One of the charges against HADRIANUS (4) was that, knowing the scandalous life of Stephanus, he did not deprive him of his orders. (Gregorius, *Epp.* iii. 7.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (40), of Cagliari, had by his will directed a monastery to be founded on a property of which he had a lease. As the freeholder refused to consent, his widow Theodosia proposed instead to establish a nunnery in a house, of which she was absolute owner. Bishop JANUARIUS (25) appears to have hindered her, and then to have represented that it was her fault that her husband's wishes were not carried out. Even after Gregory the Great had interposed, he apparently continued his opposition. (*Epp.* iv. 8, 15, v. 2.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (41), chartularius of the emperor in Sicily. Gregory the Great, in a letter to the empress, complains of his offensive conduct in illegally seizing the property of private persons (*Epist.* lib. v. ind. xiii. 43). He is also mentioned in lib. iii. ind. xi. 3. He is apparently not the same person as the Stephanus chartularius addressed in lib. ii. ind. x. 28, in which Gregory requests him to cause two fugitive monks to return to their monastery; if he is, he is spoken of in very different terms from those of the later letters. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 563, 605, 707.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (42), vir magnificus, by whom Gregory the Great sent money to the subdeacon, Anthemius, in May A.D. 596, to ransom prisoners taken in Campania by the Lombards. (*Epp.* vi. 35.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (43), abbat of a monastery in Gaul—according to the reading of some MSS. of Lérins—to whom Gregory the Great addressed a letter in A.D. 596 (vi. 56) by St. Augustine on his second mission after his return to Rome (AUGUSTINUS, Vol. I. p. 226). In this letter Gregory exhorts him to vigilance, and thanks him for certain presents. If Lérins was the monastery of Stephanus, it appears by another letter of Gregory's (xi. 12), that he had died before A.D. 600, and that Gregory thought him careless in the government of his monastery. [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (44), of Naples, was betrothed to a woman who, before marriage, entered a nunnery. Her brother then charged Stephanus with keeping possession of her house and some other property. Gregory the Great directed that if so he should be compelled to make restitution. (*Epp.* vii. 23.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (45), abbat of St. Mark, complained to Gregory the Great that the lands granted by his predecessor, BENEDICTUS I. *q. v.* were unjustly retained by the Roman church. (*Epp.* ix. 30.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (46), deacon of Salona, had been sent by MAXIMUS (18) to Rome, and was delayed there by illness. (Gregorius, *Epp.* ix. 125.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (47), of Campania, had been ransomed by one Accellus. As his wife was a slave of the Roman church, Gregory the Great directed that Accellus should be repaid by the subdeacon Anthemius, and the sum allowed in his accounts. (*Epp.* xii. 44.) [F. D.]

STEPHANUS (48), optio or adjutant. [EUMORPHIUS.]

STEPHANUS (49), primicerius. [RESPECTUS.]

STEPHANUS (50), deacon of Macarius, Patr. of Antioch. When Macarius retracted his Monothelite views at the sixth general Council, Stephen remained stedfast and was expelled the assembly. (Ceill. xii. 749.) [G. T. S.]

STEPHANUS (51) (THE YOUNGER), ST., lived sixty years in a Byzantine monastery in the 8th century. He was one of those who took an active part in defence of images in the iconoclastic controversy, and was put to death after tortures by the emperor Constantinus Copronymus. He is commemorated on Nov. 28. (Cave, *Hist. Liter.* ii. p. 6.) Among the letters of Ephraim Syrus there is one (paraen. xxv.) addressed (according to one MS.) to a certain Stephanus as "the young," who may be, as Vossius thinks, the Stephanus of this article, but in that case the letter is interpolated. (Eph. Syr. *Opp.* ed. Voss. p. 377, ed. 1603; Tillem. viii. 756.) [I. G. S.]

STEPHANUS (52), of Byzantium, priest or monk, in the latter part of the 8th century, author of a life of St. Stephen the younger. There was another Stephen of Byzantium, a heathen of more ancient date, author of a treatise "περὶ πολέων." (Cave, *Hist. Liter.* ii. 267.) [I. G. S.]

STEPHANUS (53) Thaumaturgus, monk in the Laura of St. Saba, near Jerusalem. His life by LEONTIUS (65) is given by the Bollandists (*AA. SS.*, 13 Jul. iii. 504), prefixing their Commentarius Praevius; he is commemorated in the Greek Menaea and Anthologia on July 13, and October 28, but the Bollandists place his feast on April 23, the day of his death. The life abounds more in miracles than in historical points.

Stephanus was the son of a brother of JOANNES (529) DAMASCENUS, and, contrary to the usual rule regarding age, was taken into the Laura at the age of ten years; this was in A.D. 735, and probably on the recommendation of his uncle, while Martyrius was abbat. At the age of twenty-five he left the Laura, and visited various monasteries, before retiring, at the age of thirty-seven, to the strictest seclusion for five years, and to an anchorite's cell for other fifteen. He then returned to the Laura, and died, A.D. 794, aged 69 years. [J. G.]

STIDBERT, an abbat, to whom Offa, king of Mercia in 767 (K. *C. D.* 116, A.D. 767 corr. for 757), gave lands in Middlesex, in exchange for other land in Chiltern (Ciltinne). The act was confirmed thirty years after, in a council at Chelsea under king Kenulf. The Middlesex lands are said to be on a stream called Lidding between "Gumeninga hergae [Harrow] end Liddinge"; the lands exchanged are at "Wichama." The act is attested by Offa, Jaenbert, and two bishops. The name of Stidbert does not occur in any list of abbats; but the exact locality of the land and original home of the charter, now in the Cotton Collection, may yet be discovered, and might throw a ray of light on the obscure history of Middlesex at this date. [S.]

STILICHO. An account of his life will be found under HONORIUS (1), emperor, and in the *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography*. A few points only require additional notice. The chronology now generally accepted (Dahn, *die Könige der Germanen*, v. 36; Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, i. 310) on the authority of Prosper places Alaric's first invasion at the end of A.D. 400, which is confirmed by Paulinus of Nola (*Carm.* xxvi. 5, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxi. 638), and the battle of Pollentia on Easter Day, A.D. 402, not 403. As to Stilicho's relations with St. Ambrose, when his soldiers carried off one Cresconius, who had taken refuge in a church at Milan, he repented, and let him go unhurt, and when St. Ambrose was on his death-bed he exclaimed, that if he died it would be the ruin of Italy, and sent him a deputation of the noblest men of the city to entreat him to pray that his life might be prolonged (Paulinus, *Vita Ambr.* 34, 45; in *Patr. Lat.* xiv. 39, 42). To the literature referred to in the above articles should be added *Trois Ministres des Fils de Théodose* by A. Thierry. [F. D.]

STRATEGIUS (1), a married layman at Constantinople, who shewed hospitality to Gregory during his residence there, and to whom he commended his friend Sacerdos when visiting that city after his being deprived of the superiorship of the hospital at Caesarea (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 92). [SACERDOS.] [E. V.]

STRATEGIUS (2), a presbyter by whom letters passed between Basil and Patrophilus of Aegae and Theophilus of Castabala, on the business of Eustathius of Sebaste (Basil. *Epp.* 244, [82]; 250, [85]; 245, [309]. [E. V.]

STRATEGIUS (3). [EUSEBIA (6).]

STRATIOTICI. Epiphanius (*Haer.* 26), in his article on the sect to which he gives the name of Gnostics (under which head he appears to have included different branches of the Ophites of whom he had heard in Egypt), says that in Egypt they were called, among other names, Phibionites and Stratiotici. He gives no explanation of either name. Philaster (*Haer.* 57), speaking of the Floriani (*q. v.*) says they were called "milites" because so many of them were soldiers. This seems to be a mere guess. [G. S.]

STRATON, a deacon, against whom at the Carthaginian conference the Donatists brought a charge, that having been guilty of "tradition" he had afterwards been employed by Melchiades to execute the decree of Maxentius for restoring to the Christians their property, thus implicating Melchiades himself in the same charge. The president asked for proof of identity, as more than one person might bear the same name, and the Catholics pointed out that this question was full of uncertainty, but the Donatists persisted in their clamorous objection (Aug. *Brevic.* 34, 36; *Post Coll.* 17). [H. W. P.]

STRATONICE, Oct. 31, martyr at Cyzicum, in Mysia, with Seleucus, her husband, at the Quinquennalia of Galerius and during the Diocletian persecution. She was the wife of a leading magistrate of the town and as such came to see the tortures of a large number of Christians who had been there assembled. Their patience converted her, and she converted her husband. Her father, Apollonius, made every effort to win her back to paganism, but when he failed he became her most bitter accuser. The narrative of their various sufferings and miraculous deliverances is a very long one. They were finally beheaded and buried in the one tomb, over which Constantine built a church (Asseman. *Acta Mart. Orient.* t. ii. p. 65). The Acts offer many marks of authenticity. Cf. Le Blant, *Actes des Martyrs*, p. 224, etc.; *AA. SS.* Boll. Oct. xiii. p. 893–916; Ceill. ii. 481–483). [G. T. S.]

STRATONICUS (1), bishop of Charrae (Haran) c. 512 (Gams). He had been a presbyter and oeconomus of the Greek church at Edessa, and in the latter capacity, during a severe famine and pestilence, in December 511, he built a hospice and infirmary for the sick poor. Shortly after this he was appointed bishop of Charrae (Jos. Stylit. xlii.; Assemann. *Bibl. Orient.* i. 271; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 977). [E. V.]

STRATONICUS (2), bishop of Soli in Cyprus, at the close of the 7th century. He accompanied his metropolitan, Constantius, to the Sixth General Council of Constantinople in 680, and in the 12th session they both brought forward numerous testimonies from the writings of the fathers to the twofold operation of Christ. (Labbe, vi. 973, 1033; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1072). [E. V.]

STUDIUS (1), a correspondent of St. Ambrose (*Epp.* xxv., xxvi.). In answer to an inquiry of his, whether it were right to execute sentences passed on criminals, St. Ambrose gives him advice. [J. Ll. D.]

STUDIUS (2), prefect of Constantinople at the time of Chrysostom's deposition and exile, June A.D. 404. To him is addressed the imperial decree of Aug. 29th, threatening the friends and adherents of Chrysostom with the confiscation of their houses if unlawful assemblies were held in them, but at the same time giving permission for the enlargement of the ecclesiastics and others who were in prison or on ship-board on the charge of having caused the conflagration. All foreign bishops and clergy were ordered to leave the city. This was followed by another decree, also addressed to Studius, Sept. 11th, ordering masters to keep their slaves from attending the assemblies of the Joannites at the risk of fine to themselves and corporal punishment to the slaves, and threatening the Nummularii and other corporations of

Constantinople with a fine of 50 lbs. of gold for the same offence (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. tit. ii. lex 37; tit. iv. lex 5, tom. vi. pp. 75, 103). Studius was a personal friend of Chrysostom, who wrote to console him on the death of his brother soon after his arrival at Cucusus (Chrys. *Ep.* 197). Studius's favourable feelings towards Chrysostom rendering him an unfit instrument for carrying out the designs of his enemies, he was speedily removed from his office, and replaced by the pagan Optatus. [E. V.]

STUDIUS (3), a consul of the 5th cent. and founder of a monastery of the sleepless monks under Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople. A.D. 471. (Ceill. x. 345.) [GENNADIUS (10).] [G. T. S.]

STYLITAE. The example set by Simeon, the famous Syrian pillar-saint, found not a few copyists in Syria and Greece, so late even as the 11th century, but scarcely elsewhere. (Nil. Epp. ii. 114, 115.) Sometimes the saint lived inside the pillar, more usually on the top. (Miraei, *de Scr. Eccl.* c. 93, ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Eccl.*) The monks of Egypt seem from the first to have been averse to the practice. In the more practical western church the custom never prevailed. When an ascetic, Wulfilaich, near Trèves in the 6th century, tried the experiment, his bishop demolished the pillar (Gregor. Turonens. *Hist. Fr.* vii. 15). The Stylitae must not be confounded with some devotees at Alexandria in the 4th century, who slept on prostrate obelisks, described by the emperor Julian as "filthy and superstitious" (ap. Fabric. *Biblioth. Graeca*, v. 41). The Stylitae, partly perhaps through their independence of authority, were apt to fall into heresy. Ephraem of Edessa is said to have converted one of them miraculously from heresy (Mosch. *Prat.* c. 36, ap. Rosw. *Vit. Patr.*). The state of mind engendered by this morbid and unnatural existence is described with poetic insight by Tennyson in his poem on the founder of the Stylitae. (See SIMEON STYLITES and DANIEL THE STYLITE in this Dictionary; also Evagr. *Hist. Eccl.* i. 13, vi. 23; Theodor. Lect. *Hist. Eccl.* i. 12; Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* xv. 23, on the Acoemetae or Studitae.) [I. G. S.]

SUAEBHARD, king of Kent, 676. (Kemble, *C. D.* 14, 15.) [SUEFRED.] [C. H.]

SUAEBRAED, king of Essex, 704. (Kemble, *C. D.* 52.) [SUEFRED.] [C. H.]

SUCCESSUS (1), bishop of Abbir Germaniciana (Abbir minus, *Mommsen*, *hod.* Hren Naâm Momm.), in the far south (Morcelli) of proconsular Africa. The city was so called from Galba's German legions, who were sent to tranquillise the tribes. Castra Galbae received its name at the same time. Successus attended every one of Cyprian's councils in A.D. 252, A.D. 254, A.D. 255, *Epp.* 57, 67, 70, and spoke sixteenth in the third council on baptism. To him Cyprian addresses (and requests him to circulate) the important information he obtained from Rome as to the rescript of Valerian ordering the general persecution of A.D. 258, in which year Successus himself was martyred (Morcelli). [Is it possible that this distant see was too hot with barbarians, and that he was a kind of bishop *in partibus* residing in or near Carthage?] [E. W. B.]

SUCCESSUS (2) (SUCCENSUS), bishop of Diocaesarea in Isauria, c. 431 (Gams), to whom Cyril of Alexandria addressed two celebrated letters on the Incarnate Word, in reply to requests for a statement of his belief on the one Incarnate Nature (Cyrill. Alex. *Epp.* 38, 39; Labbe, iv. 173; Phot. cc. 229, 230, pp. 788 ff.; Tillem. xiv. 570; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1021). [E. V.]

SUCCONIUS (SACCONIUS), bishop of Uzalis near Utica (Aug. *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8), was one of the bishops who attended the council at Carthage in February 484, and was afterwards banished (*Not. Afric.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 270). A report reached the pope, either Felix III. or Gelasius, that Succonius had communicated at Constantinople with Acacius, and a letter is extant in which the pope rebukes him if he had really done so. (Felix III., *Epp.* in *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 967; Ceillier, x. 417 n.) [F. D.]

SUEFRED (SUEBRED, SUAEBHARD, SUAEBRAED), a son of Sebbi, king of the East Saxons, who about the year 695 came to the throne conjointly with his brother Sighard, and ceased to reign some time before 709 (Bede, *H. E.* iv. 11). His name, with those of his father and brother, is attached to the Barking charters (Kem. *C. D.* 35, 38) and to the forged Peterborough charter, in which he appears as king of Kent. [SEBBI, SIGHARD.] The only question of interest that attaches itself to Suefred is his possible identity with Swebheard, or Webheard, king of Kent, and his connexion with the conquest of Kent by Ethelred of Mercia in 676 (*Chr. Sax. M. H. B.* 321). Bede (*H. E.* v. 8) mentions as kings of Kent in 693, the year in which archbishop Brihtwald was consecrated, Wihtred, who certainly belonged to the royal house of Kent, and Swæbhard, of whom nothing else is known. Matthew of Westminster indeed makes him the brother of Wihtred, but gives no authority. The Chronicle (*M. H. B.* 323) simply copies Bede. In the spurious charter of Peterborough above referred to, Suebheard appears as king of Kent in immediate connexion with a statement that that kingdom had fallen under the sway of Sighere king of the East Saxons. Swebheard appears in Kentish charters more than once; he attests grants of king Oswin to Minster, dated Jan. 27, 675, without the title of king (Kem. *C. D.*, No. 8; Elmham, pp. 229, 230; Thorn, col. 1770); he himself grants land in Thanet to the same monastery, as king of the Kentishmen with the advice of Theodore, of king Ethelred and his father king Sebbi, dated March 1, 676 (*C. D.* No. 14; —Elmham, pp. 232–234; Thorn, 1770); and another charter granting land at Sturry (Kemb. *C. D.* No. 15.—Elmham, pp. 234, 235; Thorn, col. 1770); Elmham identifies him with the Suefred as well as with the Swebheard of Bede, and gives his pedigree (pp. 235, 236, 298), from the East Saxon kings. Under the name of Suaebræd, the king of the East Saxons, in 704, he and another person named Pæogthath, make a grant to Waldhere, bishop of London, of land on the Thames named Fiscesburna (Kemble, *C. D.* No. 52) at Twickenham, which is confirmed by Coenred and Ceolred

kings of Mercia; and this last seems to be a genuine charter. Granting that the Kentish and Peterborough charters, above cited, are spurious or interpolated, they point unquestionably to a tradition that the Swebheard of Bede was an East Saxon prince, and, if so, that he was a representative in Kent of the Mercian authority which at some periods of Ethelred's reign was supreme there. Thorn represents him as having obtained the kingdom by violence (ap. Twysden, c. 1770). No more is heard of either Sighard, Suefred or Swebheard, either in Essex or Kent. Offa must have succeeded soon after the granting of the charter to bishop Waldhere. [See EAST SAXONS, Kings of.] It is, however, possible that Swebheard shared the kingdom with him, and that he should be identified with the king Swebriht, whose death is recorded by Simeon of Durham, from the Northumbrian Annals in 738 (*M. H. B.* 659). [S.]

SUENES (Σουήνης), a wealthy Persian Christian, persecuted under Isdegerd. (Theod. *H. E.* v. 38 al. 39; Tillem. xii. 360.) [C. H.]

SUFFRONIUS, bp. [EUFRONIUS (3).]

SUIDBERHT, abbat of Dacre (Dacore), in Cumberland. Beda mentions a cure wrought there by St. Cuthbert's reliques during Suidberht's abbacy. (Beda, iv. 32.) [J. R.]

SUIDBERT (SUIDBERCT, SUITBERT, SUIBERT), regionary bishop in Frisia, one of the twelve whom St. Egbert sent out to Northern Europe. He went to Frisia, A.D. 690, and was so successful in his mission, that about the time when St. Willibrord went to Rome for consecration, Suitbertus was selected by the rest of his associates and sent to Britain for the same purpose. He followed St. Wilfrid into Mercia, and was consecrated by him, June 29, 693 (Pagi, ann. 693, § 5; Stevenson's note on Bed. v. 11). On his return to the continent, he devoted himself more specially to the conversion of the Bructeri lying to the north of the Rhine and the Lippe; but Pepin d'Heristal, some time after, at the request of Blythryda his wife, gave to St. Suitbertus an island in the Rhine, called by Bede "In littore," and now Kaiserswerth, six miles from Düsseldorf. There he built a monastery and died A.D. 713. Bede, who is our only real authority (*Hist. Eccl.* v. c. 11), calls him "vir modestus moribus et mansuetus corde": his monastery was long illustrious, and his memory is still revered in Germany. The *Vita S. Suitberti*, attributed to Marchelmus or Marcellinus, and given by Surius at March 1, is probably of the 12th century. The Bollandists (*AA. SS.* Mart. i. 67) treat fully regarding St. Suidbert and his companions, and give a sermon on St. Suidbert by St. Radbodus, the bishop of Utrecht, in the 10th century (see also *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 433 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 218). [J. G.]

SUINTHILA, king of Spain, A.D. 621–631, succeeded on the death of Reccared II., the youthful son of Sisebut. There is no ancient authority for the statements that he was a son of Reccared I. or a son-in-law of Sisebut. He had been one of the generals of the last-named king, and completed the work of extinguishing the last remnants of the power of the Byzantines in the peninsula. He had previously defeated them in a pitched battle, taken one of their governors prisoner, and won over another. He thus became the first Gothic king over the whole of Spain. At the beginning of his reign he put down a revolt of the restless Basques, to curb whom he founded the city of Ologitis. Before A.D. 625 he associated with himself his son Racimir in the kingdom. Isidorus concludes his *Historia Gothorum* in A.D. 625 with praises of his justice, his devotion to business, his generosity, and his care of the poor. From the fact, however, that no council was held in his reign, and that it was marked by no measures against the Jews, it is supposed that he was unfavourable to the clergy, or at any rate maintained an independent attitude towards them. He certainly became obnoxious to the magnates, probably on account of his attempting to make the crown hereditary, and thus encroaching on their right of election. One of them, Sisenand, formed a conspiracy and called in the aid of Dagobert I., who, bribed by the promise of the golden dish weighing 500 pounds, the gift of Aetius to Thorismund, sent the army of Burgundy under Abundantius and Venerandus to assist the rebels. It advanced to Saragossa, the Gothic troops and Suinthila's adherents including his brothers, went over to Sisenand, who was proclaimed king at Saragossa. Suinthila abdicated when he saw his cause was hopeless, his life was spared, but he and his wife and sons were deprived of all their property except what the generosity of the victor allowed them. The confiscation was confirmed by the 75th canon of the fourth council of Toledo in A.D. 633, from which it appears that Suinthila was then alive. The same canon excluded him, his wife and his sons from communion. Dagobert afterwards sent an embassy for the dish, which was accordingly given up by Sisenand, but the Goths prevented its removal from the country by force. Sisenand finally sent Dagobert instead 200,000 solidi. (Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.*; Fredegarius, in Migne *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 651; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 313; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 184; Gams, *Kirchg. von Spanien*, ii. (2) 81.) The crown of Suinthila found with the Guarrazar treasure [RECCESVINTH] is preserved at Madrid. It is described with an illustration in the DICT. OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES, i. 510. [F. D.]

SUITHANA (SUITHA, OSUITHA), an abbess in the diocese of Mainz, excommunicated by Lullus, her archbishop, for permitting lax discipline in her monastery between cir. 755 and 786 (ep. 14). For the readings, cf. *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 827, and Jaffé, *Monum. Mogunt.* 292. [C. H.]

SULPICIUS (1) I., ST., consecrated archbishop of Bourges A.D. 584. Gregory of Tours says: "He is in truth a most noble man, of the first senatorial families of Gaul, versed in rhetoric, and in poetry second to none" (*Hist. Franc.* vi. 39). One of his first acts was to summon a council at Clermont, to settle a dispute beween the bishops of Cahors and Rodez as to the jurisdiction over certain parishes (*ibid.* 38, 39). In 585 he subscribed the second council of Mâcon. He died in 591 (*ibid.* x. 26), and is said to have been buried in the church of St. Julian, but to have been transferred to that of St. Ursinus afterwards. Though he is sometimes distin-

guished from Sulpicius II. by the cognomen of Severus, he must not be confounded with Sulpicius Severus the historian (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 969; cf. *Gall. Christ.* ii. 15). His day is Jan. 29. (Boll. p. 967.) [S. A. B.]

SULPICIUS (2), II., ST., twenty-ninth archbishop of Bourges, surnamed Pius to distinguish him from Sulpicius I. of this see. We have two lives of him, both purporting to be written by men who had known him personally. The longer of the two, which was probably the work of a monk of the monastery in which Sulpicius ended his days, was first published by Surius (Jan. 17) with his customary abbreviations and alterations, then accurately by Mabillon, in the second saeclum of his *Acta SS. Ord. S. Benedicti*, whence it has been transferred to the *Patrologia Latina*, lxxx. 574–92. Both are to be found in Boll. *Acta SS.*, Jan. ii. 167, seqq. For an estimate of them see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 578. From these and other sources we learn that he was born at Vatan in the diocese a little before the close of the 6th century, and was ordained by St. Austregisilus, and became his archdeacon (Boll. *ibid.*, p. 166). In 613 Clotaire II. became sole king of the Franks, and Sulpicius was made his abbas castrensis, which office he held till 624, when he was appointed to the episcopate of Bourges. As bishop he was at the council of Rheims under Sonnatius, the date of which is variously given between 625 and 630 (Flodoardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. 5), and in the latter year, by the order of Dagobert, whose letter to him survives (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 16; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1177), he convened the bishops of his province and consecrated his friend, Desiderius, bishop of Cahors. The biographies give but few details of his episcopate beyond the usual miracles of the age, but he is said to have applied himself with much success to the conversion of the Jews. About three years before his death, weakness compelled him to resign the principal duties of the see to Vulfoledus, who afterwards succeeded him. He died Jan. 17, 644, in a neighbouring monastery, which he had founded and which took his name.

Three letters of Sulpicius are extant, two to Desiderius of Cahors and one to Verus of Rodez. They are printed in the *Patr. Lat.* lxxx. 591–4, but are of little interest. The *Historia Septem Dormientium*, which purports to be written by Gregory of Tours, is addressed to him (*Patr. Lat.* lxxi. 1105).

Sulpicius' day is Jan. 17, on which he appears in many martyrologies both ancient and modern (Boll. *Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 165). Many churches are said to have been dedicated to him in the diocese of Liége by his disciple St. Remaclus (*ibid.* p. 166), and the large parochial church of Saint-Sulpice at Paris derives its name from him. [S. A. B.]

SULPICIUS SEVERUS, ecclesiastical historian [SEVERUS, SULPICIUS].

SUNNA, Arian bishop of Merida, intruded by Leovigild c. A.D. 682 when he found he could not win over MASONA. Sunna, on his arrival, seized some of the churches and tried to get possession of the basilica of St. Eulalia. Masona resisted, and Sunna wrote accusing him to Leovigild, who ordered that Sunna and Masona should hold a dispute before the local magistrates in the atrium of the basilica, which should be the reward of the victor. In this the orthodox writer represents Masona as gaining an easy victory, and he accuses the defeated Sunna of then procuring the banishment of Masona by false charges. On Reccared's accession Sunna, unlike most of his fellows, adhered to his former creed. For his conspiracy and banishment see RECCARED and MASONA. Reccared urged him to become a catholic, and promised in that case to appoint him to some other see. He replied, "A catholic I will never be, but will live in the rite in which I have lived, or will die most willingly for the religion wherein I have remained from my earliest years, even until now." The little known of Sunna mainly comes through the frantic partisan of orthodoxy who wrote *De Vitis Patrum Emeritensium* (11, 12, 17, 18, in *Esp. Sag.* xiii.), but his conspiracy is also mentioned in the chronicle of Joan. Biclarensis. (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 182: Görres in *Zeitsch. für wissensch. Theol.* 1885, 329, 331; C. A. A. Scott's *Ulfilas*, 216, 217.) [F. D.]

SUNNIAS, a presbyter of Getica in the beginning of the 5th century. He, with Fretela, wrote to Jerome about the year 403, and received his reply. (*Ep.* 106 ed. Vull.) [FRETELA.] [W. H. F.]

SUNNILA, bishop of Viseo, was originally an Arian, and was probably appointed by Leovigild after his conquest in A.D. 585 of the Suevic kingdom, which included Viseo. At the third council of Toledo in A.D. 589 he however abjured Arianism, and was allowed to retain his see. Immediately before him Joannes subscribes as Velensis. No such see being known, it is generally supposed to be a mistake for Valeriensis (JOANNES (430)), but Florez conjectures the true reading to be Vesensis, and that Joannes was the Catholic bishop of Viseo, several sees at this council being represented by both an Arian and a Catholic bishop. (*Esp. Sag.* xiv. 312; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 277, 254.) [F. D.]

SUPERIUS (1), African (? Tingit) bishop (see AHIMNIUS); first proposed the case in Cyp. *Ep.* lvi., as to whether lapsed persons who subsequently suffered as confessors might be restored. [E. W. B.]

SUPERIUS (2), a presbyter, convicted with others of stealing property from the temple of Serapis at the same time as Silvanus (*Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 179–181, ed. Oberthür, p. 170, 171, ed. Dupin). [H. W. P.]

SUPERIUS (3), a centurion, present at the enquiry about Felix of Aptunga (Opt. i. 26; Aug. *Ep.* 88). [H. W. P.]

SUR, otherwise Syr, one of the three original disciples of Pachomius, the Egyptian founder of regular monastic communities in cent. iv. (Boll. *Acta SS.* 14 Mai. iii.). [PACHOMIUS.] [G. T. S.]

SURANUS, abbat of a monastery at Sora, expended all he had in relieving the fugitives from the Lombards. Being therefore unable to ransom himself, he was murdered by them; and as his body fell to the ground, the whole of the

neighbouring mountain and forest, it is said, was shaken. (Gregorius, *Dial.* iv. 22; *AA. SS.* 24 Jan. ii, 606.) [F. D.]

SWEBHEARD, SWÆBHARD, SWABERT, SUEBRED. [SUEFRED.]

SWITHÆD (SWITHRED), king of the East Saxons. He appears in the pedigrees (*M. H. B.* 629), as the son and successor of Selred, who was killed in 746. Under the name of Swithred he is mentioned by Florence of Worcester as king in 758 (*ib.* 544), and he is the last king mentioned in the appendix to the Chronicle of Florence, although two more generations are included in the pedigree (*ib.* 629, 637), in which Sigeric is named as his son and successor. [S.]

SWITHELM (SUIDHELM), king of the East Saxons. He is described by Bede as the son of Sexbald, and in the pedigrees of the ancient kings as son of Sigebald, in which case he was brother of Sigebert the Good, whom he succeeded some time after the year 653 (*M. H. B.* 629, 637; Bede, *H. E.* iii. 22, 30). He, like Sigebert, was a Christian, and under the influence of bishop Cedd who baptized him at Rendelsham, in Suffolk, Ethelwald, the king of the East Angles, being his godfather. He died in or before the year 665; and nothing more is known about him. The next rulers of the East Saxons, still under Mercian dominion, were Sebbi and Sighere. [S.]

SWITHULF, an abbat, probably of some northern monastery, who is said by Symeon (*H. R.*) to have died in A.D. 772. He is mentioned in the *Liber Vitae* of the monks of Durham (p. 9). [J. R.]

SWITHUN, a benefactor of St. Andrew's church, Rochester, bequeathing to it lands settled on him by charter of Kenulf king of Mercia, and Cuthred king of Kent, in 801. (Kemble, *C. D.* 179; Thorpe's *Registrum Roffense*, p. 20.) [C. H.]

SYAGRIA, a charitable lady at Lyons, c. 500, praised by Ennodius (*Vit. Epiph.* in *Pat. Lat.* lxiii. 234). When Epiphanius bishop of Pavia came into Gaul to redeem the Italian captives in the hands of Gundobald, it was she who supplied much of the ransom money. She is mentioned very honourably in the life of the abbat Eugendus (§10, Boll. *Acta SS.* 1 Jan. i. 52; Tillem. xvi. 103, 143, 489). [C. H.]

SYAGRIUS (1), of Verona. [INDICIA.]

SYAGRIUS (2), author, mentioned by Gennadius (*De Script. Eccl.* lxv.) among authors who wrote before A.D. 450; he wrote *De Fide* against the heretics who denied that there could be any distinction of persons in the Godhead. The work is lost, but Gennadius gives a short account of the arguments used (*Hist. Litt. de la Franc.* ii. 652; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 469). Cave (i. 426) thinks he may be placed in 437. [J. G.]

SYAGRIUS (3), addressed by Sidonius in three letters, a person of good family if all three are to the same person. His ward, the daughter of Optantius, is asked in marriage by Projectus a man of rank, of whom Syagrius receives from the bishop an honourable character (*Epp.* lib. ii. ep. 4). He is studying the German language with astonishing ardour, and Sidonius styles him "novus Burgundiorum Solon in legibus disserendis" (lib. v. ep. 5). He owes it to his illustrious ancestry no longer to neglect the duties of civic life for rural pursuits (lib. viii. ep. 8). [R. J. K.]

SYAGRIUS (4), ST., nineteenth bishop of Autun, held a position of some eminence in France in the latter half of the 6th century. From an expression in a letter of Gregory the Great to queen Brunichilde (quem i.e. Syagrium, vestrum proprium novimus, ix. 109) it has been inferred that he was her brother, but without foundation. It is not however improbable that he was a member of the noble family to which belonged the Syagrius with whom Sidonius Apollinaris corresponded (*Epist.* viii. 8, see too v. 5). He was consecrated by St. Germanus of Paris about 560 (Venant. Fort. *Vita S. Germ. Par.* 64), and acquired considerable influence both with king Guntram (see Florentius Gallus, *Vita S. Rusticulae*, cap. i., Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. ii. 658; Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. 28; *Vita S. Aridii*, xxxv.) and with queen Brunichilde. The latter obtained for him from Gregory the gift of the pallium, to which his see gave him no claim (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* ix. 11, 108), and assisted him in founding two monasteries at Autun, one for men and one for women, and a xenodochium (*ibid.* xiii. 8) and perhaps in his embellishments of the cathedral. On the other hand, the *Historia Epitomata* of Greg. Tur. (lxxxix.) states that he joined the party of the pretender Gundovald against Guntram, but its accuracy is doubtful (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 84). There are various indications of his activity as a bishop. He attended numerous councils (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 344), was a trusted agent of Gregory the Great, who recommended to his good offices St. Augustine and his monks (*Epist.* vi. 54) and made numerous appeals for his co-operation in the war he was waging against simony and other ecclesiastical abuses in France (*Ibid.* ix. 106, 113, 114, 115). St. Aunarius or Aunacharius, of Auxerre, was his disciple (AUNARIUS) and according to Gregory of Tours, St. Virgilius, his archdeacon, owed to him his elevation to the archbishopric of Arles in 588 (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 23). He is believed to have died in the year 600, and was buried in the nunnery of St. Andochius which he had built.

His cult began very early. Gregory of Tours speaks of him as venerabilis et egregius antistes (*Vita S. Aridii* xxxv.), Gregory the Great as reverendae memoriae episcopum (*Epist.* xiii. 8, 9), Venantius Fortunatus, as dominus sanctus et apostolicâ sede dignissimus papa (*Misc.* v. 6, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 191), and Ado characterizes him as, vir summae sanctitatis (*Chronicon*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxxiii. 111). His day is Aug. 27, on which he appears in many of the ancient as well as the modern martyrologies (see Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. vi. 84). [S. A. B.]

SYLVIA, sister of Flavius Rufinus, consul in 392 and prefect of the East under Theodosius and Arcadius. A work written by her was discovered at Arezzo in 1885, bound up with an unpublished work of St. Hilary of Poitiers *de Mysteriis*. It contained two hymns and the account of a journey in the East. M. Ch. Kohler gave an analysis of the text in the *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, while M. Ganurrini discussed its authorship in a paper

before the Academy of Christian Archaeology at Rome (cf. *Revue Critique*, May 25, 1885, p. 419. [G. T. S.]

SYL- *vid.* SIL.

SYMEON *vid.* SIMEON.

SYMMACHIANI, heretics so called, are enumerated by Philaster (c. 63), are supposed by him to have derived their doctrine from PATRICIUS, the preceding heretic on his list, and are described by him as secularists, looking forward to no future judgment, and satisfying without scruple all the lusts of the world and the flesh. It is uncertain whether or not we are to identify these with Ebionites, known under the name of Symmachiani in the time of St. Augustine (*Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, xix. 4, 17; *Contra Cresconium Donatistam*, i. 31), and who, perhaps, were called after Symmachus, the translator of the Old Testament. These last are also referred to by Ambrosiaster (*Prol. Epis. ad Gal.*), and are described by him as taking their origin from the Pharisees as keeping the Mosaic law, but calling themselves Christians, and as teaching that our Lord was mere man. [G. S.]

SYMMACHUS (1), the twenty-second bishop of Jerusalem, the seventh of the Gentile succession, was preceded and followed by a Gaius. The beginning of his episcopate is placed in the first year of Commodus, A.D. 180. Eutychius (367) assigns him two years of office. (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 12; Epiphan. *Haer.* lxvi. 23; *Chron. Armen.*) [E. V.]

SYMMACHUS (2), author of the Greek version of the Old Testament which in Origen's Hexapla and Tetrapla occupied the column next after that of Aquila and before those of the LXX. and Theodotion. Above, Vol. III. p. 19 [art. HEXAPLA], will be found the contradictory accounts (*a*) of Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 17; *Demonstr. Evang.* vii. 1), followed by Jerome (*De Viris Ill.*, s. v. Origenes; *Praef. in Esdr.*; *Comm. in Abacuc*, ii. 3), who make him an Ebionite,—and (*b*) of Epiphanius, who makes him a Samaritan apostate to Judaism (*De Menss. et Pondd.* 16). It has been attempted to reconcile these authorities by supposing an Ebionite sect to have existed among the Samaritans. But the contradiction lies too deep to be thus removed: for it is plain that Eusebius speaks of Symmachus as a heretical Christian, while Epiphanius represents him merely as passing from one to another of two sects, both of which lay outside the Christian pale. This latter account is discredited by the improbability that a Samaritan, however learned, should have had such knowledge of the Old Testament outside the Pentateuch as to execute a version of it so far independent as that of Symmachus appears even in its surviving fragments to have been. That of Eusebius, on the other hand, is confirmed,—(1) by the name "Symmachians," which as we know from the Ambrosiaster (*Prolog. in Ep. ad Galat.*), and from Augustine (*Contra Cresc.* i. 31; *Contra Faust.* xix. 4), was applied even in the fourth century to the Pharisaic or "Nazarean" Ebionites—and (2) by the fact that Eusebius was able to refer to a work of Symmachus as extant (*ὑπομνήματα τοῦ Συμμάχου*), in which he maintained the Ebionite heresy in the shape of an attack on the Gospel of St. Matthew. This work, according to Eusebius (*l. l.*), was stated by Origen to have been obtained by him, together with other interpretations on the Scriptures (*μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων εἰς τὰς γραφὰς ἑρμηνείων*), from one Juliana, who had received them from Symmachus himself. A later writer, Palladius (circ. 420), adds that this Juliana was a virgin, *λογιωτάτη καὶ πιστοτάτη*, who lived in Caesarea of Cappadocia, and gave refuge in her house to Origen for two years in the time of a persecution; adducing as his authority an entry which he says he found written by Origen's own hand, in a book which he describes as "very ancient, and arranged in *στίχοι*" (*παλαιοτάτῳ βιβλίῳ στιχηρῷ*), as follows: "This book I found in the house of Juliana the virgin in Caesarea, when I was hiding there; who said that she had received it from Symmachus himself, the interpreter of the Jews" (*Hist. Lausiaca*, 147).[a] Huet (*Origeniana*, libb. I. iii. 2; III. iv. 2) is probably right in assigning the sojourn of Origen in this lady's house to the time of Maximin's persecutions (A.D. 238–241); but his statement, that among the books found there by Origen was Symmachus's version of the Old Testament, is a misrepresentation of Eusebius's account: and it is not borne out by the words just cited from Palladius, though his description of the book he saw, as *στιχηρὸν*, would suit a volume of that version containing the poetical books. And neither that author, nor Eusebius, gives any ground for Huet's idea, that the Old Testament version of Symmachus had been unknown to Origen until he discovered it in Juliana's possession. The memorandum written by Origen in the book described, tells us how it came into his possession, but does not convey that its contents had not been previously known to him *aliunde*. And Eusebius speaks of the version of Symmachus (vi. 16), not as freshly discovered by Origen, but along with those of Aquila and Theodotion as being in common use (*καθημαξευμένας*) in Origen's day, in contrast with the obscure "Fifth" and "Sixth" versions, which Origen was the first to bring to light out of places of concealment (see above, Vol. III. p. 22). Indeed, we have sufficient evidence in Origen's extant remains, that he knew and used Symmachus's version long before the time of Maximin (236–239). Quotations from it occur (*e.g.*) in the fragments of his *Commentaries* on Lamentations of which he tells us (p. 321, Delarne) no version save those of Symmachus and the LXX. were known to him when he wrote;—sc., before 231 (see above, ORIGEN, p. 109). He quotes it also in his *Commentaries* on Gen. ii. 7 (p. 29), and on Pss. ii. 2; iv. 1 (pp. 539, 556); both in all probability equally early works (ORIGEN, pp. 104, 105, 108, 109). For the note on Genesis comes from the *third* Τόμος, and we know that he had written the first *eight* before 231; at which date he had also completed his *Commentaries* on the Psalms to the end of the 25th (Eus. *H. E.* vi. 24). Baronius (*Annal.* t. ii., s. a. 295) similarly misrepresents Eusebius and Palladius as relating that Origen found Symmachus's version in Juliana's house; but infers that the time of the occurrence was that of the

[a] This ambiguous expression probably means "translator of the Jews' Scriptures."

persecution of Severus (circ. 205), inasmuch as that version must have been in Origen's hands long before the reign of Maximin.[b]

The statement of Palladius, as an incidental corroboration, coming almost direct from Origen himself, and resting on the testimony of a lady who had known Symmachus personally, powerfully confirms Eusebius, and leaves no room to doubt that Symmachus was a Christian (or "semi-Christian" as Jerome expresses it) of the Nazaraeo-Ebionite sect. Epiphanius's narrative of his secession from the Samaritan to the Jewish religion, is therefore to be rejected; and with it the recent theory of Geiger, who seeks to identify him with the Jew Symmachus son of Joseph (see above, Vol. III. p. 20).

The authority of Epiphanius has however been commonly accepted for placing the date of Symmachus under the reign of Severus (193–211),—as by the compiler of the *Chronicon Paschale* (s. a. 202), as well as by Cave (*Hist. L.* s. a. 201) and more recent writers;—notwithstanding the gross historical blunders and the self-contradiction which disfigure the chronological arrangement as it stands in the Greek text of the treatise *De Menss. et Pondd.* above referred to. In chapter 16, the thirteen years' reign of Commodus is omitted from the list of emperors by which the author professes to fix his dates; while in ch. 18 it is duly inserted. And though he places Symmachus, as has been said, under Severus (ch. 16), he makes his version prior to that of Theodotion, whom (ch. 17) he places under Commodus, the predecessor of Pertinax the predecessor of Severus. The ancient Syriac version of this treatise, however, clears away most of this confusion by reading *Verus* for Severus, in ch. 16, and, by adding in ch. 18 a sentence explaining that the emperor meant is Marcus Aurelius (161–180),—whose paternal name was (as is well known) Annius Verus. Accepting these corrections, we find that the account of Epiphanius, *quantum valeat*, dates Symmachus thirty, or at least twenty years earlier than has hitherto been supposed.

The extract above given from Palladius roughly fixes limits for the possible date of Symmachus, by shewing that he was an elder contemporary of Juliana, who was contemporary with Origen, but that he had died before Origen's sojourn in her house. If, with Baronius, we fix that sojourn in the reign of Severus, it follows that to place Symmachus, as the Greek text of Epiphanius does, in that reign, is inadmissible. But if, with Huet, we fix it in the reign of Maximin, any date not earlier than the beginning of the reign of M. Aurelius, and not much later than the end of that of Severus, will suit for Symmachus.

For fuller particulars concerning the Syriac rectification of the chronology of Epiphanius, see below under THEODOTION, under which head will be found also the reasons for believing Theodotion to be prior to Symmachus. One argument which has been advanced to prove this point is to be noted as untenable, that namely which rests on the fact that Irenaeus does not mention Symmachus in the passage (iii. 21), where he cites from Aquila and Theodotion their readings of Isai. vii. 14; whence it has been inferred that he was ignorant of Symmachus's version, and that therefore it was probably the latest of the three. But it is quite possible that even if made in the reign of M. Aurelius, it might have failed to become known to Irenaeus writing in Gaul, circ. 180–185. The work might have existed, though Irenaeus had not met with it; and besides, his ignorance of it is not proved by the fact that he does not mention it. As well might we infer that Symmachus was unknown to Origen, because he does not mention him in the passage where he tells how Aquila omits, while Theodotion gives the verses appended to Job in the LXX. And yet this passage occurs in his Epistle to Africanus, written after he had compiled his Hexapla, of which the version of Symmachus was an essential part.

A description of his version will be found in the article HEXAPLA, already referred to. His object in forming it seems to have been to imitate Aquila in following the Hebrew exclusively, but to avoid his barbarous diction, and to commend his work to Greek readers by purity of style. Thus, his renderings are at once externally dissimilar to Aquila's, and (frequently) internally akin to them. Remarkable cases of identity of translation between these two versions occur, *e.g.* the long passage, Dan. ix. 26, 27, which appears to have been borrowed by Symmachus verbally from Aquila.[c] Of his other writings nothing further is known, except that some of them (apparently in a Syriac version) were in the hands of Ebedjesu (*d.* 1318), who gives the title of one of them, as ܕܦܘܪܫ ܦܘ̈ܩܕܢܐ (*Catal. Scriptorum*, ap. Assem. *B. O.* iii. p. 17); which title Assemani renders "*De Distinctione Praeceptorum*," and identifies the work, not improbably, with that described by Eusebius, conjecturing that the "*praecepta*" may be those of our Lord, as given by St. Matthew.

[J. Gw.]

SYMMACHUS (3) Q. AURELIUS, the last eminent champion of paganism at Rome, was the son of L. Aurelius Avianus Symmachus, who was prefect of the city in A.D. 364, and Consul suffect and praetorian prefect in A.D. 376, and was one of the envoys sent by Julian to Constantius (Ammian. xxi. 12, 24). He was educated at Bordeaux (*Epp.* ix. 88), where he and Ausonius became firm friends. (Auson. *Id.* 11, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xix. 895; Symm. *Epp.* i. 13–43). After holding the offices of quaestor and praetor, he became Corrector of Lucania and Bruttium in A.D. 365 and proconsul of Africa in A.D. 373. (*Cod. Theod.* viii. tit. v. 25, xii. tit. i. 73). He was again in Gaul about A.D. 369, when he delivered his first panegyric on Valentinian, as he witnessed the construction of his fortifications on the Rhine. (*Laud. in Valent. Sen.* ii. 6.) He was appointed prefect of the city at the end of A.D. 383 or the beginning of A.D. 384. He bore himself modestly

---

[b] Huet's erroneous view has been more or less fully adopted by Neander (*Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 477, Bohn's ed.), and by other modern writers. Dr. Field, on the other hand, seems unreasonably to discredit the whole evidence of Palladius.

[c] For a good example of the mutual relations of the four versions, see Field under Malachi ii. 13. See also Ex. ii. 14; Ps. cxxxviii. 15; Jer. xxiii. 23, etc.

in that great office, which had been conferred on him unsolicited, declining the silver chariot which his predecessors had obtained permission to use (*Epp.* x. 24, 40) and the title of "Magnificence" (*Epp.* iv. 42). During his term of office he was accused of dragging from the churches people who had taken sanctuary there, and bringing bishops from various near and distant cities in chains to Rome. These charges were apparently founded on an inquiry undertaken by him by the emperor's orders into the condition of the fortifications of Rome, and he succeeded in clearing himself without much difficulty by means of a letter from pope Damasus (*Epp.* x. 41).

In A.D. 382 he headed a deputation in the name of the majority of the senate, to the emperor Gratian, to request the replacement of the altar of Victory in the senate house, and the restoration of their endowments to the vestals and the colleges of priests. The Christian senators, who according to St. Ambrose were really the majority, forwarded through pope Damasus a counter petition, and by the influence of St. Ambrose the efforts of Symmachus were defeated [GRATIANUS (5)]. Again in A.D. 384, after Gratian's death, a repeated attempt of Symmachus was foiled, and his arguments were refuted by St. Ambrose (S. Amb. *Epp.* 17, 18, 57, in *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 961, 972, 1175; Symm. *Epp.* x. 61).[a]

He probably took part in the missions for the same purpose sent by the senate to Theodosius after the fall of Maximus, and to Valentinian II. in A.D. 392 (S. Amb. *Epp.* 57), and again suffered the same disappointment. In A.D. 393 the pagan party had a momentary triumph. Eugenius, at the instigation of Flavian and Arbogast, who had placed him on the throne, restored the altar of Victory and the endowments of the priests (Paulinus, *Vita S. Amb.* in *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 30), but they were again abolished by Theodosius after the defeat of Eugenius and Arbogast. Symmachus appears to have made a final attempt in A.D. 403 or 404; at least such is the natural inference from the two books of Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum*, which were written after Pollentia and consequently about the latter year.

After the defeat of Maximus, Symmachus endeavoured to remove the bad impression caused by his panegyric on the fallen emperor, by an eloquent harangue on the glorious actions of Theodosius both in war and peace. (*Epp.* ii. 31, 13.) This was delivered before January 23rd, A.D. 389, the date of the law *De Codicillis* (*Cod. Theod.* iv. tit. iv. 2), and therefore before the triumphal entry of Theodosius into Rome. He is said to have inserted in his speech a petition for the restoration of the altar of Victory, which so irritated Theodosius that he banished him a hundred miles from Rome. (*De Promiss.* iii. 38, in *Patr. Lat.* li. 834.) The story, related by Socrates (*H. E.* v. 14, in *Patr. Gr.* lxvii., 601) and repeated by Cassiodorus (*Hist. Trip.* ix. 23 in *Patr. Lat.* lxix. 1140), that Symmachus was accused of high treason on account of his panegyric on Maximus, was obliged to take sanctuary in the church of the Novatians at Rome, and was pardoned by Theodosius as a compliment to the Novatian bishop, is probably a distorted version of these events. Tillemont (*Emp.* v. 755) discusses the whole question. Theodosius at any rate soon pardoned him and raised him to the consulate in A.D. 391.

It is singular that, champion as Symmachus was of the pagan cause, he was on excellent terms with the leaders of the Christians. His friendship with the semi-pagan Ausonius indeed proves nothing, but he was a friend of pope Damasus, and apparently of St. Ambrose himself, whom Cardinal Maï considers to be the Ambrose to whom seven of his letters are addressed (*Epp.* iii. 31–37) and of St. Ambrose's brother Satyrus (S. Amb. *De Excessu Fratris*, i. 32, in *Patr. Lat.* xvi. 1300). He was also an intimate friend of Mallius Theodorus, to whom St. Augustin (*Retr.* i. 2, in *Patr. Lat.* xxxii. 588) dedicated one of his works. When prefect, he sent St. Augustin as teacher of rhetoric to Milan (*Conf.* v. 19, in *Patr. Lat.* xxxii. 717), and he was thus the unconscious instrument of his conversion. His Christian opponents always speak in the highest terms both of his character and his abilities. He was a member of the college of pontiffs, and as such exercised a strict supervision over the vestal virgins. In the case of one of the Alban vestals, who had broken her vow of chastity, he demanded the enforcement of the ancient penalty against her and her paramour (*Epp.* ix. 128, 129), and he sternly refused the request of another to be released from her vows before she had completed her full time of service (*Epp.* ix. 108).

The letters of Symmachus give a remarkable picture of the circumstances and life of a Roman noble just before the final break-up of the empire. Though his wealth was not above that of an average senator (Olymp. *apud Photium*), it was very great. Besides his mansion on the Coelian near S. Stefano Rotondo, he had other houses in Rome (*Epp.* iii. 14), and numerous country residences, of which he mentions four suburban—the Ostian on the Tiber, the Arabian, the Vatican, and the Appian (*Epp.* i. 6, iii. 55, ii. 57, vi. 58), and several more remote, at Bauli, Formiae, Capua, Naples, Praeneste, Laurentum, Tivoli, Lavinium, and Puteoli (*Epp.* i. 1, 8, 10, ii. 60, iii. 50, vii. 35, iv. 44, vi. 81, vii. 15, vi. 66.) He had property near Aquileia, in Samnium, in Sicily, and in Mauritania (*Epp.* iv. 68, vi. 11, ii. 30, vii. 66.) The expenses of his son's praetorship, which he paid, amounted to 2000 pounds of gold (Olymp. above cited), and in many of his letters he asks his friends to send him rare wild beasts for the sports of his son's praetorship and questorship. Among others, seven Irish wolf-dogs may be mentioned (*Epp.* ii. 77). By his wife Rusticiana, daughter of Orfitus, prefect of the city under Constantius, he had a daughter, who married Nicomachus, and a son, the subject of the next article. In three of his letters he speaks of his advancing years (*Epp.* iv. 18, 32, viii. 48), but the date of his death is unknown. He was certainly alive in A.D. 404.

Till recently his only works known to exist were his letters. The editio princeps, printed at Venice in the pontificate of Julius II. is exceedingly rare. The first complete edition was published at Paris in A.D. 1580, by Juret and

[a] Gibbon, ch. 28, gives a summary of the arguments of Symmachus and St. Ambrose.

Lectius. They are reprinted in ten books in *Patr. Lat.* xviii. Early in the present century Cardinal Mai discovered in the Ambrosian library, among the MSS. from Bobbio, a palimpsest containing fragments of nine speeches of Symmachus, which he published in A.D. 1815, and republished in A.D. 1846, with three more palimpsest fragments from Bobbio, now in the Vatican library. There are many other speeches entirely lost. Cardinal Mai gives the titles of those that are known. A new edition of the *Relationes*, his official correspondence with emperors, which, in the common editions, are printed in the tenth book of the letters, was published in A.D. 1872 by W. Meyer.

[F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (4), a presbyter to whom Chrysostom wrote consoling him under the trials and difficulties which beset him, which are the necessary portion of one who has entered on the narrow way. (Chrys. *Ep.* 45.) [E. V.]

SYMMACHUS (5) Q. FABIANUS MEMMIUS, son of the orator (No. 3), praefectus urbis in A.D. 418, 419. The part he took in the contested election between BONIFACIUS I. and EULALIUS (1) is sufficiently described under those names. He was proconsul of Africa in A.D. 415. (*Cod. Theod.* xi. tit. xxx. 65.) His official letters to the emperor, with the replies, are printed in Baronius and at the end of the tenth book of those of his father (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xviii.). A fragment of one of the letters which is imperfect in the common editions is added by Cardinal Mai in his edition of the fragments of the elder Symmachus. [F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (6), one of the two bishops who visited Paulinus of Nola on his death-bed (Uranius, *Epist.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liii. 860). He is perhaps the same as the Symmachus, bishop of Capua, whose festival was kept on October 22nd (Ughelli, vi. 320). [F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (7), a correspondent of Isidore of Pelusium, who (lib. i. *Ep.* 152) tells the story of St. Chrysostom's sufferings, and commends his work on the priesthood. [ISIDORUS (31).] (Ceill. viii. 483.) [G. T. S.]

SYMMACHUS (8) Q. AURELIUS MEMMIUS, probably the grandson of the prefect (No. 5) and great-grandson of the orator (No. 3), patrician, and consul in 485, was one of the most distinguished senators in the times of Odovacar and Theoderic. His son-in-law Boethius (*De Cons.* i. pr. 4, ii. pr. 4) and Procopius (i. 1) speak in the highest terms of his virtues, learning, and charity. He was not only a Christian but a catholic (Paul. Diac. *Hist. Rom.* xvi. 9). Cassiodorus (*Var.* iv. 51) praises the magnificence of his buildings, and asks him on Theoderic's behalf to undertake the supervision of the repairs of the theatre of Pompey, and he is named first in the commission of five senators who were to try Basilius and Praetextatus on the charge of magic (*Var.* iv. 22), and this may have been the cause of Basilius afterwards becoming the accuser of Boethius. (*De Cons.* i. 4.) Avitus writes to him (*Epp.* 31) and FAUSTUS (36) as the leaders of the senate with regard to the trial of pope Symmachus. At the end of 525 or beginning of 526 Theoderic, who feared some design against himself on the part of Symmachus in revenge for the execution of Boethius, had him brought to Ravenna, put him to death and confiscated his property (*An. Vales.*; Procop. i. 1), which was however restored by Amalasuintha after her father's death to his children (Procop. i. 2). He left only daughters, RUSTICIANA the wife of Boethius, GALLA (9), who was canonised (*AA. SS.* Oct. iii. 147), and probably a third, Proba. [F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (9), bishop of Rome from November, A.D. 498, to July, A.D. 514, under the reigns of Theoderic the Ostrogoth as king of Italy, and Anastasius as emperor in the East. The circumstances of his election simultaneously with that of the antipope Laurentius, the conflict which ensued between the two parties into which Rome was divided, and its final settlement through the intervention of Theoderic, have been noticed in the article on LAURENTIUS (10). What follows with regard to these events is here given as supplementary.

The proceedings which terminated in the *Synodus Palmaris*, at which Symmachus was acquitted of the charges made against him, appear to have been as follows:[a]

For several years after Symmachus had been confirmed in the see by Theoderic as the lawfully elected pope the party of Laurentius continued their opposition to him, causing violent conflicts and general disturbance at Rome. The evident virulence of the two opposed parties against each other is to be accounted for (be it remarked) by the fact, that they represented two opposite policies with regard to the then existing schism between the Western and Eastern churches. Laurentius had been elected in the interests of the policy of concession to Constantinople and the East, which the last pope, Anastasius II., had favoured; Symmachus for the maintenance of the unbending attitude which had been taken by Felix III., when the schism first began. Hence the question at the root of those violent and continued conflicts was not merely that of the legality of the two elections, or of predilection for one or the other claimant to the see; it was rather one of principle on the absorbing topic of the day. What occurred was this.—Moved by representations made to him at Ravenna of the disturbed state of Rome, and of the accusations brought against the reigning pope, Theoderic in the first place sent Peter, bishop of Altinum, to Rome in the capacity of visitor, and summoned a synod of Italian bishops for entertaining under him the charge against Symmachus. The visitor

[a] It is to be observed that the date of this synod is, in this as in the former article, assumed to have been A.D. 501, and its acts to be what are given in Labbe as those of *Synodus Romana III. sub Symmacho*, though it is spoken of by Ennodius (*libellus apologet.*), and in the acts of subsequent councils, as *Synodus IV.* The question of date not being of any great importance, it has not been thought necessary to discuss it in these pages. Its uncertainty partly arises from the corruptness of our text of the ancient documents which bear on it. See with regard to it, Pagi *in* Baron *ad ann.* 503, iv., and Mansi's *Notae ad ann.* 502, i. There is, however, no doubt that *Synodus Romana III.* (*apud* Labbe) was what was called the *Synodus Palmaris*, at which Symmachus was acquitted.

is said to have been directed by the king to treat Symmachus with respect, visiting him, in the first place, at the Vatican; but he seems to have been intended to supersede him in his functions till the case had been adjudicated, and to have, in fact, taken temporary possession of the temporalities of the see, and to have officiated in his stead in the solemnities of Easter (501), having arrived at Rome before the festival with that special purpose (*Fragment. Vit. S. Symm., vulg.* a *J. Blanchinio*; referred to by Mansi, *Not. in* Baron. *ad ann.* 502. I.). After Easter the synod convened by the king assembled, but separated in confusion without effecting anything, and some of the bishops left Rome. The reason was, that Symmachus had refused to appear before it, objecting to the jurisdiction of the visitor, and that it was alleged in his behalf that none but the pope himself could canonically summon or preside at a Roman council. This state of things was represented to Theoderic by the metropolitans of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, in the name of the bishops who had remained in Rome, and the suggestion made to him that the council should be summoned to meet at Ravenna in his own presence. He declined the proposal, saying that he would rather, if it were necessary, come himself to Rome; but he urged them to reassemble and finish the business, after waiting for the bishops who had left the city, but who would be called upon to return. He further obviated former difficulties by allowing the council to be assembled under the authority of Symmachus himself. The day for it fixed by the king was the Calends of September. It met in the basilica of Julius; Symmachus appeared at it, and duly authorized its proceedings, expressing thanks to the king, and declaring himself willing to reply to his accusers. But he demanded that, as a preliminary step, Peter the Visitor should cease to perform ecclesiastical functions in his stead, and that he should be put again in possession of the temporalities as well as the full powers of his see. If this were done, he would reply to the charges made against him, but not otherwise. This demand caused a further postponement; Theoderic was asked to consent to it, but refused. After hearing from him to this effect, the synod again met, prepared, in obedience to the royal command, to hear the charges against the pope. Altercation at once ensued. First, the form of the accusation was objected to, in that it was so framed as to imply that the king was aware of the pope's guilt, and had only remitted the case to the synod for sentence to be pronounced; secondly, the evidence of the pope's slaves, who were adduced as witnesses against him, was objected to as inadmissible. While the dispute was going on, Symmachus himself appeared, but was attacked by a mob of his opponents with such violence that he had to be rescued by the two *majores Domûs*, who had been sent to Rome to represent Theoderic, and took refuge under their escort in the Vatican. After this occurrence he refused to attend or authorize any subsequent synod. The bishops again wrote to Theoderic, representing their helplessness, seeing that they could not proceed canonically without the pope's authority, but that he now refused to give it, and could not be compelled. They therefore requested to be allowed to return to their several homes, leaving the matter in the king's hands. But Theoderic would not let them off, the purport of his reply to them being as follows:—"I could have settled the whole matter myself before now, had I been so minded; but it is one for you ecclesiastics, not for me, to settle; I have no wish to usurp authority in matters spiritual; I call upon you to accomplish what you have been assembled for; it will be a disgrace to you all if you leave things as they are; if you cannot see your way to entertain these charges against the pope without his leave, dismiss them, if you like, without discussion, but at any rate come to some conclusion; I am ready to endorse and carry out whatever you decide; my one desire is to see peace and order restored at Rome." (See *Praeceptiones Regis*, inserted by Labbe after the Acts of *Synod III.*) To this effect wrote the Arian monarch, who, together with the other Gothic kings of the same persuasion, seems to have acted with great fairness towards his Catholic subjects, and with reluctance to intervene in their disputes. The result was, that the synod, so often adjourned, met once more on the first of November, and, dismissing all charges against Symmachus without any hearing of his accusers, declared him innocent, and further required all, under pain of being accounted schismatics, to accept him and submit to him as lawful pope. The preamble to the verdict implies that it was arrived at with a view to peace, and as led to by providential ordering, rather than on the merits of the question at issue; and thus it remains undetermined whether the charge (supposed to have been of adultery) had any ground. But the result was that Symmachus retained thenceforward undisturbed possession of the papal see. As was to be expected, the defeated party objected to the proceedings of the synod. A remonstrance came out, entitled *Adversus synodum absolutionis incongruae*, to which Ennodius, being at that time in Rome, was employed to reply (as to who he was, see *Art.* on ENNODIUS). His work, called *Libellus apologeticus pro synodo IV. Romana*, will be found in Labbe. Written in the affected style of a somewhat pedantic rhetorician, it is a defence in all respects of Symmachus and his supporters in the synod, and is not sparing in contemptuous abuse of his opponents. Still it is valuable as throwing much light on the history of events; and it is further noteworthy as containing the earliest well-established expression of the view (which seems to have been maintained by the friends of Symmachus at the synod) of the pope's entire immunity from all human judgment. "St. Peter (it is said) has transmitted to his successors the perennial dowry of his merits, with the inheritance of his innocence; what was granted to him for the light of his deeds pertains to them, whom an equal splendour illuminates. For who can doubt him to be holy who is exalted to such a summit of dignity, for whom, should his own merits be deficient, those of his predecessor suffice?" Again, "The causes of other men God may have willed to determine through men; the bishop of this see He has, without question, reserved to His own judgment."....

"And, again, I say that by the voice of holy pontiffs the dignity of his see has been made venerable throughout the world, the causes of the faithful everywhere being submitted to him, while he is designated the head of the whole body; concerning which this appears to me to have been said by the prophet, 'If this is humiliated, to whose help will ye flee? And where will ye leave your glory?'"

In a subsequent synod of 218 bishops at Rome (*Syn. Rom. V. sub Symm.* Labbe), this *libellus* of Ennodius was read and approved, having synodical authority given to it; and Symmachus ordered it to be inserted among the apostolical *decreta*. In this same synod, according to its Acts handed down to us, it was further ordered under the direction of Symmachus that all bishops everywhere should thenceforth have immunity from accusations brought against them by their flocks, except in cases of heresy or injustice; *i.e.* that charges of immorality (such as had been brought against the pope) should not be entertained against them: further, that, in all cases of bishops being legitimately accused before provincial or general synods, they should have, if they had been spoiled or deprived, full restitution before being brought to trial.

Other Roman synods held under Symmachus were as follows:—(1) One of bishops and other clergy, held A.D. 499, after his first confirmation in the see, with the purpose of providing against scandals that had attended elections to the popedom. It forbade, under penalties, all canvassing for the see, or promises of money, during the lifetime of any pope, and ordered that after the decease of a pope, in case he should not have given directions about the election of his successor, the election should be made by the majority of the clergy, any elector proved to have received bribes being disqualified; and, further, that any one adducing conclusive evidence of bribery or canvassing should, though himself implicated, be pardoned, and even receive reward. (2) One apparently held after the *Synodus Palmaris*, A.D. 502 (though erroneously given in collections of councils as *Synodus IV. Palmaris*), for the consideration of a law against the alienation of church property which had been made by Odoacer the predecessor of Theodoric. After the death of pope Simplicius, A.D. 483, Basilius, Praefectus Praetorio, had come into the synod assembled for the election of a new pope, had declared the action of the clergy without the king's leave unlawful, and had further propounded to them a law in Odoacer's name, which forbade under pain of anathema all future alienation, either by popes or any other, of lands or goods belonging to the church (see FELIX III.). That synod seems to have accepted the law without protest; but it was objected to as invalid by the synod under Symmachus, as having been imposed on the church by mere lay authority, during the vacancy of the see, and without the concurrence of the clergy; the anathema appended to it being especially protested against as an assumption of spiritual powers by laymen. It was therefore on these grounds declared null and void; but an ordinance to the same purport was passed by the synod, and thus made spiritually valid, all future popes, as well as other persons, being declared to be bound by it. (3) One of which the date is not given, at which invaders of ecclesiastical possessions, and appropriators of offerings to the church, though they might be princes or supported by princes, were subjected to excommunication.

Among the extant letters of Symmachus several refer to the old question of rivalry between the Gallic sees of Arles and Vienne. For accounts of earlier disputes between them; of the authority claimed, and in the end successfully maintained, by the popes over the churches of Gaul; of the settlement of the jurisdiction of the two sees by pope Leo I.; and of subsequent difficulties under pope Hilarius (see Articles on ZOZIMUS, LEO I., HILARIUS (pope), and HILARIUS ARELAT). It appears that Anastasius II., the predecessor of Symmachus, had sanctioned some invasion, on the part of Vienne, of the jurisdiction assigned to Arles by Leo. After the accession of Symmachus, Eonus, then the primate of Arles, wrote to him to complain of Avitus of Vienne having, under such sanction, ordained bishops beyond the limits of his proper jurisdiction. The reply of Symmachus shews an evident readiness to impute blame to Anastasius (whose whole policy, with regard to the East, as has been seen above, he had been elected to counteract), and is remarkable among the utterances of popes for its decided repudiation of the action of a predecessor. He lays down the principle, that the ordinances of former popes ought not to be varied under any necessity, as those of Leo had been by Anastasius, and that they must be now maintained. Still he does not at once adjudicate on the pending dispute, but requires both Eonus and Avitus to send full statements of their case to Rome; and in his letter to Avitus, while he repeats what he had told his rival, that the confusion introduced into the province by Anastasius, contrary to ancient custom and former papal ordinances, was not to be tolerated, he still allows that Avitus may have reasons to allege for some equitable dispensation under existing circumstances, and invites him to state such reasons. The appeal of Eonus to Rome appears to have been in 499; but it was not till 513 that we find the bishop of Arles finally confirmed in all the rights of his see which had been accorded to it by pope Leo, Caesarius having then succeeded Eonus. Symmachus in that year wrote to this effect to the bishops of Gaul, and in the following year to Caesarius, warning him at the same time to respect the ancient rights of other metropolitans, and to report whatever might be amiss in either Gaul or Spain to Rome.

In the meantime the church of Gaul had evinced interest in the cause of Symmachus when he was accused at Rome. A letter from the aforesaid Avitus of Vienne to the senators and ex-consuls Faustus and Symmachus, after the proceedings of the *Synodus Palmaris* had been made known in Gaul, purports to convey the sentiments of the whole Gallic episcopate. Faustus, be it remembered (see Art. on LAURENTIUS), had been the leading lay supporter of Symmachus. In this letter, while the liability of ecclesiastics, according to Christ's prediction, to be brought before "rulers and kings" is acknowledged, alarm is expressed at the pope's ecclesiastical subordinates having presumed to

sit in judgment on him, lest the prerogatives, not only of the head of the whole church, but also of the episcopate at large, might by such precedent have been endangered; and the influential senators addressed are earnestly conjured to support the pope, and see that he suffer no harm in his position.

After the defeat of the party of Laurentius at Rome, and the final settlement of Symmachus in the see, the emperor Anastasius, to whom the result would, of course, be peculiarly unwelcome, issued a manifesto against Symmachus, in which he reproached him with having been unlawfully elected, accused him of Manichean heresy, and protested against his presumption in having (as he said) excommunicated an emperor. To this invective Symmachus replied in a letter to the emperor, entitled "Apologetica adversus Anastasii imperatoris libellum famosum." In this reply, which is expressed in strong and indignant language, the pope rebuts the charges against himself, and retorts that of heresy on the emperor; he accuses him of presuming on his temporal position so as to think to trample on St. Peter in the person of his vicar, and reminds him that spiritual dignity is, at least, on a par with that of an emperor; and he protests strongly against the violence that had been used against the orthodox in the East. As to the allegation that he (Symmachus) had excommunicated the emperor, he says that it was not the case; he had only followed in the steps of his predecessors, and it was not the emperor but Acacius that they had excommunicated; the emperor, in fact, excommunicated himself; he had only to cease to take part with heretics, and to repudiate the deceased Acacius, and Rome would receive him into communion. The tone of this letter is sufficient to shew that the supporters of Symmachus had not been mistaken in their man, when they elected him with the view of maintaining a firm attitude against Constantinople.

Anastasius was by no means awed, or deterred from his course, by any such papal fulminations, which had probably the opposite effect upon him. He appears after this more than ever determined to support Eutychianism. In the year 511, Macedonius, the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, who could not be induced to condemn the council of Chalcedon, was expelled from his see [see Art. on MACEDONIUS (3)], and violent conflicts, accompanied with bloodshed, occurred in the imperial city. At Antioch also bloody contests ensued between the Eutychians and the orthodox, which terminated in the expulsion of Flavianus from the see [FLAVIANUS (16)]. It was probably during these troubles that the orthodox bishops of the East addressed a letter to Symmachus, imploring his countenance and support. They address him in their need as the successor of St. Peter, charged with the care of feeding the sheep of Christ through the whole habitable world. Being themselves entirely orthodox (and they embody in their letter a confession of their faith), they beg to be recognized as in communion with Rome, even though some of them had, on urgent request being made to them, retained their sees for the support of orthodoxy, rather than leave Christ's sheep to wolves. They think it hard that they should suffer for the prevarication of the deceased Acacius, quoting the text, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." They beg the pope to receive them as Joshua received the Gibeonites and Rahab the harlot. They even adulate him so far as to say that as, when the whole world was sick through the transgression of one, the disciples of the heavenly physician called upon Him for cure, so those who now suffered through the transgression of Acacius, called upon the pope to come to their relief, in imitation of his Heavenly Father, who "maketh His sun to arise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and the unjust." The drift of their petition was to be received into communion with Rome, and have the pope's countenance in their opposition to Eutychianism, though some of them still remained in outward communion with the Eastern churches, and (whether willingly or as a necessary consequence of this) retained the name of Acacius in their diptychs. But such conditions Symmachus was not likely to accept, concurrence in the excommunication of Acacius, as well as of Peter Mongus and others who had been condemned by Rome, being insisted on by successive popes (with the exception of the yielding Anastasius) as a preliminary to any terms of peace (See FELIX III., GELASIUS (1), HORMILDAS). Accordingly there is no evidence of his having responded in any way to the humble supplication of those Eastern bishops. What his attitude towards them would be appears plainly from a letter of his addressed generally to the bishops of the East, dated A.D. 512, *i.e.*, soon after the expulsion of Macedonius from the see of Constantinople, but containing no reference to the appeal to himself which has just been referred to, having perhaps been written before he received it. In this letter he calls on them to dissociate themselves entirely from heretical communion, and to have no part with any (including the deceased Acacius) whom the Roman see had condemned, but rather to endure gladly banishment or any other penalties. Such as were ready thus to act, but no others, would be received into communion by him. In the same spirit he sent also a letter of congratulation and encouragement to certain African bishops who had been deposed and banished, and, who, it seems, had written to Ennodius at Rome, asking to have certain relics of the saints Nazarius and Romanus sent them.

At some time during the episcopate of Symmachus Theoderic visited Rome; probably before the accusations against the pope which led to the *Synodus Palmaris;* for Cassiodorus, who gives an account of the visit, places it under the consuls of the year 500; and that Theoderic remained at Ravenna while the case was pending may be gathered from the documents that refer to it. Being himself an Arian, he evidently had no desire to intervene personally in the disputes of the Catholics, declaring it to be his sole desire that they should agree among themselves, and that order should be restored at Rome. His visit is described by Cassiodorus, and by an anonymous author cited by Valesius, as having been welcomed with enthusiasm. Symmachus and the senate (we are told) met him on his approach to the city; he shewed devotion to St. Peter, as though he had been

a Catholic, promised to maintain inviolably whatever the rulers of Rome before him had ordained, entertained the people with games, and bestowed on them princely benefactions. The Catholic church fared, in fact, better, and enjoyed more independence, under the Arian kings of Gothic race than under many meddling and domineering emperors; and, acting as they did, they received equal respect and allegiance from their catholic subjects.

Symmachus is said by Anastasius (*Lib. Pontif.*) to have built, restored, and enriched with ornaments many Roman churches, to have spent money in redeeming captives, to have furnished yearly money and clothing to exiled orthodox bishops, and to have ordered the "Gloria in excelsis" to be sung on all Sundays and Saints' days. He is commemorated as a saint in the Roman calendar on the 19th of July, and is thus noticed in the Roman Martyrology:—"Romae sancti Symmachi papae, qui schismaticorum factione diutius fatigatus demum sanctitate perspicuus migravit ad Dominum." [J. B—Y.]

SYMMACHUS (10), Q. AURELIUS ANICIUS, son of Boethius and grandson of No. 8, at a very early age consul with his brother Boethius in 522. (Boethius, *De Cons.* ii. Pr. 2, 4.) [F. D.]

SYMMACHUS (11), defensor of the Roman church in Corsica, addressed by Gregory the Great (i. 52) [HOROSIUS]. He was also ordered to check the alleged practice in Corsica of priests having women living with them. If he was the same person as the "vir magnificus domnus Symmachus" named in xi. 44, he probably belonged to the same house as the preceding, as he is there mentioned in connexion with RUSTICIANA, which was a family name of the Symmachi (Mai, *Praefatio in Symmachi orat.* xvii.). [F. D.]

SYMPHONIA, the name of a book used by the ARCHONTICI (see Vol. I. p. 153; Epiph. *Haer.* 40). [G. S.]

SYMPHORIANUS (1), Aug. 22, martyr, according to the MSS. of his acts, under Aurelian, for which name Ruinart would substitute Aurelius, dating his passion about A.D. 180. He was born in Autun, of noble birth, the son of a man named Faustus. He was trained in christianity from his childhood. The city of Autun was devoted to the worship of Berecynthia, a cult which held its ground there most pertinaciously till the time of Gregor. Turon. (cf. *de Glor. confess.* cap. 77). The consular Heraclius, who governed there, was most anxious to convert the christians by argument. He entered into discussion with Symphorianus, who reviled his false deities. The judge then used threats and tortures, and finally beheaded him outside the walls, in the place of common execution; his mother, from the city wall, encouraging him to suffer, in words which have been embodied in the Gothic Missal. The acts of this martyr have been evidently compiled out of very ancient documents. The judicial investigation is reported in the most exact and most technical forms of Roman law. The questions proposed and the answers given are such as we find in the most genuine remains of antiquity. Yet there are also indications that they have been worked up into their present shape. Le Blant (*Actes des Martyrs*, p. 25) notes as one proof that early documents have undergone this process, the use in them of the word *consularis* for *proconsul*, as well as in the sense of governor, which was not so used till after the triumph of Christianity. The details of the worship of Cybele may be very usefully compared with those given in the passion of St. Theodotus and the Seven Virgins of Ancyra. Celtic idolatry in Asia and in Gaul followed precisely the same ritual. (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 67–73; Ceillier, i. 472; *AA. SS.* Boll. Aug. iv. 496–498.) [G. T. S.]

SYMPHOROSA, July 18 (*Mart. Rom.*), June 27 (Us. Adon.), the wife of Getulius, tribune and martyr, under the emperor Hadrian [GETULIUS]. She suffered shortly after, with her seven sons, Crescens, Julianus, Nemesius, Primitivus, Justinus, Stracteus or Extacteus, and Eugenius. The occasion of their deaths was, according to their acts, the dedication festival of the new palace which Hadrian built at Tibur, cf. Spartianus's account of Hadrian in the *Scriptt. Aug. Hist.* Ruinart, in his *Acta Sincera*, fixes the date of their martyrdom at A.D. 120, at which period, as Dion Cassius notices, Hadrian put many persons to death. The composition of their acts is attributed in MSS. to Julius Africanus, a view which modern criticism rejects. [JULIUS AFRICANUS, Vol. I. p. 57.] The acts however must have been compiled at an early period, and from historical documents. There are no miraculous stories in them, while there are various historical coincidences and genuine touches in the acts both of Symphorosa and of Getulius, which have led Le Blant to attribute some authority to them (*Actes des Martyrs*, pp. 48, 128). [G. T. S.]

SYMPHOSIUS, bishop probably of Astorga (Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (1) 370 n.), a Priscillianist leader, is first mentioned in A.D. 380 at the council of Saragossa, from which he withdrew after one day to avoid joining in the condemnation of the Priscillianists. After the death of Priscillian in A.D. 385 St. Ambrose offered his mediation, proposing that the Priscillianist bishops should be received on certain conditions if they recanted their errors. Symphosius and his son DICTINIUS then seem to have gone to St. Ambrose, and in his presence agreed to these conditions, Dictinius being allowed to retain his priesthood, but being declared incapable of being raised to the episcopate. Symphosius then desisted from honouring Priscillian and his companions as martyrs, and from using his apocryphal and other writings, but afterwards, yielding, as he said to the importunity of the people, he consecrated Dictinius as his coadjutor and successor in the see of Astorga (Gams, p. 392). As the feeling throughout almost the whole province of Astorga or Gallicia was strongly Priscillianist, he consecrated other Priscillianists to the sees vacant there, and he and Dictinius refused to attend a council summoned at Toledo in A.D. 397. However, they appeared before the first council of Toledo in September, 400, and renounced both verbally and in writing (Idatius, *Chron.*) the doctrines and writings of Priscillian, and condemned him as a heretic. They were excluded from com-

munion till answers had been received from the pope, bishop SIMPLICIANUS of Milan, and the other bishops who were consulted. In the meantime, also, they were not to ordain bishops, priests or deacons. (Tejada y Ramiro, *Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 124, 191, 195.) The reception of Symphosius and the other recanting bishops and the retention of their sees caused a schism, the bishops of Baetica and part of Carthaginiensis refusing to accept the decision of the council, which was approved of by INNOCENT I. c. 404 (Innoc. *Epp.* 3 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 486). (Tillemont, *M. E.* viii. 518–523.) [F. D.]

SYMPOSIUS (SYMPIUS, SAMUS), bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, from whom, in A.D. 374, Basil received kindly expressed letters of communion. He sent his reply through Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, in order that he might criticize it and pass it on accompanied by a letter of his own (Basil, *Ep.* 190, [406]). Symposius attended the council of Constantinople in A.D. 381 (Labbe, ii. 655). He was buried in the martyry of St. Thecla (Basil. Seleuc. *de Miraculis S. Theclae*, c. 15; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1012). [E. V.]

SYMPRONIANUS, a Novatianist controversialist, to whom Pacianus of Barcelona addressed his letters against Novatianism. [PACIANUS.] [G. T. S.]

SYNADIUS, a correspondent of Isidore of Pelusium. Isidore (*Epist.* i. 284) discusses for his use the doctrine of the Resurrection of the body. [G. T. S.]

SYNCLETICA (1), a virgin and deaconess of 5th cent., celebrated by Sedulius the poet in his epistle to the abbat Macedonius. She was of noble blood, but of such humility, says the poet as to deserve to be chosen a member of Heaven's senate. She was also so learned a theologian as to be capable of teaching, did not her sex prevent. (Sedulii Opp. in *Corp. Scriptt. Ecclesiast. Lat.* Vindob. 1885, t. x. p. 9; Ceill. viii. 107.) [G. T. S.]

SYNCLETICA (2), Jan. 5, a virgin of Alexandria, whose life has been attributed to St. Athanasius, but only, as it would seem, on the authority of Nicephorus Callistus, a writer of cent. xiv. The life is, however, an ancient document written by one Polycarp, an ascetic and a contemporary of the saint. It is useful to shed light on the controversies and social life of cent. iv., cf. *AA. SS.* Boll. Jan. t. i. p. 242–257; Coteler. *Monumenta*, t. i. p. 216. [G. T. S.]

SYNCLETION (SYNCLETICA), a lady who sent medicines to Chrysostom during his last winter at Cucusus which relieved him in three days. He begs Olympias to obtain more for him through count Theophilus. (Chrys. *Ep.* 4.) [E. V.]

SYNCLETIUS (1), bishop of Trajanopolis in Thrace, and metropolitan, one of the three episcopal commissioners—Palladius of Helenopolis, and Hesychius of Parion (who, being a friend of Antoninus, speedily abandoned his commission on the plea of health) being the other two—deputed by Chrysostom A.D. 400 to proceed to Asia, and, in conjunction with the bishops of the province, examine and decide on the charges brought by Eusebius against Antoninus bishop of Ephesus. The commission was opened at Hypaepi, but the investigation proved abortive through the artifices of Eusebius, whom Antoninus had gained over by bribes, and who pretended that his witnesses were not forthcoming, and that time was needed to produce them. Syncletius and Palladius waited more than two months in vain and then returned to Constantinople, having previously passed a sentence of excommunication on Eusebius for non-appearance and false accusation. On their return to Constantinople they found Eusebius, who pretended that he had been ill, and promised still to produce his witnesses. In the meantime Antoninus died, and the case against him came to a natural termination. (Pallad. pp. 131–133.) [E. V.]

SYNCLETIUS (2), a deacon, by whom Euphemius patriarch of Constantinople wrote a letter to pope Gelasius, A.D. 492, seeking a restoration of communion between the two sees. (Ceill. x. 486; Bower's *Hist. of the Popes*, t. ii. p. 217.) [G. T. S.]

SYNCLETIUS (3) (SYNCLETICUS), bishop of Tarsus in the middle of the 6th century. By incautious reading of some heretical writings he became tainted with Eutychianism, together with the monk Stephen his "syncellus." His metropolitan, Ephraim of Antioch, wrote letters to him and held a synod to take cognizance of his errors, and was successful in bringing him back to the orthodox faith. (Photius, *Cod.* 228, pp. 780, 781; Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 875.) [E. V.]

SYNEROS, Marcionite teacher, mentioned by Rhodo (*ap.* Euseb. *H. E.* v. 13). See the article MARCION, Vol. III. p. 819, a. [G. S.]

SYNEROTIS, a martyr in the Diocletian persecution, whose true name has only been lately discovered. In Ruinart's *Acta Sincera*, p. 546, the passion of a saint Serenus is recorded with a variety of spellings—Serenus, Sirenus, Sinerius, Sinerus. He was a gardener at Sirmium in Pannonia. He reproved the wife of one of the emperor Maximian's officials for immodesty. She complained to her husband, through whose influence he was arrested and put to death. A Christian cemetery was lately discovered at Sirmium with ancient inscriptions, shewing that the true way of spelling the martyr's name was Synerotis. De Rossi's *Bullet.* 1884–85, p. 145, discusses the circumstances of the martyrdom and of the new discovery (cf. *Archaeologische Epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich*, ix. (1885) 138). [G. T. S.]

SYNESIUS (1), a youthful relative of Gregory Nyssen, but otherwise unknown, charged with a capital offence. Gregory (*Ep.* 7 in *Pat. Gr.* xlvi. 1036) solicits his pardon from some high official, thought to have been Cynegius, pretorian prefect (384–390), pleading that the offence had been committed by misadventure and without premeditation. [C. H.]

SYNESIUS (2), bishop of Ptolemais in the Libyan Pentapolis, early in the 5th century. Two treatises have appeared on the subject of Synesius within the last few years, one in French

by H. Druon, *Études sur la vie et les œuvres de Synesius*, Paris, 1859; the other in German, by Dr. Volkmann, *Synesius von Cyrene*, Berlin, 1869. To the former I am indebted for much information respecting the chronological arrangement of Synesius's writings, especially the letters, though in some respects I cannot accept M. Druon's arrangement. The latter I did not see till this essay was nearly completed; it is a well-written treatise, but not so elaborate as the former.

There are some men whose writings have a particular value for students of history, precisely because they are deficient in marked originality. The man of original genius necessarily stands almost alone. He may express the highest thoughts and aspirations of his age, but for that very reason he is the representative of a small class rather than of the mass of his contemporaries. There are others whose works, though far inferior in literary and philosophical value, are almost, if not entirely, equal in historical importance. They are men of real ability, whose minds are receptive rather than creative, who are not great thinkers themselves but can reproduce faithfully the ideas of others, who are easily impressed by the various influences to which they are in turn exposed, and have great power of conveying to others the impressions made upon themselves, who are seldom consistent throughout their lives to one form of belief, or to one principle of policy, and so represent in turn widely different phases of thought and feeling. Such a man at the close of the 4th and commencement of the 5th century was Synesius of Cyrene. His life was almost exactly coincident with what is probably the most important crisis through which the world has passed. He witnessed the accomplishment of the two great events on which the whole course of history for many centuries depended—the ruin of the Roman empire and the complete triumph of Christianity. He was born when the pagan world was mourning the untimely death of the last of the pagan emperors. He died amidst the horrors of the barbarian invasions, when the recent fall of Rome seemed to every portion of the Roman empire a sign of impending ruin. With all the varying influences of this great age of change he was brought into contact, by all in turn his character was moulded, and all, with more or less completeness, are depicted in his works. He never attained the highest rank of literary excellence, but he writes as one who had carefully observed and considered the political, social, and intellectual condition of society. He was not a great philosopher, but he has described for us better than any one else one of the latest phases of Greek philosophy, which is not without its value even now. He was not a great poet, but he attempted with success a style of poetry of which we have hardly any previous examples. He had no pretension to vie with his illustrious contemporaries Augustine, Jerome, and Chrysostom, as a leader of religious thought, but he does represent at least one side of the religious history of that day, which we should look for in vain in the writings of those great champions of the Christian faith.

Synesius was born about the year 365 at Cyrene, "a Greek city of ancient fame, celebrated in the songs of countless poets," but then already in decay, and superseded by Ptolemais as the capital of Pentapolis. He was of good family, and loved to boast of his descent from the Heraclids, who led the first colony from the Peloponnese to the shores of Africa. Though a younger son, he inherited an ample fortune, with considerable estates in the interior of the country. Of his early years but little is known, except that he served in the army, and was passionately fond of field sports. The extremely interesting series of his letters which have been preserved to us begins with the time when he had left the army and commenced his studies at Alexandria. With a pardonable condescension to the tastes of novel-readers, Mr. Kingsley has described his heroine as still young and beautiful at the time of her cruel death. Twenty years at least before that date Hypatia was already the most distinguished teacher of philosophy in the civilised world. The wonderful influence she exerted over such a man as Synesius is itself a proof of the greatness of her abilities. Throughout his life, in all his troubles, in spite of all his changes of opinions, he always turned to her with reverence and chivalrous devotion. From her he derived his attachment to Neoplatonism, that strangely attractive system, a religion rather than a philosophy, by which those who still clung to the teaching of ancient Greece found means to combine their love of literature and their religious feeling in a poetical form of mystic Theism.

But even in the time of Hypatia the great school of Alexandria was not considered sufficient for any one who aimed at acquiring the reputation of a philosopher. Athens, though fallen, was still the chief university of the Roman world. Students from Athens looked down with contempt on all who had not studied the great systems of philosophy in their ancient home. To Athens, therefore, Synesius was driven by the remonstrances of his friends. "I shall get one advantage at least by going there," he said, "I shall no longer have to look with reverence on those persons who have no advantage over us in the knowledge of Plato and Aristotle, and yet because they have seen the Academy and Lyceum treat us as if they were demi-gods and we but demi-asses." On his arrival at Athens, he playfully declared he had at once grown wiser by a hand's breadth and an inch over. But both with the city and its teachers he was profoundly disappointed. Athens seemed to him like an animal of which only the skin remained to shew what it had once been. Of its former grandeur nothing, in his opinion, was left but the names of the places. It was distinguished only for the manufacture of honey. The two most eminent teachers of philosophy attracted young men to their lectures, not by the fame of their eloquence, but by presents of honey from Hymettus.

From Athens and Alexandria Synesius returned to his country home in Pentapolis, determined to divide his time between country pursuits and literature, planting trees, breeding horses, training dogs for hunting, writing poetry, and studying philosophy. From this pleasant life he was called away to plead the cause of his native city before the court of Constantinople. He arrived in that city A.D. 397, and remained there three years. A man of refined literary taste and strong religious feelings, enthusiastically fond of

a country life, naturally turned with disgust from the corruptions of that court and city which have been so vividly painted for us in the elaborate satires of Claudian, and the indignant denunciations of Chrysostom. Amid the intrigues of the palace, while Goths and eunuchs struggled for supremacy, the cause of an obscure and distant city had little chance of attracting attention. But Synesius was fortunate in the friendship of Aurelian, a distinguished statesman, the leader at that time of what may be called the patriotic party. By his influence Synesius was allowed to pronounce before the emperor Arcadius and his court an oration on the nature and duties of the kingly office.[a] This oration is still extant, but the language is in parts so bold, the invective so personal, as to suggest a doubt whether it could really have been delivered, at least in its present form. It is well known that great orators, especially in that age, published orations which either had never been delivered at all, or had been considerably altered after they were delivered. Still Synesius, on a subsequent occasion, claimed to have spoken before the king with greater boldness than any Greek had ventured to do before; and it is probable that the anti-Gothic party put him forward as a "rustic philosopher," who would be allowed much of that license which was then accorded to Christian preachers. In any case the oration is one of the most important historical memorials of that age. It expresses the deliberate judgment of a man of great ability, strong patriotic feeling, and highly cultivated mind, who could denounce moral evils with the righteous indignation of a Christian bishop, and, unlike the Christian bishops of that day, did not neglect the nature and extent of the political evils which, no less than the moral evils, were destroying the state. He began with a dignified exordium, skilfully contrived to prepare the emperor and his court to receive his words, not as the ideas of the envoy of a petty state, but as the teaching of philosophy itself. Much of what followed was derived from Plato and other teachers; but when Synesius passes from vague philosophical generalities he at once becomes vigorous and instructive. A brief abstract of the more important portions of the speech may not be altogether devoid of interest:

"Kingly power has been divinely appointed to be the representative upon earth of God's providence. Therefore the foundation of the kingly character must be laid in piety. Before undertaking anything, however small, the king will seek God's guidance. There is nothing more impressive than the sight of a king in the midst of his people lifting up his hands in prayer to God—his King and theirs. It is reasonable to suppose that God especially delights in the worship of a pious king, and unites that king to Himself by mysterious bonds of union. The more the king is loved by God, the more will he love men. The character which he finds in his own King he will display towards his own subjects.

[a] Synesius says that in the Eastern empire the emperors were generally addressed by the title of king, but that they did not use that title themselves on account of the old Roman prejudice against it.

"To secure success in war, philosophy shews us that the king should make a habit of living with his soldiers, sharing in their hardships, joining in their military exercises, treating them as his friends, making himself personally acquainted with their names and characters, and so winning the affections of that simple noble race. Look at Homer. See how he has represented Agamemnon, not only himself addressing even the common soldiers by name, but also exhorting his brother to do the same. Besides the king is a manufacturer of wars as a shoemaker is of shoes. Now a shoemaker would be justly ridiculous if he knew nothing about the implements of his trade, and how can a king know how to use his implements—the soldiers—when he is not even acquainted with them? Nothing has done more harm to the Roman state than the habit of surrounding the person of the king with a theatrical pomp and a sort of divine mystery. Do not be vexed at what I say. The fault is not yours. It is the fault of those who began this evil custom, and have handed it down to posterity as a thing to be proud of. The fear that if you are often seen you will be reduced to the level of mere men makes you state prisoners. You see nothing, you hear nothing which can give you any practical wisdom. Your only pleasures are the most sensual pleasures of the body. Your life is the life of a sea-anemone. The result of this studied seclusion is that you repel the wise and noble while you admit to your familiarity creatures who are the counterfeits of humanity; creatures with small heads and scanty brains, who, with idiotic grins and equally idiotic tears, with the language and gestures of buffoons, help you to kill the time, and to lessen the burden of that cloud which the unnatural character of your lives brings upon you.

"When do you think the Roman state was at the height of its power? Is it now, when you are arrayed in purple and gold; when precious stones from the mountains and the seas of barbarous countries are set in your hair, in your sandals, in your robe, in your girdle, in your ears, in your seats? Is it now, when the bare pavement is intolerable to you; when you will not even walk on the natural ground, but golden earth must be brought for your use by waggons and transports from distant continents—and the men who sprinkle it before you would form no despicable army—for you think it unkingly not to indulge the very soles of your shoes in luxury? Were not things better then, when the armies were commanded by princes who lived in the midst of their soldiers, men of simple habits and coarse dress, whose faces were tanned by the sun; men whom the common people would think to have been badly off indeed compared with you, but who, at all events, had not to guard their homes against attacks from the barbarians of Europe and Asia, for those barbarians were themselves obliged to fortify their own country against the danger of their attacks? Things cannot go on quietly as they have done. We are now at the turning-point. The stone of Tantalus hangs over the state suspended by a slender thread. Our chief danger is from the employment, not of citizens, but of barbarians as soldiers; not of sheep-dogs, but of wolves to guard the fold. While this is

so, to grant exemption from military service to all who ask for it, and to let our own countrymen devote themselves to every other kind of occupation, is it not the conduct of men hastening to their destruction? Rather than tolerate the employment of Scythians as soldiers, we should demand from friendly agriculture the men who will fight in her behalf. The philosopher should be taken from his study, the trader from his shop, the drone-like populace from the theatres where they spend their lives. These Scythian soldiers will be sure to turn their arms against us as soon as they think they can do so with success. And they will have many to help them in this city. Every family, which is at all well off, has a Scythian slave. The baker, the water-carrier, the waiter at table, the men who carry the seats for their masters to sit down on in the streets are all Scythians; for this race has long been marked out as the fittest to supply the Roman people with slaves. The servile insurrection of Spartacus and Crixus[b] was one of the greatest misfortunes which befel the Romans in former times. But our slaves, if they revolt, will be joined by their brethren, who form our army. They will be commanded by men who are high in rank, both among them and among us, men who take their place among Roman magistrates and scorn all that has long been most honoured among Romans, men who put on the toga to appear in the senate, but when they leave the senate-house quickly exchange the toga for the sheep-skin, and laugh at the toga as a dress in which men cannot draw their swords easily. We must get rid of these men. Do not think I am urging you to a task beyond our powers. We are Romans, and the Romans have conquered every nation. They are Scythians, and the Scythians, as Herodotus says, and as we ourselves see, have the vice of effeminacy. They have repeatedly been conquered, have frequently fled from their own country; they are always being driven forward by one nation and back again by another. Your father Theodosius vanquished them in arms, and then was vanquished by pity for them. He admitted them to the citizenship, and to the honours of the state; he gave land to these pests of the country. Since this has been known, fresh hordes are continually arriving, claiming the same treatment. But with increased spirit, and increased levies of native citizens, above all if you display what Homer calls the mighty wrath of Zeus-born kings, we shall either make these men our helots or send them back across the river (Danube) to tell men that the old softness is no longer to be found among the Romans.

"Then as regards the duties of the king in times of peace. The chief characteristic of the true king, as of God, is benevolence. The discharge of his duties is not more troublesome to him than giving light is to the sun. He will visit as far as he can all his dominions. He will receive readily, and with paternal kindness, the embassies from subject cities, that he may, when necessary, relieve them from public burdens and restore their lost prosperity. He will take care that his soldiers are as little burdensome as possible to citizens and agriculturists. As he cannot see to everything himself he must appoint governors in the different states, thus like God working through lower agencies. These governors must be chosen for virtue, not for wealth, as now. A man who has bought his office with money unscrupulously gained cannot really know what justice is. It is not likely he will hate injustice; he will hardly refrain from turning his tribunal into a market-place. He will not look with a noble contempt on bribes, when he knows that he is indebted to bribes for the dignity he holds, and that he has hired the government of the province as he might hire a house or farm. It is for you to make virtue, not wealth, an object of envy by promoting the poor and virtuous, and by shewing your detestation of that most ignoble vice of avarice. God has given many enviable privileges to the king, but the greatest of all is this: that he can by his example change even the ideas of morality which have been branded on the hearts of the people by long custom.

"Finally I pray that the king may become enamoured of philosophy; then philosophy, whose flame is now almost quenched, will have many disciples. It is not in the interests of philosophy that I pray for this. She does not suffer by being exiled from men, her home is with God; even when here her chief thoughts are with Him, and when the earth will not receive her, she remains with the Father. But human affairs prosper or decline as she is present or absent from us. May I then be successful in the prayer which Plato prayed in vain. May I see philosophy admitted by you to a share in the government. In this all my wishes are combined. And I myself shall justly be the first to reap the harvest from the seeds which I have sown, if, when I come to confer with you about the wishes of my country, I find you are yourself the king whose ideal picture I have drawn."

Some of the evils which Synesius anticipated were soon realised. The Gothic, or, as Synesius would have contemptuously called him, the Scythian, leader Gainas revolted, and triumphed without difficulty over the effeminate court of Arcadius. Aurelian was sent into banishment, and his supporters in Constantinople were exposed to considerable dangers. In after years, Synesius declared that he had only escaped the devices of his enemies through warnings sent to him in dreams by God. At the time he shewed his courage by publishing a curious political pamphlet, in which, under the transparent veil of a supposed Egyptian myth relating to the contest between Good and Evil in the persons of Osiris and Typhon, he described the conflict between Aurelian and Gainas. It was doubtless easy at the time to detect the personal allusions, but the piece is of very little historical value now, and is chiefly remarkable for a theory of Providence which will be noticed when we come to the subject of Synesius's religious opinions. In a few weeks the power of Gainas sank as rapidly as it had risen. Part of his army perished in a popular rising in Constantinople. The rest were destroyed by an army of Huns in the pay of the emperor. Aurelian returned to Constantinople, and for the remainder of Arcadius's reign occupied a position of great import-

[b] Speaking of these men, Synesius says that gladiators fought as expiatory sacrifices for the Roman people.

ance at the court. By his influence Synesius obtained the boon which he asked for Cyrene, and was able at length to quit the hateful city. The letter in which he thanked his friend is too characteristic to be omitted: "If there are spirits, gods, and daemons,[c] who preside over the destinies of states, as there certainly are, believe they are all grateful to you, remembering the benefits which, when holding the highest magistracy, you conferred upon mankind. Believe that at all times they are present with you, to aid and support you, praying always to your God and theirs that you may receive the fitting reward for having, as far as in you lay, imitated Him. For the work of benevolence is the only work which belongs to God and man alike. Now imitation is a form of resemblance, and there is a connexion between the imitator and the thing imitated. Feel, then, that you are become like God, by participating in His benevolence, and indulge the pleasant hopes which accord with such a frame of mind."

He returned to the country life of which he was so fond, and for which he was so well fitted. It must have been a pleasant home. "With us," he wrote to his brother Evoptius, who was suffering from the heat by the sea-side, "you can sit under the shade of the trees, and when you are tired of one tree you can move to another, and from one grove to another grove. Then think how delightful it is to cross the running stream! How pleasant is the light breeze when it softly stirs the boughs. And there are the varied songs of birds, and bright flowers, and shrubs in the meadow,—some the results of cultivation, others the gift of nature, all fragrant. I will not celebrate the praises of the nymphs' cavern, it would need a Theocritus to do that. Nor is this all." The pursuits and inhabitants of this country retreat are described by him with pleasant irony in a letter unhappily too long to be given in full. "We are roused in the morning by the neighing of horses, the roaring of bulls, the bleating of sheep and goats. With the first rays of the sun we hear the hum of the bees, which is quite as pleasant as any music. Our meetings are extremely social, we help one another, in agriculture, in flocks, in shepherds, and in hunting, of which the country affords a great variety. Neither we nor our horses can live without toil. We feed upon barley-meal, which is very pleasant to eat, and very pleasant to drink, such as Hecamede mixed for Nestor. After severe labour, this drink is a protection against the effect of the summer heat. We have also wheaten cakes, and excellent fruits, and honeycomb, and the milk of goats,—for it is not our custom to milk cows. Our best supply for the table comes from the chase. I cannot understand why Homer did not give the epithet 'man-ennobling' to the chase, whereas he does give it to the agora, which only produces shameless, infamous mannikins, who are of no good, but are scurrilous, and skilful only in mischief. Even if we allow that our honey is inferior to that from Hymettus, it is so good that when you can have it you have no wish for any foreign production. Our oil is clearly better than any other kind of oil, unless judgment is given by persons of perverted tastes. Our music is pre-eminently national. We have a small rustic pipe, of masculine tone, not unworthy of being used in training the boys of Plato's republic. For it does not admit of any modulations, nor will it harmonise with every voice. The singers adapt themselves to the simplicity of the music. Then we have capital songs, no effeminate subjects, but the praises of the dog who does not fear the hyaenas and dashes at the wolf's throat, of the ewe which bears twins, of the fig-tree and of the vine. But nothing is so common in our songs as thanksgivings and prayers for blessings on the men, the plants, and the herds. About the king and the king's friends there is naturally hardly a word. There is a king—that, I may say, they know well. We are reminded of that every year by the tax-gatherers. But who he is, that is not so clear. Some among us think that Agamemnon, son of Atreus, who was so distinguished at Troy, is still reigning, for this has been transmitted to us in our childhood as a name for a king. And the good herdsmen speak of his friend Ulysses, a bald-headed man, but clever in finding his way out of difficulties. They roar with laughter when they talk of him, as if it was but last year that he blinded the Cyclops. . . . They often ask me about ships and sails, and the sea. Though they may accept what I tell them about ships, they steadily refuse to believe that any food fit for men can come out of the sea. That, they think, is the special prerogative of mother earth. Once, when they would not believe what I told them about fishes, I took a jar, opened it with a stone, and shewed them some preserved fish from Egypt. But the men said these were poisonous serpents, jumped up and ran away, believing the bones would be as poisonous as the teeth. One very old man, who was considered the cleverest among them, said he certainly could not believe that anything good to eat could come out of salt water, when good tanks of drinkable water only produced frogs and leeches, which no madman even would think of eating. . . . You will say this is the kind of life men led in the time of Noah, before slavery became the punishment of men's crimes." Synesius's own estates were of course cultivated by slaves, who were subjected to what he calls a philosophic and Laconian discipline. "They are so liberally treated, and, I may say, placed so nearly on an equality with ourselves, that they look on me rather as a ruler whom they have chosen for themselves, than a despot who has been imposed on them by law." These, however, were the slaves whom he had inherited, whose ancestors probably had lived with his ancestors for many generations, till it was felt that masters and slaves formed but one family. He was not so fortunate with those whom he acquired in other ways. We find him writing to a friend to claim his aid for the recovery of a slave, his cousin's property, who had run away and escaped to Egypt. Another, whom he had unfortunately bought at a friend's sale, turned out quite a disgrace to his "philosophic master." "I shall not punish him," says Synesius, in a letter to his brother; "wickedness is a sufficient punishment to the wicked." So he sends him back to his native land, glad enough to be rid of him, but still with something of a secret liking

[c] The word daemon occurs in the letters and in his other works both in a good and bad sense, but in the hymns only in a bad sense.

for the amusing scoundrel. "He must be tied to the hatches during the voyage; don't let him go down into the hold, or you must not be surprised if he makes several of your wine-skins half empty. And if the voyage should be long, he would gulp down the fragrant wine to the very dregs, and induce the sailors to do the same, for, in addition to everything else, the scoundrel is very clever in persuading people to enjoy themselves. What hired sailor is grave enough to resist when he sees the wretch exulting in his wantonness as he passes round the cup? He has other buffooneries besides, of which the captain must beware. Now Ulysses, when *he* sailed by the sirens' shore, was bound lest he should yield to pleasure; but this man, if the captain is wise, will be bound lest he should induce the sailors to do so."

From his country retreat, and from the city of Cyrene where he occasionally resided, Synesius kept up a brisk correspondence with his friends in different parts of the world, especially at Alexandria and Constantinople. But the difficulties of communication were great. It was often necessary to wait till some trustworthy person was going to these cities, to whom a bundle of letters might be confided to be distributed on his arrival. In the winter there was no communication with Constantinople. At all seasons the voyage was dangerous. Sometimes the ship was obliged by stress of weather to put in at an intermediate port, the letters were landed and often stayed there. A letter for a friend in Syria had to be sent first to a friend in Alexandria, who in his turn must watch for an opportunity of forwarding it on. Under these circumstances it is not wonderful that letters were often mislaid, were often more than a year upon the road, arrived sometimes in an almost illegible state, and even moth-eaten. Synesius's most intimate friends, who lived at a distance, seem to have written to him only once a year. "When I received," he writes to his friend Pylaemenes, "the spring letters from Thrace (Constantinople), I turned over the packet again and again to see if one of them was marked with the honoured name of Pylaemenes, for I could not open any letter before his. But there was none. If you were away from Constantinople at the time, I hope you will return speedily and prosperously. But if you were there when all my acquaintances gave their letters to Zosimus, it would be strange indeed if any one was more mindful of me than Pylaemenes."

Naturally in those days letters were of far greater importance than they can be now, in this age of newspapers and the penny-post. Naturally, therefore, the arrival of a letter from the capital, or from a distinguished literary man, was a great event. The fortunate recipient hastened to communicate it to his neighbours. "A man from Phycon," writes Synesius to Pylaemenes, one of his greatest friends at Constantinople, "gave me a letter he had brought inscribed with your name. I read it with pleasure and astonishment, with pleasure for the love I bear you, with astonishment for the beauty of the language. I collected in your honour an Hellenic audience[d] in Libya, telling the people they must come and hear a remarkable letter. And now Pylaemenes is celebrated in these cities as the creator of the divine epistle. One thing surprised the audience. You asked for my Cynegetics,[e] as if there was really something valuable in them. They thought you must be very satirical. They felt that one who was considered amongst themselves very deficient in eloquence could not have produced any trifle worthy of your attention. But I defended you from the charge of irony, and told them that besides your other virtues you were extremely kind-hearted and very lavish of praise, so that your request had not been made in mockery, but to give me the pleasure of being honoured by the testimony of so great a man in my favour. Write to me, then, as often as you can, and feast the people of Cyrene with your eloquence. Nothing could give them greater pleasure than to hear a letter from Pylaemenes read, for they are already enchanted with the specimen they have had. You will certainly find several persons coming here; if nobody else, there will be the persons who are appointed to the higher or lower magistracy in this state, or to the governorship of Egypt. You will easily know who they are by the crowd of debtors who accompany them." This letter is itself an example of the prejudicial effect which the knowledge that their letters would be widely read and criticised had upon the writers themselves. It was impossible for them to write with ease and freedom when they knew that what they wrote would be subjected to the jealous scrutiny of strangers. "I should like to write to him," says Synesius of a friend at Constantinople, "but I do not dare to do so lest I should have to stand the scrutiny of those Universalists, who dissect every word." Men naturally became rhetorical and affected in letters which, though nominally intended for the private perusal of a friend, were really designed to be read to a public audience. It is not surprising, then, that many of Synesius's letters are highly studied productions, that there are in them frequent signs of affectation, of straining for effect, of an unnecessary parade of learning. Besides, the taste of the day in literary circles was strongly in favour of an elaborate style, with extravagant compliments, forced metaphors, and artificial antitheses; and how great an influence such a taste may exercise even on the highest minds, will be known by all those who have read the letters of St. Basil to Libanius. Such a taste is the natural product of an age of intellectual degeneracy. When the power of searching criticism has passed away, writers are themselves unable to distinguish between real originality of thought and mere ingenuity of expression. With all their defects, however, the letters of Synesius are, on the whole, extremely interesting. The worst, from a modern point of view, are good examples of what was considered fine writing fourteen or fifteen centuries ago. And happily many were written without any thought of an audience, and so are simple natural descriptions of his life and feelings. They shew him to us as he really was, a straightforward honourable man of strong religious feelings, very affectionate and kind, skilled in all the literary culture of that age;

[d] The allusion is to a literary circle in Constantinople which Synesius calls the Hellenicum.

[e] A poem on hunting not extant.

a very pleasant companion, shrewd and witty, with a great variety of tastes and an equal variety of powers; fond of a quiet, domestic life, but very energetic in everything he undertook; very sensitive, easily excited and depressed, and so naturally shrinking from all intricate business, especially from political life, and only to be roused from his repose by the prospect of doing a kindness to his friends or neighbours.

Some of his letters were addressed to influential friends in behalf of persons in distress. Thus he wrote to Heliodorus at Alexandria,—"Fame says you have great influence with the governor of Egypt, and it says truly, for you thoroughly deserve it, because you make a good use of your influence. In order, then, that you gain some advantage from your virtues and from your influence, listen to the request of my friend Eusebius." In this very difficult style of letter-writing Synesius shewed his ingenuity by suggesting that whenever he gave his friends the opportunity of doing a kindness he was really conferring a benefit upon them. So he wrote to Pentadius, who was Augustalis, or civil governor of Egypt, "I am anxious both for you and for this man; for you lest you should do wrong, for him lest he should suffer wrong. Now if you agree with Plato that to do wrong is worse than to suffer wrong, I think I am conferring a greater benefit on you than on him by pleading on behalf of one who is accused of crimes he never committed." In a somewhat different tone is his letter to Anastasius, an influential friend at Constantinople: "Some God, some reason, or some daemon, has persuaded Sosenas that the place in which we are has something to do with our finding the Deity propitious or unfavourable to us. As, then, he is doing badly here, and has entirely lost the property he inherited from his father, he has determined to sail away to Thrace and there reconcile himself with Fortune. If you have any influence with that deity commend the young man to her, and let her find him some way of acquiring wealth. She can easily do so if she likes. She has had no difficulty in transferring to others the property of his father, Nonnus. Let her then make Sosenas the heir of some other father, and thus justice will succeed injustice." The following letter was obviously intended to be read by literary friends. It is addressed to a Cyrenaean named John, of whose misdeeds we shall hear again. "Fear of the laws is the greatest fearlessness. But you are always afraid of appearing to be afraid of them. Fear then your enemies and the judges also—unless they are corrupt. And if they are corrupt, and you are not the person who gives the highest bribes, you should be still more afraid. They are terribly zealous for justice, especially when they are bribed to be so."

Of the hundred and fifty-six letters which are still extant no less than forty-nine are addressed to his brother Evoptius. They form a pleasant series, full of interesting details, but it is somewhat remarkable that there is no allusion in them to their early years or to their parents. This would make it probable that they had been left orphans when quite young. To Evoptius himself, Synesius was warmly attached, and the letters themselves abound with frequent proofs of their mutual affection. There are few more characteristic letters in the whole collection than the one written when his brother, who usually resided at Cyrene, went on a visit to Alexandria: "You had loosed the cables when I checked the mules on the western beach. When I stept from the chariot the sail was already unfurled and the wind was blowing on the stern. Still with my eyes I attended you on your way as far as they could reach, and many prayers I uttered to the winds for the life so dear to me, commending to their care the bark, because it bore that freight most precious to me. And they—for they love what is good—promised me you should go and return in safety. They are good daemons and will not deceive me. As then you prayed to them for your voyage hence, so pray to them for your voyage hither; in that they will aid you still more gladly."

Probably Synesius would have owned that next to his brother his greatest friends were his books. It is touching to find him just before the birth of his eldest son talking of the pleasure he will have in introducing his son to the society of these old friends—a pleasure which he never knew. They were to be the most valuable part of his inheritance. "I have lessened my estates, and many of my slaves have bought their freedom from me, I have no money in women's ornaments or in coin, but I have many more books to leave than I inherited." In the opinion of some of his contemporaries, however, the money had not always been judiciously laid out. He was loudly accused of not being particular in buying correct copies. Of course in those days, when books were rare and dear, the more correct a copy was the dearer it became, and Synesius, with all his love for literature, had none of that minute carefulness of thought which would have led him to attach a very high value to precise accuracy of expression. He was one of those men who are easily struck by the general beauty of a piece, but are not inclined to weigh deliberately the importance of each separate phrase. He was sure to prefer a large number of somewhat imperfect manuscripts to a small number in which no inaccuracies could be detected. This, however, is not what he says himself in his defence, and the defence he does make has certainly the merit of originality. The great object of reading, according to him, is to develope the powers of the mind, but in reading we are too apt to leave the whole work to the eyes. Where, however, the manuscript is itself imperfect, the mind is continually compelled to exert itself to supply the missing words and to reconstruct the broken argument. There is therefore, at least for intelligent persons, a positive advantage in reading a book full of corrupt passages.[f]

In connexion with this theory he mentions some curious facts which throw great light on his literary habits and abilities. When he was reading any book he would often pause, close it, and improvise a continuation to what he had already read. On comparing this with the book he often found he had correctly divined the sense and style of the passage, and even in philosophical works the precise form of the argument. When he read aloud to a circle

[f] Any one who reads Synesius's letters and hymns, especially in the Abbé Migne's edition, will be able thoroughly to test the value of this theory.

of friends, he often improvised additions to the poem or to the narrative, and his friends, without detecting the change of style, often praised the author most loudly for the very passages which were due to the ingenuity of the reader. There was no kind of poetry which he did not imitate. "You would think me at one time a contemporary of Cratinus and Crates, at another of Diphilus and Philemon. Of such soft materials, so to speak, has God formed my soul that it readily takes the impressions of language and of characters." It is this flexibility of mind, indeed, seldom united in any one with great originality, which makes Synesius's writings so attractive, enabling him to represent so many different phases of thought, and so many different shades of character. He seems to have been naturally impelled to attempt in turn every form of composition, attaining in each a high, but never the highest, degree of excellence. Not content with his fame as an orator, a pamphleteer, a poet, and a philosopher, he resolved to enter into competition with the rhetoricians, or, as they were generally called, the sophists, of that day. Among the Greek rhetoricians under the empire no one was more celebrated than Dion, commonly surnamed Chrysostom, of whose writings Synesius has left an interesting criticism, and whose orations addressed to Trajan he had aspired to rival in his oration addressed to Arcadius. Among the works of Dion then extant was a Eulogy of Long Hair. It was one of those elaborate trifles which so much delighted literary circles in the decay of thought and learning under the despotism of the Caesars. When so many of the higher paths of literature were practically closed against them, when the serious discussion of historical, social, and political subjects was constantly attended with danger, even if, under the altered conditions of life, men retained much taste for such subjects, a very disproportionate value was naturally assigned to these trifles, which had, at all events, the merit of displaying the ingenuity of the rhetorician. The more insignificant the subject, the greater the ingenuity required. The subject might be a parrot, a gnat, a bit of dust; the interest of the piece consisted in the skill with which the author invested the subject with a fictitious importance, expending on it all the resources of his learning, bringing all the arts and sciences to embellish his declamations and support his arguments. Of this style of composition, interesting as an illustration of literary tastes in former times, there is, I believe, no better specimen extant than Synesius's Eulogy of Baldness, of which a brief abstract is subjoined:

"Dion has written such an eloquent encomium on long hair that a man is quite ashamed of being bald. When my hair began to fall off I was smitten with grief. To whom of the gods, to whom of the daemons did I not pray for help? When that did no good, I began to doubt the existence of a providence. But now I think that treatise was so eloquent simply because Dion was such a clever man. He could easily have written a much better encomium on baldness. For, if we look at the matter fairly, there is an antagonism between hair and wisdom: where the one flourishes the other does not. The most hairy of all animals is the sheep, and everybody allows that of all animals the sheep is the most stupid. The least hairy of all animals is man, and by common consent man is of all animals the wisest. Then consider the different classes of men. If you go into a museum, and look at the statues of the philosophers, you will see that they are all bald. It is true Apollonius of Tyana had long hair, but then, I fear, that shews that he was only a conjuror and a dealer in magic arts. Socrates, who in every other respect was so modest, was extremely proud of his resemblance to Silenus, and the reason was because Silenus was bald. In the Bacchic orgies the frantic revellers have long hair and are covered with hairy skins, but Silenus, who was appointed by Jupiter for his wisdom to restrain the excesses of Bacchus, sits among them bald-headed. Besides, our hair grows most freely when we are children, that is to say when we are least wise. As we grow older and wiser our hair gradually falls off. It is true some people fail to become bald even in old age, but then some people also fail to become wise.

"The reason of all this is a divine mystery not to be revealed to the vulgar. I will endeavour to say as much as can be said with reverence on the subject. Before the fruit, which is the object of the plant's existence, is produced, nature, for her own amusement and pleasure, produces the flower, and the husk in which the fruit is wrapped. These all fall off or wither before the fruit attains maturity. So the hair, which nature produces as an ornament like the flowers, or a covering like the husk, must fall off before wisdom, the fruit of the mind, can be brought to perfection. Again, the Father has appointed the universe to be the habitation of the third god, the soul of the universe. The universe has therefore the most perfect and comprehensive form. This form geometry shews us is in plane figures the circular, in solid figures the spherical. Therefore the universe is spherical. Now all souls are emanations from this god, therefore they naturally seek a habitation similar to his, that is to say one which is spherical. The most perfect souls inhabit the stars, those who are next in excellence inhabit the heads which are most spherical, that is to say which are most bald. Only the least rational souls will enter the heads which lose the spherical form through the profusion of their hair.

"If Homer and Phidias represented Zeus with long hair, that was only to humour the popular prejudice. The Greeks were always indifferent to the pursuit of truth. Any one who innovated on their traditional religion would soon have drunk the hemlock. Homer would have fared ill if he had told the truth about Zeus, and invented none of the fables which astonish children. If the gods really have any bodily form, the only idea we can gain of it must be from considering the heavenly bodies, but these are all spherical. The only heavenly bodies which have anything like hair are the comets, so they are the only heavenly bodies which perish. Besides they are always the forerunners of great calamities.

"When men are ill they have their heads shaved. Indeed the head is the citadel of life, and from it the cables, so to speak, of disease and health proceed. Now, by being bald, the head is exposed to all the inclemencies of the

weather, and so becomes harder and stronger, therefore disease has the more difficulty in penetrating into it. But the head which is covered with hair is necessarily weak, like a tree which has grown in the shade. If you want any proof of this, you may visit the battle-field which Herodotus describes on the borders of Arabia and Egypt. He says that, while the Persian skulls were quite weak, the Egyptian skulls, which were shaven, were so hard that you could not break them even with a large stone. If you do not like to undertake so long a journey, or think it would be wrong to hit a dead man's skull with a stone, and yet are unwilling to believe Herodotus, there are plenty of long-haired Scythian slaves in this city. If you were to hit one of them on the head, even with a knuckle-bone, you would kill him.

"The instances Dion quotes in support of his opinions are unfortunate. It is true the Spartans combed their long hair before the battle of Thermopylae, but then they were all killed there. On the other hand before the battle of Arbela, where the Persian empire was overthrown, Alexander caused all his soldiers to have their heads shaved.

"Then Dion says Achilles had long hair. 'The goddess seized him by his flaxen locks.' Well, suppose Achilles *had* long hair! He was at that time young and passionate. When a man is young it is natural that as his heart swarms with passions, so his head should swarm with hairs. Had Achilles lived longer he would doubtless have become wise and bald. But the truth is Dion has left out the most important part of Homer's line. 'She stood behind and seized him by his flaxen lock.' Stood *behind* him! Of course because there was no hair in front to take hold of. Why even with me anybody might still take hold of the hair at the back of my head. So I conjecture Achilles was already partially bald. . . .

"As then baldness is the end at which nature aims, and as those whose nature is highest are as I am, it would be well to assist others to the attainment of this perfection by the use of the razor."

There are many works whose very style shews that they have been written with pleasure and finished with satisfaction, and no one who has read this treatise in the original will be surprised to find that it was, at least at first, an especial favourite with Synesius. If his books were his friends, his writings were his children. Some, as he playfully told his friend Nicander, were his legitimate sons, the offspring of his union with divine Philosophy or her companion Poetry. But others were too obviously the offspring of Rhetoric to be regarded by a philosopher as his lawful issue. To this latter class he feared the Eulogy of Baldness must belong, and yet he had a special affection and admiration for it. "But they tell me the mother-apes gaze with rapture on their own offspring, and are astonished at their beauty, though they see clearly enough that the other young ones are but the children of apes. So then I also must leave others to judge of my children." Probably this treatise was written while he was still at Constantinople. In later years he spoke with a just depreciation of such elaborate trifling. For then misfortunes had come to trouble the easy current of his life, and in the dark days before him he had deeper thoughts to occupy his mind and a sterner work to do.

With the death of Theodosius, the last hope of maintaining the grandeur of the Roman empire seemed suddenly to die away. The burden of the government was too heavy for any but the strongest man to sustain, and from his firm grasp the sceptre fell into the feeble hands of his children, who, throughout their lives, except in name, were never more than children. On all sides the barbarians pressed in through the weakly guarded frontier to the rich and defenceless provinces. Everywhere the same miserable story is repeated of pillage and slaughter, and ruined civilisation. It has often been alleged as a proof of the degeneracy of the Britons under the Roman sway, that, when the Roman soldiers were withdrawn, they were so unable to defend themselves. As a matter of fact, however, the resistance in Britain was more vigorous, certainly more national, than in the other parts of the Roman empire. The Britons at all events did not fall without leaving behind them some record of a bloody struggle. The extraordinary feature of the barbaric invasions is the general apathy of the inhabitants whose countries were invaded. No love of country, no fear of confiscation, no cruelties inflicted on themselves, no indignities offered to those most dear to them, could kindle in them one spark of courage, even the courage of despair. The only armies which encountered the barbarians were chiefly composed of barbarians themselves. The generals who commanded them, even if nominally Roman, were usually like Stilicho of barbarian descent. Not even the inhabitants of the great cities could find in their numbers, their superior intelligence, and the strength of their fortifications, sufficient confidence for a vigorous defence. Rome and Milan, Lyons and Arles, fell by turn before Goths and Vandals, leaving many records of their sufferings, but not one of a single heroic struggle for life and liberty. The various characteristics of this miserable time are well illustrated by the letters of Synesius. The miseries which descended upon the Western empire did not spare the distant province of Pentapolis. The nomadic tribes of Libya took advantage of the weakness of the Roman government to sweep down upon the fertile land. Their inroads were not, like the great Teutonic invasions, a national migration for the acquirement of a new country. At least at first they were merely predatory incursions. In the absence of precise chronological indications to determine the dates of all Synesius's letters, it is difficult to distinguish between the events of different years. I have therefore grouped together from different letters such details as throw light on the general character of these inroads.

They seem to have begun not long after Synesius's return from Constantinople. At Cyrene, as elsewhere, there were no troops to oppose them. Synesius's spirits rose with the danger. "I at all events," he writes, "will see what manner of men these are who think they have a right to despise Romans. I will fight as one who is ready to die, and I know I shall survive. I am Laconian by descent, and I remember the letter of the rulers to Leonidas—'Let them fight as men who are ready

to die, and they will not die.'" Here and there a few displayed the same courage. "Blessings on the priests of Auxiditae, who, when the soldiers hid themselves in the caves, called the people together and, after divine service, took the offensive against the enemy. Now, Myrsinitis is a long deep ravine, thickly wooded; but as the barbarians had hitherto met with no opposition, they were not alarmed at the badness of the ground. They encountered a hero, however, in the deacon Faustus. Though unarmed, he attacked a man who was fully armed, and struck him a blow with a stone on the head, not throwing the stone, but rushing on the man and striking him like a boxer. Then he took the arms of the fallen man, and killed several others. For my part I should like to give triumphal crowns to all who took part in the fray, and make a public proclamation in their honour. For they are the first who have done a gallant deed, and have shewn that these invaders are not Corybantes, or daemons such as wait on Rhea, but men who can be wounded and killed like ourselves." As time went on, the inroads became more destructive. "They have burnt the barns, and devastated the land, and carried off the women as slaves. The males they never spare. Formerly they used to take young boys alive; now I suppose they feel they are too few in number to leave many guards with the booty, and still have men enough to resist attacks. Yet none of us are indignant. We sit at home hoping in vain for the soldiers. Shall we not cease our folly? Shall we not march against these men in behalf of our children, our wives, our country? For my part, I have dictated this letter almost on horseback, for I have levied a troop among our neighbours. When we begin our march, and it is known that I have a force of young men with us, I hope that many will join me." The supply of arms, however, for this volunteer force was a great difficulty, and we find Synesius writing even to a friend in Syria to send him bows and darts, especially the long Syrian darts, which he found went further and straighter than the Egyptian. On the eve of an engagement with a body of marauders, he thus describes the arms of his party: "We have already three hundred spears, the same number of bills, but only ten two-edged swords. Still I think the bills will give the strongest blow to the enemies' bodies. We shall certainly use them. If necessary we shall use clubs, and some of us have axes to cut down their shields and compel them to fight us on equal terms." The Ausurians had got the shields from the runaway soldiers. "I believe we shall fight to-morrow." It was, however, by no means safe for private persons to levy men for the defence of the country which was abandoned by its rulers, and his brother wrote to him in great alarm that he was exposing himself to a charge of treason. Synesius replied with spirit, "You are a pleasant person, hindering us from taking up arms when the enemy are at hand, plundering everywhere, and every day slaughtering whole villages, and when there are no soldiers, at least none to be seen. Will you say after this that it is not lawful for private persons to bear arms, and that they may be put to death, seeing that the state may be angry with any one who attempts to save himself? . . . I would gladly die at once if my country could regain her former aspect." Things grew worse, till he wrote almost in despair this touching letter to Hypatia: "Even if, as Homer says, 'The dead forget in Hades,' yet even there will I remember the beloved Hypatia. I am surrounded by the misfortunes of my country, and mourn for her as each day I see the enemy in arms, and men slaughtered like sheep. The air I breathe is tainted by putrefying corpses, and I expect as bad a fate myself, for who can be hopeful when the very sky is darkened by clouds of carnivorous birds? Still I cling to my country. How can I do otherwise, I who am a Libyan, born in the country, and who have before my eyes the honoured tombs of my ancestors? For your sake alone I think I would leave my country, and change my abode if I am ever again free from anxiety." In a short time afterwards, owing to the arrival probably of a new general, the Ausurians were repulsed, and Synesius in the year 403 left for Alexandria, where he married and remained two years. On his return he found Cerealis governor, under whose rule the predatory incursions of the barbarians became a regular invasion. "He is a man," wrote Synesius to an influential friend at Constantinople, "who sells himself cheaply, who is useless in war, and oppressive in peace. As if what belonged to the soldiers was the property of the general, he took all they had and gave them furloughs in return, allowing them to go where they thought they should find people to maintain them. Thus he treated the native soldiers; as he could get no money out of the foreign troops, he got money by their means out of the cities, for he went and established himself with them, not where he thought he could do most good, but where he thought he could get most money. For the cities oppressed by the presence of these soldiers paid money to be rid of them. The Macetae soon heard this, and from that mixed tribe the story spread to the barbarians. 'Thus came they as the flowers and leaves of spring in multitude.' Alas for the youths we have lost! Alas for the harvest we have sown in vain! We have sown our land for the enemies' flames. The wealth of most of us consisted in flocks, and in herds of camels and horses. All is gone. All has been carried off. I am distracted by our misfortunes. Pardon me. As I write to you I am being besieged, many times in an hour. I see the fire signals, and light others in reply. . . . When Cerealis saw the danger he embarked his money, and is now at anchor in the bay. He sends us orders by a boat that we are to keep within the walls, and not attack these invincible men, otherwise, he protests, he is not to blame for the consequences. Besides, we are to set four watches at night, as if our hopes depended on our not going to sleep." While the governor thus deserted his duties, "Synesius the philosopher" mounted on the ramparts, and prepared for a vigorous defence. "I have no time for letters," he says, "I am occupied in devising a machine which shall hurl large stones a considerable distance from the walls." "At break of day I ride out," he says in another letter, "as far as possible to gain tidings of these brigands. I will not call them enemies, but robbers and murderers, since they do nothing but kill and plunder the helpless. At night with a body of

young men I make circuits round the hill, that the women may sleep without fear. I have some soldiers with me, of the company of the Balagritae, who, before Cerealis was governor, were mounted archers, but he has sold their horses. Still they do for me without horses, for we need archers to guard the wells and river, as we have no water within the walls. I want a few men who do not belie the name of men. If I get them, with the help of God, I am confident of success. But if I must die, there is this benefit in philosophy that I should not shrink from leaving this 'little bag of flesh.' But that I shall shed no tear at the thought of my wife and child, that I cannot pledge myself to do." The city which was thus besieged was probably Ptolemais, the capital of Pentapolis. As Volkman has pointed out, it cannot have been Cyrene, for there was a celebrated spring of water in that city. Besides, the capital was the most probable place for the governor to be at; it was close to the sea-shore, and Procopius mentions that, in the reign of Justinian, it was almost deserted owing to the want of water, and that the aqueducts were restored by that monarch. Happily for the people of Pentapolis, Cerealis was superseded, and a new and vigorous general soon repelled, at least for a time, the incursions of the barbarians, and restored comparative tranquillity to the country.

It was obviously Synesius's belief that, at all events in Pentapolis, the country might have been easily protected against the barbarians if there had been any ability in the government or vigour in the people. He was probably right. The Roman empire fell because so few of its own citizens cared to do anything to preserve it. In this respect Synesius's own career is very suggestive. The vigour he displayed during these invasions shews that he was one of those men whom every wise government seeks to enlist in its service. He had, indeed, before his embassy to Constantinople, consented to hold office for a time; "the injuries done to my friends, both private individuals and soldiers, compel me to wish for a political office, though I know I am naturally unfit for it." The corruption of the law courts, however, and the oppressions of the government, had soon filled him with disgust. He not only resigned this office, but while at Constantinople employed all his influence, at last with success, to get released from serving as a member of the senate of Cyrene, a duty he was bound to discharge in consequence of the estates he possessed in that district. Only if freed from this "accursed public service" could he have leisure for philosophy. From the charge of want of patriotism he vigorously defended himself in a letter to his friend Pylaemenes. "If circumstances gave free play to philosophy, no other science, nor all the sciences combined, would do so much for the harmonious arrangement of the government and the benefit of mankind. ... I had rather my soul was guarded with virtues than my body with soldiers, now that the state of affairs no longer allows a statesman to be a ruler. ... In our law courts a man can only become rich by subverting all rights, human and divine, and giving up his freedom to become a pitiable slave."

While he still took part in public affairs he advocated, but of course unsuccessfully, two important measures for the benefit of his country. One was the enrolment of a national militia, certainly the only way of successfully resisting the barbarians, though the general adoption of such a measure would inevitably have broken up the Roman empire by degrees, and made the provinces independent states. In Synesius's letters the very names of the soldiers are significant. They are called Marcomanni, Balagritae, Unnigardae, Arabians, never Romans. Such men were not likely to expose themselves very vigorously to any great dangers in behalf of a people they despised. Still it is remarkable that Synesius lays far more blame on the generals than on the soldiers. He repeatedly says that the soldiers fought well when well commanded, but he shrewdly adds, as the result of an extended experience, "the command of foreign mercenaries makes even the best generals merchants." Commanders, looking upon military service simply as a question of money, were chiefly anxious to make their fortunes as quickly as possible. For many years the legislation of the Roman emperors had steadily discouraged Roman citizens from serving in the army. In the increasing poverty of the empire, and the increasing burden of taxation, numerous laws had been made to prevent citizens volunteering into the army, in order to escape the burden of taxation that was crushing them hopelessly down. Those who could earn money to pay taxes were not to be allowed to serve the state as soldiers. While they were thus prevented from learning the use of arms, and were so oppressed by the exactions of the government, it is no wonder that men had no heart to encounter a savage enemy, fond of fighting and careless of life. When men were selling themselves as slaves to gain protection against their oppressors, many not unnaturally thought they could hardly be worse off through any change of rulers. It was not only in Spain that, to use the expression of Orosius quoted by Gibbon, many preferred liberty with poverty under the barbarians to the vexatious burdens of taxation under the Romans.

The other proposal was that the military governor of Pentapolis should, as in former times, be made dependent on the governor in Egypt, instead of being sent direct from Constantinople. This suggestion points to the want of responsibility in the governors of the distant provinces, owing to the difficulty of exercising any efficient supervision over them from the capital. The reason for the proposed change obviously was the far greater ease of communication between Pentapolis and Alexandria, than between Pentapolis and Constantinople. A governor knew that a long time must necessarily elapse before any action could be taken in the capital in consequence of complaints made against him, as the voyage was always long, and for several months in the year almost impossible. But with Alexandria the communications were comparatively easy and frequent. The chief people of Pentapolis often visited Alexandria, almost all of them had friends and relations living there. There would be no difficulty in bringing complaints against a deputy before his official superior in Egypt, and in securing at least some attention to them. In his oration on the duties of the kingly office Synesius had asserted that go-

vernors were generally appointed not for merit but for money, and his letters abound with illustrations of this remark. He mentions one man who obtained the governorship of Pentapolis after making a fortune by keeping a house of ill-fame. In another letter he speaks of a newly-appointed governor of Egypt who owed his wealth to unscrupulous embezzlement. Other cases are alluded to in which offices were purchased for noblemen by their creditors, as the best way of enabling them to pay their debts. It was impossible for such men in the short tenure of their offices to make their fortunes, as well as satisfy the demands of the central government, by any taxation which could under any show of legality be imposed upon the people. Hence arose a class of men whom Synesius calls the common pests of the country, the worst of brutes, informers who accused rich men of imaginary crimes, that the confiscation of their properties might enrich themselves and the needy governors. If any governor was high-minded enough to repress these informers, he was almost sure, according to Synesius, to be falsely accused himself on laying down his office. It was indeed an almost hopeless task in that day for the best of rulers to hold the balance fairly between the claims of the people he ruled and the claims of the imperial government he served. It was almost impossible, even for well-meaning men, to avoid being at once tyrants to the slaves below them and slaves to the tyrants above them. It is not surprising then that men of strong religious feeling, like Basil, turned from this mingled state of servitude and tyranny to find in the solitude of the desert, or the duties of the Christian ministry, the possibility of that life of holiness to which they felt God had called them. It was but natural that men, even of strong patriotic feeling, like Synesius, should turn from the degradation of official life, to live in thought among the glories of the heroic age of action in the pages of Homer, and the heroic age of thought in the pages of Plato.

His philosophical studies did not meet with much encouragement among the people of Pentapolis. "I never hear in Libya the sound of philosophy, except the echo of my own voice. Yet if no one else is my witness, assuredly God is, for the mind of man is the seed of God, and I think the stars look down with favour on me as the only scientific observer of their movements visible to them in this vast continent." He pursued the study of astronomy, not only with his usual fondness for the beauties of nature, but as a valuable introduction to the highest branches of philosophy. To him, as to Plato, astronomy is "not only a very noble science, but a means of rising to something nobler still, a ready passage to the mysteries of theology." He had received instruction in it from Hypatia, his "most venerated teacher," at Alexandria. While at Constantinople he sent his friend Paeonius a planisphere, constructed in silver according to his own directions, with a letter which contains a curious and rather obscure description of it. He mentions that Ptolemy, and the sacred college of his successors, had been contented with the planisphere on which Hipparchus had marked only the sixteen largest stars, by which the hours of the night were known, but that he himself had marked on his all the stars down to the sixth degree of magnitude.

In philosophy itself Synesius is not entitled to rank as an independent thinker. He is simply an eclectic blending together the elements of his belief from widely different sources, without taking much trouble to reduce them to a strictly harmonious system. He had neither depth nor precision of thought sufficient to win for himself a high place in the history of philosophy. At the same time, he constantly speaks of his delight in philosophical studies, and he always claims as his especial title of honour the name of a philosopher. But if he had been asked which he considered the most philosophical of his writings, he would probably have answered his poems. For, from his point of view, poetry was inseparably connected with philosophy, as both are occupied with the highest problems of life; both look at the ideal side of things, and in the union of the two religion itself consists. The Homeric poems were valuable to him, not only for their literary excellencies, but as furnishing a rule of conduct. He quotes Homer, as a Christian of that day quoted his Bible. His quotations are not merely happy illustrations of his arguments and descriptions. He evidently looked up to Homer as an authority in political, social, moral, and even religious questions. Besides Homer and Plato, who seem to have been his favourite authors, he was certainly well versed in the whole range of Greek literature. There is hardly a poet, or historian, or philosopher of eminence from whom he has not quoted or to whom he does not allude.

And in this, as in other respects, he is a faithful representative of one of the latest phases of thought in the Alexandrine school. The ascetic system of Plotinus and Porphyry had failed as an opposing force to the rising tide of Christianity. The theurgical rites, and mysterious forms of magical incantation, with which Iamblichus and others sought to prop up the falling creed, had had but a limited success. Repeated laws of increasing severity had been passed to repress the practice of magical arts, and many men accused of practising them had been imprisoned and even executed. Besides, the very persons over whose credulity such pretensions could exercise any influence would in the fourth century naturally be far more attracted by the far more wonderful pretensions of the Christian hermits. Those, who, in the uncertainties of changing creeds and falling institutions, craved for some visible yet supernatural confirmation of their faith, could hardly fail to feel that the stories told half in secret of supernatural powers exercised by Iamblichus were poor indeed compared with the countless tales of visions seen and miracles wrought by monks of Nitria and Scetis, which continually excited the wonder and stimulated the religion of the people of Alexandria. In supposed miracles, as in real austerities, no pagan philosopher was likely to rival the fame of Antony or Ammon. Among the higher classes the great majority of thinking men, who were still unwilling to embrace Christianity, were chiefly influenced in the Eastern empire by their attachment to Greek literature, in the Western empire by their reverence, partly political, partly religious, for Rome itself, whose greatness seemed to them to depend on the maintenance of that system, partly political,

partly religious, under which it had been acquired. Ambrose might employ his great abilities in supporting the imperial government, believing that the glory of Rome would acquire fresh lustre from the triumph of Christianity. Basil might display his eloquence in advocating the study of Greek literature by Christian youths, and shew by his own example the benefits they might receive. The senators of Rome and the literary men of Greece instinctively felt that the progress of Christianity would be fatal to that form of political greatness, and to those intellectual ideas, to which they were attached. The Greek mythology had lost its hold on their belief, but the poetry which that mythology had inspired and in which it was enshrined still retained its power over the imagination of educated men among the cities of the Eastern empire, which, however slightly Greek in origin, had become thoroughly Greek in language and in culture. Besides, the ideal of life presented in Greek literature was far more attractive to many minds than the ideal presented by the popular teaching of Christianity at that day, especially to those minds in which the intellectual were stronger than the moral impulses. Those who "still cared for grace and Hellenism," to use Synesius's expression, turned with increasing fondness from the intellectual degeneracy of their own day to the masterpieces of former times, seeking to satisfy the craving, then universally felt, for a definite religious creed, by taking from all the writers they admired the elements of a vague system, to which they gave the name of a philosophy, but which was far stronger in the poetical feelings it evoked than in the philosophical arguments by which it was supported.

Synesius's own poems are the most original of his works. Their literary merit indeed is not of the highest order. To express poetically the abstruse doctrines of the Neoplatonic philosophy would have taxed to the utmost the powers of the highest genius, and Synesius's power lay not so much in the strength of imagination as in warmth of poetical feeling. The metres are unfortunately chosen, and are not sufficiently varied to preserve them from monotony. The fatal facility of the short lines constantly led to a jingling repetition of the same cadences and the same turns of construction. Still the ten hymns which are extant would be interesting, if for no other reason as specimens of a style of lyrical poetry, the meditative poetry partly philosophical and partly religious, which was hardly ever attempted in ancient Greece, though common enough in modern times. Their chief value however, consists in the light they throw on the religious feelings and experiences of a man of deeply interesting character. Any one who wishes to know the religious aspect of Neoplatonism and the different phases of thought through which an able man of strong religious feelings could in the fifth century pass from it to Christianity, can hardly do better than study these hymns. Some idea of their general character may be gained from a description of the first hymn, written in his country home before he went on the embassy to Constantinople. The version however rough is faithful, and the greatest success which any translation of poetry can have is to suggest to the reader that the original must be so superior as to make it worth his while to turn to it.

Synesius begins with professing his intention of tuning the Doric music to nobler themes than the praises of sweetly smiling virgins and young men in the bloom of youth.

"For what are strength and beauty,
And what are gold and fame,
And what are kingly honours,
Compared with thoughts of God?
Let others drive the chariot,
Let others bend the bow,
Let others heap up riches,
And hug the joy of gold.
Be mine to lead unnoticed
A life remote from care,
Unknown indeed to others,
But not unknown to God.
* * * *
Hark to the shrill cicala
Who drinks the morning dew!
Untouched by me the lyre sounds,
A mystic voice is near!
O what divine conception
Will have its birth in me?
The self-derived Beginning,
The universal Lord,
The unbegotten Father,
Above the heavens throned,
In matchless strength rejoicing,
Remains for ever God,
The Unity of Unities
And of all monads first."

This monad in an ineffable manner has produced and keeps united the highest forms of pure existence. In thus diffusing itself it has acquired a trinal force. This ineffable fountain of existence is glorified by its offspring, who issue from and flow around it as their centre. But here the poet rebukes his lyre for proclaiming the divine mysteries to the vulgar. The things of God should be covered with sacred silence. To the intelligence of man belong only the worlds of intelligence. This intelligence, itself immortal, the offspring of divine parents, has become united to matter. Though small it is indivisibly transfused throughout the universe which it preserves and rules.

"Part rules the starry courses,
Part guides the angelic quires,
But part with heavy fetters
Was bound to human form,
And, severed from its parents,
Drank dark forgetfulness,
Because with blinded passion
It loved the loveless earth.
And, though divine, delighted
On mortal things to gaze.

Holy servants of the Spiritual Father, listen propitiously to hymns in His honour, and propitiously convey my prayers to Him."

"And yet a light remaineth
On these veiled eyes to shine,
And yet a strength existeth
To lead the fallen back,
When, joyously escaping
The troubled waves of life,
They tread the holy pathways
Which to their Father lead.
Bless'd is the man delivered
From matter's yawning gulph,
Who with light step ascending
Directs his course to God

Who after all the troubles
And bitter cares of earth,
Has trod the paths of *spirit*
To the depth illumined by God.
'Tis hard indeed to struggle
The whole heart to upraise
By those divine affections
Which are the wings to heaven.
Yet follow without ceasing
This impulse of the mind;
Thy Father will draw nigh thee,
And stretch a hand to aid.
A light will go before thee,
And shine upon thy road,
The land of Thought revealing
From which all beauty springs.
Then come, my soul, and quaffing
The fountain of all good,
With earnest supplications
Implore thy Father's aid.
Arise, my soul, delay not,
Leave earthly things to earth,
Soon mayst thou with the Father
As God in God rejoice."

The three hymns which follow are mainly amplifications of the same ideas. He had returned from Constantinople with an increased love for nature, and an increased feeling of the difficulties of life, which led him to a more profound conviction of his dependence upon God, and a more solemn view of the relation between God and created things. Wandering along the valleys and mountains of his country home, "unpolluted by the tread of men with city thoughts," he heard a universal hymn of thanksgiving to God. "Mother nature in all her varied colours, and all her varied works, with all the different voices of her children, offers up one harmonious hymn to Thee. Day and night, lightning and snow, air and water, seeds and plants, cattle and birds and fishes, all bodies and all spirits utter an eternal song of praise to Thee." And so his own thoughts found expression in solemn prayer. "Let the earth be silent when Thy hymns are sung, when prayer is offered to Thee let all things in the world keep silence, for they are Thy works, O Father. Let the sighing of the wind and the whispering of the trees, and the song of the birds, be hushed. In silence let the sky, in silence let the air, listen to my song. Let the stream already flowing gently stay its course. Let those who check all holy strains, the darkness-loving daemons, haunters of the tomb, fly from my prayer. But let those to whom belong the depths and heights of the universe, the pure and holy servants of the Spiritual Father, listen propitiously to hymns in his honour, and propitiously convey my prayers to Him."

The God to whom he thus offers the "unbloody sacrifice" of his prayers is at once One and Three —"one root, one source, a triple form." To attempt to explain the mystery of this Trinity would be the atheistic boldness of blinded men. The three persons of the Trinity, to use the Christian form of expression never employed by Synesius himself, are not as with Plotinus—Unity, Intelligence, Soul. Most frequently the Christian terms are used—Father, Spirit, Son—for the resemblance between the attributes assigned in the Neoplatonic philosophy to the soul, the third God, the ruler of the world, and the attributes assigned by Christianity to the Son apparently led Synesius to place the Son third in his system of the Trinity. The Father is also called the Unity. The Spirit is nowhere called the Intelligence,[6] but is often called the Will. The Son, who emanates from the Father through the Spirits is also called, with a curious combination of expressions, the Word, the Wisdom, and the Demiurgus. The stream of life and intelligence descends from the Father through the Son to the intellectual worlds, and from them to the visible world which is the image of the intellectual. To all in heaven and in the sky, and on the earth and beneath the earth, the Son imparts life and assigns duties. To the gods and to all mortals who have imbibed the showers of intellectual life, He gives intelligence. Though remaining eternally with the Father He issues forth to guard the worlds which He Himself has framed from evils, and to bring to all the joy of life from the source whence He Himself receives it. Nor is the Father, however mysterious in His nature, so "hidden in His glory" as to be inaccessible to sympathy for His children. In the efficacy of prayer and in the reality of spiritual communion with God Synesius firmly believed. "Give, O Lord, to be with me as my companion the holy angel of holy strength, the angel of divinely-inspired prayer. May he be with me as my friend, the giver of good gifts, the keeper of my life, the keeper of my soul, the guardian of my prayers, the guardian of my actions. May he preserve my body pure from disease, may he preserve my spirit pure from pollution, may he bring to my soul oblivion of all passions." And again in the beautiful prayer of the soul for reunion with God—"Have pity, Lord, upon Thy daughter. I left thee to become a servant upon earth, but instead of a servant I have become a slave. Matter has bound me in its magic spells. Yet still the clouded eye retains some little strength, its power is not altogether quenched. But the deep flood has poured over me and dimmed the God-discerning vision. Have pity, Father, on Thy suppliant child, who, often striving to ascend the upward paths of thought, falls back choked with desires, the offspring of seductive matter. Kindle for me, O Lord, the lights which lead the soul on high."

Synesius has nowhere expressly stated that he regarded matter not as created by God but as existing independently and necessarily evil, but this idea is most consistent with the language he generally employs. God is nowhere said to have created the world, but the Son is said to have framed the visible world as the form and image of the invisible. At all events the corruption of the soul in each individual is attributed to the seductive influence of matter, a view which he has expressed at some length in his very curious treatise on Dreams. The soul, he says, descends from heaven in obedience to a law of Providence to perform its appointed service in the world. It then receives, as a loan, the imagination, which is figuratively called the boat or chariot by which the soul travels on its earthward voyage. In other words it is the connecting link between mind and matter. It is something intermediate between the corporeal and incorporeal, and philosophy therefore has

[6] This is the more remarkable as the words intelligence and intellectual are constantly used where we should naturally say spirit and spiritual. The Intelligence is sometimes used as a name for the Father.

great difficulty in determining its real nature. It is through this imagination that we realise to ourselves not only the sensations of the body but also the conceptions of the mind. It is the duty of the soul to purify and elevate the imagination. It is the constant aim of matter, or rather of the daemon of matter, to corrupt and degrade it. Of the way in which this is done Synesius gives a curious semi-physical explanation. The proper habitation of the imagination, or, as he more generally calls it, the imaginative spirit, is the brain cells. Now, in proportion as this spirit is purified it becomes more and more aetherialised, and so expands as to occupy fully its appointed place. But when it is corrupted it thickens and contracts so that it can no longer fill the hollows of the brain. Then, as nature abhors a vacuum, this empty space, intended to be filled by spirit and no longer filled by a good spirit, is naturally occupied by an evil spirit, which thus mingles with and still further corrupts the good spirit. The great danger to men is that the soul will be induced by the pleasures of earth to forget its divine origin, and become a willing slave to the influence of matter. To save us from this evil Providence sends us sorrows, for the soul would never be diverted from earth if on earth it met with no misfortunes. What are called undeserved calamities are really designed by God to loosen the chain which binds us to earth. What are celebrated as wonderful pieces of good fortune are really snares which the earth daemons set to entrap the soul. If the soul is ensnared by them it is difficult indeed, but not impossible with God's aid, to break off this degrading slavery. The difficulties of doing so have been fully symbolised in the sacred records by the so-called labours of Hercules.

The action of Providence in the government of the world is described by Synesius in the treatise written at Constantinople which has been already mentioned. All existence, he says, proceeds from God and has been assigned by Him to an infinite variety of beings, descending in regular gradations from God Himself, who is pure existence, to matter, which, being in a state of constant flux, does not, properly speaking, admit of existence at all. The beings of the highest order are called Gods, and they are divided into two classes, to the first of which the upper parts of the universe, to the other this earth is entrusted. These Gods find their chief happiness in the contemplation of the God who is above them, but to preserve the earth from the evils which would soon result from the destructive activity of the earth-daemons it is necessary for them to interpose from time to time. This they do gladly, because by doing so they render their appointed service to the supreme Deity. Still, as from their very nature their chief blessedness consists in the contemplation of the divine nature, we have no right to expect that they will continually give this up to interfere in our behalf. Now the good man is exposed to especial trials and temptations. The daemons, who spring from the earth and consider that the earth is theirs, are naturally irritated by the existence upon earth of any one whose character is diametrically opposite to their own. At first they endeavour to win him over, trying to seduce him by stimulating his passions. For they have the power of assailing men through the irrational part of their nature. Indeed the human soul, exposed to their attacks, is like a fortress, part of whose garrison is in secret league with the enemy. But if the divine element in the man prove too strong for them they devote all their energies to crushing or killing him, mortified at their defeats and afraid lest others should be emboldened to resist them by this example. This fact, in part at least, accounts for the calamities which often befall good men. When we are assaulted by temporal misfortunes, instead of looking to the Gods to deliver us from them we must use the means which the Gods have entrusted to us for that purpose. There is no opposition between prudence and piety. Providence deals with us as a mother with a grown-up son, giving us arms and bidding us use them ourselves in our own defence. If after that we give way weakly, we may expect the Gods will be slow to come to our assistance. There is no real opposition between this theory and the views Synesius has elsewhere expressed on the efficacy of prayer. He held that between the intelligence, the divine element in man, and God there might be ready and frequent intercourse, so that intellectual, or as we should say spiritual blessings are continually imparted by the Father to His children. But as regards merely earthly trouble and difficulties the Gods did what the best and wisest of men did, and abstained from meddling with them unnecessarily —a theory likely enough to commend itself to the judgment of men living in the decline of the Roman empire.

As regards a future state, Synesius says philosophy teaches us that it is the result of the present life. With death the husk of matter, which we call the body, perishes, but the soul and the imagination still remain, and there also remain, Synesius is inclined to think, certain particles of the primary elements of fire and air which the soul attracted to itself in the course of its original descent to earth. After death the soul, which has been corrupted through the corrupted imagination, sinks down towards the region of darkness. The purified soul, with the imagination it has purified, rises up towards the region of light. Between the extremes of light and darkness there exists an infinite variety of abodes fitted for the different souls according to their respective degrees of purity and corruption. The purified soul ascends by progressive stages to the region of light which is above the visible universe, but it seems to have been Synesius's belief, though he states it in obscure and hesitating language, that the soul was there separated from the imagination, and ultimately reabsorbed into the Divinity from which it had originally issued. The corrupted soul suffers in and through the imagination, but it may rise again purified by suffering and time through other forms of life.

Synesius has explained at some length his views on the nature of future punishment in a letter written from Alexandria at a time when he was most under the influence of the Neoplatonic philosophy. The style is studied, the ideas often paradoxical. It was obviously written rather to be read by his philosophical friends than with any hope of influencing the person to whom it was addressed. It may therefore be regarded as expressing, perhaps in somewhat exaggerated terms, the ideas generally held on that subject by the circle over which Hypatia

presided. A citizen of Cyrene, named John, was accused by popular rumour of having employed one of his attendants to murder another citizen, named Aemilius. Synesius writes to John, urging him to insist upon a judicial enquiry. Sooner than nothing should be done he would, were he at Cyrene, as a proof of the greatness of his friendship, bring John to trial himself. As it is, John should, if necessary, beseech and implore the judge to have his servant examined by torture. In the opinion of Synesius, as of most Romans, the examination by torture was the surest means of discovering the truth. "The torturers are exceedingly clever in detecting imposture. They have certain flesh-hooks which extract the truth as accurately as scientific syllogisms. Whatever they bring to light is certainly correct." If after this examination John is acquitted all is well, but if on the other hand John is conscious of guilt, he ought for his own sake to deliver himself up to justice without waiting to be accused. If he is guilty it is most desirable for him that he should suffer for his crime while still alive on earth. It is much better to be tortured by men than by daemons. For the daemons are appointed to cleanse the souls by punishments as fullers clean dirty cloths by carding them. In some cloths the stains are so deeply fixed that the cloth would be destroyed before they could be got out. But the soul is immortal, and therefore if its stains are of too long standing and too inveterate to be got out the soul endures immortal sufferings. When then a crime is committed, we should hasten at once to remove its stain by the infliction of punishment. Besides, it is highly probable that those who have been wronged have the power in the future state of increasing or diminishing the punishments inflicted on the wrongdoer. Will they not be most inclined to pity if they see we have already owned our guilt and voluntarily submitted to punishment? Will they not be still more incensed against us if they see us feasting on the produce of our crimes? "What will be your feelings when you quit the body, when you have no tongue to deny your guilt, but the mark of your crime is branded on you? Shall you not turn dizzy, bewildered with fear? You will be dragged away in silence and exposed to public view before the judgment seat. Play the man then now, let the pleasures be despised for which crimes are committed, let immediate punishment appease the avengers below. The man who remains long unpunished in his wickedness ought to be considered most unfortunate, as one for whom neither God nor man cares."

In considering Synesius's philosophical and theological views, it should always be remembered that he repeatedly protests against giving publicity to those abstruser doctrines which are above the comprehension of men who have not been thoroughly trained in philosophical studies. "It is, I think, an ancient and thoroughly Platonic custom to conceal the great truths of philosophy under the form of some less important subject, so that what has been discovered with difficulty, may neither be lost to mankind nor be defiled by being exposed to the profane vulgar." "Philosophy is one of the most ineffable of all ineffable subjects." He reproves his friend Herculian for talking on such subjects with unphilosophical persons, and will not even discuss them in letters lest the letters should fall into the hands of people for whom they were not intended. Proteus is the emblem of the true philosopher eluding vulgar curiosity by concealing what is divine under earthly forms, and only revealing it to the persistent efforts of heroic men. This desire for secrecy did not arise from any fear of making public profession of opinions contrary to Christianity, but from the fear lest the highest truths should be corrupted and degraded by those who were unfit to receive them, a feeling by no means unknown in the Christian church at that time.[h] Lysis, the Pythagorean, is quoted by Synesius with great approbation, as saying that "the publicity given to philosophy has caused many men to look with contempt upon the Gods." Doubtless enough has been plainly stated to enable us to form a sufficiently accurate idea of Synesius's philosophical and religious views, but there are subjects—such as the nature of the Trinity, the connexion between the old mythology and philosophy, the reabsorption of the soul, and indeed of all intelligence and existence, into the Divinity, the nature and origin of matter, the nature and work of the imagination, the scientific arrangement and nomenclature of the virtues—on which we have not the last word of Hypatia's teaching.

Another of these mysterious subjects is the subject of divination, which is discussed in a treatise on dreams, from the preface to which the passage quoted above is taken. Amid the increasing difficulties and disasters of the age, and the rapid growth of superstition, the belief in divination, under some form or other, had become almost universal. Even Theodosius, before commencing an important war, despatched an embassy to consult a Christian hermit, just as some centuries before a Spartan king would have sent to consult the oracle of Delphi.

Divination, Synesius says, is possible because the whole world forms as it were one living being. All the different members of this great body are mutually connected so that the action of one influences the action of the others, and wise men will see in each thing indications of other things. This may perhaps explain the success obtained by the incantations of magicians; there may be particular stones and plants, so connected by nature with particular Gods, that they naturally have the power of attracting them, and causing them to appear. This, however, only refers to the Gods of this world; the Gods beyond this world are not affected by incantations. The divination by dreams is superior to any other form of divination, because it can be practised by all persons, of all classes, of all ages, at all times, and in all places. It requires no outlay of money for costly preparations, such as herbs from Crete, birds from Egypt, bones from Iberia, which are needed in other cases. It does not expose us to the penalties of that malicious policy which has lately crowded the prisons. Above all it is more reverential to God, as thankfully accepting what

[h] So Theodoret (quoted by Bingham, vol. i. p. 35) says: "We speak of the divine mysteries in obscure language because of the uninitiated (the unbaptized), but when they are gone we instruct the initiated (baptized) plainly."

He is pleased to impart, and not using means to compel Him to appear. The surest way of obtaining such dreams as convey a revelation from God is to lead a virtuous life, temperate and frugal, following the precepts of philosophy, and keeping down all disturbing passions. As the perception still works in sleep, though the bodily organs are in repose, this would seem to be the most divine form of perception. So it is no wonder if men have discovered treasures from dreams, or if, as has happened in our own times, an uneducated man has become a skilful poet by holding intercourse with the Muses in his dreams. Besides, according to his own account, Synesius had himself been greatly indebted to dreams throughout his life. Dreams had taught him to invent the best snares for catching animals. Dreams had often encouraged him to renew his hunting with success, when he was inclined to abandon it in despair. Dreams had preserved his life at Constantinople from the plots of hostile magicians. Above all, dreams had aided him in his literary work, suggesting new ideas and arguments, and rendering his style more natural by removing whatever was turgid and affected. So Synesius advises all who have the requisite leisure and literary culture to make a practice of writing an account of their dreams. "In this way their knowledge of themselves will be perfected, as they will have a record both of their sleeping and of their waking life. Indeed dreams are really the best indication of character, because in sleep the imagination is not influenced by external objects. Besides, this plan is also valuable as affording an excellent discipline for our powers of composition, owing to the difficulty which must necessarily be experienced in describing the strange and apparently inconsistent events which occur to us in our dreams. Dreams will give us far better subjects than the ridiculous themes on which the sophists dispute, often with such misplaced zeal, in the theatres." It is of course impossible to say how far the character of men's dreams would be affected, especially in Eastern countries, by their belief that they might receive important communications from God in sleep, but when a man like Synesius, of great ability and earnestness, after all his experiences of literary and poetical life, could turn to dreams as the source of inspiration, both for literature and religion, it was plain that he was beginning to feel the need of some new influence which could stimulate the higher powers of his mind to fresh activity, and direct them to nobler objects. Such an influence in the 5th century resided only in the Christian church.

What means Synesius had of becoming acquainted with Christianity in his early years it is impossible to say. No one living in any part of the Eastern empire at the close of the 4th century could fail to be brought into frequent contact with Christians. But throughout his works, written before he became a Christian himself, the same phenomenon appears which is so striking in Claudian's poems—the existence of Christianity is entirely ignored. In his speech addressed to Arcadius, though the greatest prominence is given to the religious idea of duty, there is no allusion to the principles of Christianity, even where such a reference would have given force to his arguments. The orator appears unconscious that he is addressing a Christian emperor. The Deity to whom he appeals is the God of the Theist, "whose nature no man has ever yet found a name to represent." Still more striking is a passage in one of the hymns written immediately after his return from Constantinople: "To all Thy temples, Lord, built for Thy holy rites I went, and falling headlong as a suppliant bathed with my tears the pavement. That my journey might not be in vain, I prayed to all the gods Thy ministers, who rule the fertile plain of Thrace, and those who on the opposite continent protect the lands of Chalcedon, whom Thou hast crowned with angelic rays, Thy holy servants. They, the blessed ones, helped me in my prayers; they helped me to bear the burden of many troubles." Of course the temples of which he speaks were Christian churches. No pagan temples had been erected in Constantinople, and even in the other cities they had been closed some years by an edict of Theodosius. At the same time it is perfectly certain that Synesius was not then a Christian himself. This picture of a pagan philosopher praying in a Christian church to the saints and angels of Christianity, while investing them with the attributes of the daemons of Neoplatonism, is no bad illustration of the almost unconscious manner in which the pagan world in becoming Christian was then paganising Christianity. As thoroughly eclectic in religion as in philosophy, Synesius took from Christianity whatever harmonised with the rest of his creed, often varying the meaning of the tenets he borrowed to bring them into accordance with his philosophical ideas.

Some of the points of difference between his views and the opinions then generally prevalent among Christians are well stated in a treatise written by him at Alexandria, about the year 404, to defend his conduct against various criticisms. He says he has been accused of sinning against philosophy, both by people in white and people in black dresses, that is to say, both by pagan philosophers and Christian monks. The treatise is chiefly a reply to the latter, but they are never spoken of as Christians, believers in a particular religion, but as professors of a particular form of philosophy. This mode of speaking indeed would not seem so absurd in Alexandria then as it does to us now. The name of philosopher was so generally given to those who aimed at the highest rule of life, and turned their thoughts to the contemplation of God, that it was given even to the Christian monks and hermits, whose life and teaching were in the strongest possible opposition to all that had as yet been known as Greek philosophy. Thus Sozomen speaks of the monks who practised the greatest austerities at Nitria as being those who had reached the highest point of philosophy. The hermit and the philosopher, Synesius felt, aimed at the same object, the contemplation of God. Both, in order to attain that end, sought to withdraw themselves from the cares of active life. Both recognised the necessity of steadily controlling the bodily appetites. Both believed that the way to God lay through the practice of virtue. Yet with all these points of resemblance the separation between them was wide and strongly marked. The hermit sought

to rise to a superhuman state of holiness by crushing the natural affections of humanity. Synesius believed that the truest progress towards the Divinity is made by giving free play to all the affections which are not positively sinful. To the hermit, pleasure was a temptation of the devil to destroy the soul; to Synesius, pleasure was a gift from God to the soul to reconcile it to the life on earth. "God has given pleasure to the soul to be as it were a fastening by which it may preserve its connexion with the body."[i] The hermit looked on indulgence in pleasure as sinful. Synesius says: "I should be glad indeed if our natures allowed us to be always occupied with the contemplation of God, but as this is impossible I wish to enjoy some mirth, and, as it were, to anoint my life with cheerfulness. For I know I am a man, not a God that I should be free from all inclination to pleasure, nor a brute that I should find my delight in bodily pleasures." Again, the hermits considered that the study of general literature was dangerous to the soul. Synesius believed that men ought to be trained through the lower branches of knowledge to the higher.[k] Poetry, rhetoric, astronomy, all helped to enable men to rise through philosophy to the knowledge of God. Philosophy, he says, is to the other arts and sciences what Apollo is to the Muses, their companion and their guide. "I consider that a philosopher should be free not only from other defects, but also from that of rusticity; he should be initiated into the mysteries of the Graces, and should be a thorough Greek, that is to say, he should be able to mix freely with other men, by being acquainted with all literary works of importance." Above all, Synesius reproaches the hermits with considering as the end and object of life what were only the means towards the attainment of that end. For instance, he reproves them for valuing celibacy as a thing good in itself, instead of judging it according to its effect upon the character in individual cases. Besides, Synesius maintains that the highest object of man is not to lead a virtuous life, but a life of active intellectual effort. This intellectual life cannot indeed be separated from the pursuit of virtue, because it is virtue which purifies the mind so that it can rise above the earth to the contemplation of God. The virtues are, therefore, the first elements of philosophy; but the philosopher must not be content with them, as it is only through the intellect that God who is pure intellect can be apprehended. "I believe we are not permitted to think that God dwells in any other part of us than the intellect." Though there is much that is true as well as striking in this contrast, it is unfair to the Christians because it does not sufficiently recognise the fundamental distinction between the two creeds. Sin, and consequent separation from God, according to the one was the result of a depraved will; according to the other, of a darkened intellect. Hence the Christians naturally turned their chief attention to subduing the corrupt affections of the mind and body, the Neoplatonists to the cultivation of their intellectual powers. Still, the treatise is valuable as shewing the difference of ideas which separated literary men, deeply imbued with the tastes and ideas of ancient Greece, from what was generally considered in that day the highest form of Christianity. It is interesting as a last protest in behalf of the old Greek feeling of the natural grace and beauty of life, when that idea was on the point of being almost entirely lost for many centuries through the triumph of barbarism in the state, and asceticism in religion.

This treatise and the treatise on Dreams, which was written about the same time, were sent to Hypatia for approval, and were doubtless considered by her as a satisfactory profession of faith. How his opinions were so far altered in the next four years that he became a Christian, we have, unhappily, but scanty means of knowing. In none of his letters is there the slightest trace of any mental struggle. This of itself shews that the change was effected gradually, probably almost imperceptibly even to himself. He had never been really hostile to Christianity, and now as the world gradually became more Christian he became more Christian too. Almost without a struggle the old pagan society had yielded, and was still yielding, to the tide which each year set more strongly in the direction of Christianity. Almost without a struggle Synesius each year yielded more and more to the movement around him; for with all the vigour he displayed, in great emergencies he was not a man to stand long alone, or to fight to the end a battle that was already lost. Some personal influences had also been brought to bear on him. He had known and highly respected Chrysostom at Constantinople. He had afterwards come into contact with Theophilus the patriarch of Alexandria, and that able and ambitious prelate was not likely to neglect any opportunity of winning over to the Christian church one whose reputation for ability and learning stood so high. His wife, to whom he was warmly attached, and whom he married at Alexandria in the year 403, was a Christian, and in her he may have had an opportunity of remarking one of the noblest features of Christianity, the elevation which it imparted to the female character by the prominence given to the feminine virtues in the character of Christ, and therefore in the teaching of the church. But above all, when he returned to Pentapolis, in the year 404, to find his country desolated by the horrors of barbarian invasions, he must have felt how little the highest form of Neoplatonism could do to meet the wants of such a troubled age. The philosophical and poetical creed was the religion of a prosperous man in peaceful times. When the burden of suffering and danger was laid upon it, its support failed precisely where it was most needed. To enjoy that intellectual communion with God for which he craved with his whole heart, and on the possibility of which his whole system of belief depended, he needed above all things an untroubled mind. It was one of the points which had marked most strongly his separation from Christianity, that in his hymns

[i] Curiously enough this expression is borrowed from a passage in which Iamblichus speaks of pleasure as the greatest of all evils. Iamblichus, however, is speaking of bodily, Synesius of intellectual pleasures.

[k] At the same time he owns some few men have been endowed with such strength of mind as to be able to dispense with a literary training, and he instances Ammon, Zoroaster, Hermes, and Antony.

he had always prayed at least as earnestly for freedom from anxieties as for freedom from sin. A century earlier he would probably have continued in his country home, reading, writing, and hunting, "enjoying life as a festival" to the end, and dying in the full conviction that his soul was about to rise to those regions of light on which he had so often gazed with reverence and love. But now this was impossible. He had formed an ideal of life which could not be maintained, and with it necessarily fell the beliefs with which it was necessarily connected. The old creed told him that "the woe of earth weighs down the wings of the soul so that it cannot rise to heaven." The new religion taught him that cares and sorrows rightly borne, so far from hiding the divine light, reveal it in increased brightness. In former days, when he shrank into private life from "the polluting influence of business and the vicissitudes of fortune," he had probably considered the doctrine of the Incarnation as the greatest obstacle to his becoming a Christian, because it seemed to degrade the Deity by connecting it with the contamination of matter. Now, when he had left his seclusion to battle and suffer with his fellow-citizens, no doctrine of Christianity had such attraction for him as the doctrine of the incarnation, because it told of a God who had resigned His glory to share the sufferings of His creatures, and to be the Saviour of mankind. Formerly he had sought to purify his mind that it might ascend in thought to God; now he caught at the doctrine of the Holy Spirit descending into men's hearts to make them the temples of God. So the first hymn which marks the transition to Christianity begins with an invocation to Christ as the son of the Holy Virgin, and ends with a prayer to Christ and to the Father to send down upon him the Holy Spirit "to refresh the wings of the soul, and to perfect the divine gifts." But though his prayers were now addressed to Christ, it is obvious that he had rather added certain Christian tenets to his old creed than adopted a new religion. The attributes of Christ are described in almost exactly the same terms as the attributes of the Son had been described in former hymns.

The prayers for himself are almost identical. It is also curious to find that he still considered the Spirit the second person of the Trinity; to use his own illustration, "the Father is the root, the Son the branch, the Spirit intermediate between root and branch." Still, the decisive step had been taken by acknowledging Christ as the Saviour of mankind; after that the subsequent steps were natural and almost inevitable. He was baptized, probably about five years after his marriage. How far he then felt it necessary to give up the language and ideas of his old creed may be imagined from the following hymn, addressed to Christ: "Thou camest down to earth and didst sojourn among men, and drive the deceiver, the serpent-fiend, from Thy Father's garden. Thou wentest down to Tartarus, where death held the countless races of mankind. The old man Hades feared thee, the devouring dog (Cerberus) fled from the portal; but, having released the souls of the righteous from suffering, Thou didst offer, with a holy worship, hymns of thanksgiving to the Father. As Thou wentest up on high the daemons, powers of the air, were affrighted. But Aether, wise parent of harmony, sang with joy to his seven-toned lyre[1] a hymn of triumph. The morning star, day's harbinger, and the golden star of evening, the planet Venus, smiled on Thee. Before Thee went the horned moon, decked with fresh light, leading the gods of night. Beneath Thy feet Titan spread his flowing locks of light. He recognised the Son of God, the creative intelligence, the source of his own flames. But Thou didst fly on outstretched wings beyond the vaulted sky, alighting on the spheres of pure intelligence, where is the fountain of goodness, the heaven enveloped in silence. There time, deep-flowing and unwearied time, is not; there disease, the reckless and prolific offspring of matter, is not. But eternity, ever young and ever old, rules the abiding habitation of the gods."

While the old and new were thus strangely blended together in his creed, an unexpected event happened which changed the whole current of his life. In defiance of the law, which enacted that no one should hold the governorship of the province of which he was a native, Andronicus had been appointed governor of Pentapolis. He was a native of Berenice, a man of low origin, and had gained the office, Synesius says, by bribery. Against his appointment Synesius vigorously protested, in a letter to an influential friend at Constantinople: "Send us legitimate governors; men whom we do not know, and who do not know us; men who will not be biassed in their judgments by their private feelings. A governor is on his way to us who lately took a hostile part in politics here, and who will pursue his political differences on the judgment seat. From this many other evils spring—private entertainments become the subject of calumny, false accusers are suborned, the ruin of a citizen is given as a present to a woman. I have seen a man thrown into prison because he would not accuse the excellent governor, who lately resigned, of embezzling the public funds. Or rather I did not see him, no one was allowed to visit him, and he was only permitted to see the sun again on condition of accusing Gennadius."

When the ancient Romans were threatened with oppressive rulers, they chose the bravest of their fellow citizens as tribunes to protect them. In the fifth century of the Christian era, under similar circumstances, the people of Ptolemais elected Synesius a bishop. He was known to them as a man of high character and great abilities, universally liked and respected, but probably still more recommended to them by the vigour he had displayed in the recent siege. No one who has attentively studied his life and writings can doubt that he was sincere in his wish to decline the proffered honour. A frank statement of his feelings was made in a letter written to his brother Evoptius, then resident at Alexandria, and intended to be shewn to Theophilus: "I should be devoid of feeling if I were not deeply grateful to the people of Ptolemais who have thought me worthy of higher honours than I do myself. But what I must consider is not the greatness of the favour conferred, but the

[1] This expression refers to the seven starry spheres which Aether, or rather the Intelligence of Aether, guides in harmony.

possibility of my accepting it. That a mere man should receive almost divine honours is indeed most pleasing, if he is worthy of them, but if he is far from being so, his acceptance of them gives but a poor hope for the future. This is no new fear, but one I have long felt, the fear lest I should gain honour among men by sinning against God. From my knowledge of myself I feel I am in every respect unworthy of the solemnity of the episcopal office.[m] . . . I now divide my time between amusements and study. When I am engaged in study, especially religious studies, I keep entirely to myself, in my amusements I am thoroughly sociable. But the bishop must be godly, and therefore like God have nothing to do with amusements, and a thousand eyes watch to see that he observes this duty. In religious matters, on the other hand, he cannot seclude himself, but must be thoroughly sociable, as he is both a teacher and preacher of the law. Single-handed, he has to do the work of everybody, or bear the blame of everybody. Surely then it needs a man of the strongest character to support such a burden of cares without allowing the mind to be overwhelmed, or the divine particle in the soul to be quenched, when he is distracted by such an infinite variety of employments." Again, there was the difficulty of his marriage. "God and the law, and the sacred hand of Theophilus, gave me my wife. I therefore declare openly to all and testify that I will not separate entirely from her, or visit her secretly like an adulterer. The one course would be contrary to piety, the other to law. I shall wish and pray to have a large number of virtuous children." Still more important in his opinion was the question of religious belief. "You know that philosophy is opposed to the opinions of the vulgar. I certainly shall not admit that the soul is posterior in existence to the body. I cannot assert that the world and all its parts will perish together. The resurrection which is so much talked about I consider something sacred and ineffable, and I am far from sharing the ideas of the multitude on the subject." He would indeed be content to keep silence in public on these abstruser points of theology, neither pretending to believe as the multitude, nor seeking to convince them of their errors, "for what has the multitude to do with philosophy? the truth of divine mysteries is not a thing to be talked about. But if I am called to the episcopacy I do not think it right to pretend to hold opinions which I do not hold. I call God and man as witnesses to this. Truth is the property of God,[n] before whom I wish to be entirely blameless. Though I am fond of amusements — for from my childhood I have been accused of being mad after arms and horses—still I will consent to give them up—though I shall regret to see my darling dogs no longer allowed to hunt, and my bows moth-eaten! Still I will submit to this if it is God's will. And though I hate all cares and troubles I will endure these petty matters of business, as rendering my appointed service to God, grievous as it will be. But I will have no deceit about dogmas, nor shall there be variance between my thoughts and my tongue. . . . . It shall never be said of me that I got myself consecrated without my opinions being known. But let Father Theophilus, dearly beloved by God, decide for me with full knowledge of the circumstances of the case, and let him tell me his opinion clearly. Then he will either leave me in private life to philosophise quietly by myself, or else he will have no opening left for afterwards judging me, and removing me from the episcopal body."

For seven months at least the matter remained undecided. Synesius went to Alexandria to consult Theophilus, and popular feeling ran so high throughout the country that he felt if he declined the bishopric he could never return to his native land. The people also sent two envoys to Theophilus urging him to use all his influence to overcome Synesius's scruples. This Theophilus was sure to do, for, apart from the regard he may well have had for Synesius, it must have been a welcome triumph for him over his opponents at Alexandria that the most distinguished pupil of the Alexandrine school should be consecrated by him a Christian bishop, a visible sign to the people that even the noblest form of paganism was found insufficient by its noblest disciples. The religious difficulties were just those which might be expected in a pupil of the Alexandrine school, whether he derived his inspiration from Origen or from Hypatia. How far, and in what way, Theophilus, already so well known as a vigorous opponent of such views, succeeded in inducing Synesius to change them we have unfortunately no means of knowing. After all, these views were rather in opposition to the commonly received opinions among Christians than to any dogmatical teaching of the church. Even as regards the doctrine of the resurrection, Synesius would probably have had no difficulty in accepting the Greek form of the creed, the resurrection of the dead, though he could hardly have accepted the Latin form, the resurrection of the body, or the resurrection of the flesh. His amusements and his hunting seem to have been given up entirely. It has been hastily assumed that he retained his wife, but there is no evidence whatever to shew that he did so. His own letter is of itself a sufficient proof that a bishop was generally expected to separate from his wife, or, in the language of the day, to live with her as a sister, though it may be true, as Socrates asserts, that exceptions to the rule might easily have been found in the Eastern Empire. The bishop, especially if occupying an important post, felt that by retaining his wife he lost caste among his people, and Synesius, in giving up so much in the hope of benefiting the people of Ptolemais, was hardly likely to pursue a course which must fatally damage his influence, even if his wife would have consented to a mode of life which must inevitably lower both herself and her husband in public estimation. Besides, Synesius never mentions his wife in any subsequent letter,[o]

[m] ἱερεύς and the kindred terms are applied by Synesius after he became a Christian only to bishops; the term presbyter is always used of the second order of the Christian ministry. Before his conversion he uses ἱερεύς apparently of heathen priests, and on one occasion certainly of Christian presbyters. There are, however, one or two instances in which ἱερεύς may be intended to include presbyters as well as bishops.

[n] In another place he says, "To be almost or altogether truthful, is to be almost or altogether divine." And again, "Truth is the nobility of language."

[o] It must be remembered, however, that Synesius only very rarely and very briefly alludes to his wife in former

and in one written only one year afterwards he speaks of his desolation in terms which make it almost incredible that his wife was still living with him then. It is certain that no child was born to him after he was elected bishop.[P]

Yielding at last to the importunities and arguments of his friends, Synesius, in the year 410, wrote to the presbyters of the diocese of Ptolemais—"Since God has laid upon me not what I sought but what He willed, I pray that He who has assigned me this life will guide me through the life He has assigned me. How shall I who have spent my youth in philosophical leisure and contemplation, I who have only meddled with the cares of life so far as was necessary for me to discharge my duties as a private person and as a citizen, how shall I be able to bear the continued pressure of anxiety, how shall I, while devoting myself to a multitude of affairs, still turn my thoughts to those intellectual beauties, which are only enjoyed in happy leisure, without which life is no life to me and to such as I am? I know not. But to God, they say, all things are possible, even the impossible. Do you then lift up your hands in prayer for me to God, and exhort the people in the city, and those who frequent the churches, in the villages and the country, to pray both in public and private for me. If I am not abandoned by God, I shall realise that the episcopacy is not a descent from philosophy, but an ascent to a higher form of it."

Synesius soon found that his fears had been more prophetic than his friends' hopes. When he returned, Ptolemais presented the appearance of a city taken by storm. Nothing was to be heard in the public places but the groans of men, the screams of women, and the cries of boys. New instruments of punishment had been introduced by Andronicus, racks and thumbscrews and machines for torturing the feet, the ears, the lips, the nose. One man was imprisoned and tortured because he favoured a marriage of which the governor disapproved. Another man was kept in prison for not paying his taxes, while the governor prevented him from selling his land to raise the money. Double tribute was exacted, and the duty of levying the taxes was entrusted to men whom Synesius describes as more pitiless than the daemons themselves. One story which he tells shews a certain grim humour, as well as a remarkable audacity. Thoas, a satellite of Andronicus, arrived suddenly from Constantinople, the bearer, as he asserted, of a most important state secret. The prefect Anthemius was dangerously ill, and had been warned in a dream that he would never recover unless Maximus and Clinias, two rich citizens of Ptolemais, were put to death. Thoas, so he said, had been hastily summoned to the palace, and despatched with all secrecy to apprehend these culprits, guilty of having lives which were inseparably connected with the great man's sickness. Of course, no tidings had reached them of their danger, they were apprehended, and immediately tortured for the benefit of their ruler's health.

At first Synesius remonstrated, his remonstrances were treated with contempt. He reproved, his reproofs made the governor more furious. His house was beset with crowds demanding his sympathy and protection. He could not move without seeing and hearing the sufferings of his people. To add to his grief "the dearest of his children died." With a heart wrung with anguish he turned for consolation to God. "But what was the greatest of my calamities, and what made life itself hopeless to me, I who had hitherto always been successful in prayer, now for the first time found that I prayed in vain." He had accepted the office of a bishop in times of difficulty without being sufficiently in sympathy with the prevailing spirit of the Christian church, and the consciousness of this increased his natural self-distrust. The calm serenity of thought, with which in happier years he had held communion with God, was gone. As he prayed, the calamities of his house and country rose up before him as a sign that he had, by his unworthiness, profaned the mysteries of God. The soul distracted by conflicting feelings, grief and anger, shame and fear, could not rise above the earth. He prayed, and God was afar off. At first it seemed that he would sink in despair under these accumulated sorrows; there were even thoughts of suicide. He was roused by fresh tidings of Andronicus's excesses. Ever ready to assist others in their misfortunes, however great his own might be, he heard the people murmuring that they were forsaken by their bishop. Self-distrust gave way to indignation. Once roused he acted with vigour and judgment. He wrote to influential friends at Constantinople, detailing the cruelties of Andronicus, and earnestly pleading for his recall. Then, without waiting the result of his appeal to the authorities of the state, he proceeded to pronounce against the offender the judgment of the church by a formal act of excommunication.

The people were assembled in the church of Ptolemais. Synesius began by reminding them that earthly misfortunes are inflicted upon nations by God as a chastisement for their sins, and that for this purpose God makes use of evil men or daemons as instruments of His wrath, who are yet for their wickedness themselves objects of His wrath and deserving of punishment. Such a minister of vengeance was Andronicus. Then he reminded them how long and how earnestly he had himself shrunk from the episcopal office. He repeated his conviction, that he was quite unequal to the burden which they had sought to impose upon him. He implored them, if they still wished for a bishop to help them in their secular affairs, either to elect some one in his place, or to appoint him a coadjutor. When the cries of the people shewed that they refused his proposals, and desired no bishop but him, he proceeded to read the sentence of excommunication drawn up by himself and the council of presbyters, and addressed to the bishops of the Christian church throughout the world. It is noticeable that in this document he dwells chiefly on Andronicus's crimes against the church, which he had not mentioned at all in his letter to Constantinople, as if he was anxious to avoid all appearance on

letters. In letters to his friends he never once mentions their wives, except in the case of his brother Evoptius and his cousin Diogenes, and then in the list of salutations the wife is placed after the son, a curious illustration of the secluded, and comparatively unimportant, position then occupied by women.

[P] Three had been born in the five previous years.

the one hand of soliciting the interference of the state in matters more directly concerning the church, and on the other of passing an ecclesiastical sentence for offences more directly against the government of the state. In defiance of the law Andronicus had affixed a notice to the doors of every church, that fugitives from his exactions would not be allowed to avail themselves of the asylum of the altar. The priests who received them were threatened with punishments "such as even Phalaris of Agrigentum, even Cephren the Egyptian, even Sennacherib the Babylonian, would have shrunk from threatening." What was still worse, he had seized a man of wealth and high character, on a frivolous pretext, and condemned him to be tortured, as usual, in public, but at the hottest time of the day, so that none of the citizens might be there to cheer him with their sympathy; "directly I heard of it I ran out just as I was, I sat with the sufferer, I helped him to endure his sufferings. Andronicus was infuriated at the tidings that a bishop dared to pity a man whom he hated. After many lawless insults to which he was incited by Thoas, the most audacious of his satellites, whom he has used as his instrument in oppressing the people, he reached the limits of his madness by exclaiming that it was in vain for any one to hope for the succour of the church; no one should escape his hands, even by clinging to the feet of Christ. After this he is no longer a man to be reasoned with, but like an incurable limb must be cut off lest the sound part of the body should be corrupted by contagion. Therefore the church of Ptolemais communicates this decree to her sisters throughout the world.

"Let no temple of God be open to Andronicus and his family, to Thoas and his family. Let every sacred building and precinct be closed against them. The devil has no part in paradise; if he enters by stealth he must be driven out. I therefore exhort all men, whether private individuals or rulers, neither to dwell under the same roof, nor to sit at the same table with them; especially I exhort the bishops neither to speak to them while living nor bury them when dead. But if any one despises our church as the church of a small city, and receives those whom she casts out on the ground that it is not necessary to obey such a poor church, let him know that he has divided the church which Christ wishes to be one. Such a person, whether a levite, a presbyter, or a bishop, will be treated by us like Andronicus. We will neither take him by the hand, nor eat at the same table with him; far shall it be from us to share the ineffable mystery with those who take part with Andronicus and Thoas."

Before this letter was sent off Andronicus professed his penitence for the crimes he had committed, and entreated that the sentence against him might not be published—a strong proof of the power which the sentence of excommunication then exercised on men's minds. Synesius unwillingly yielded to his entreaties, and to the representations of the other bishops of the province. Relieved from this momentary fear, Andronicus soon returned to his old cruelties, and the sentence of excommunication was definitely pronounced. A short time passed and Synesius wrote in triumph to Constantinople thanking his friends for procuring the dismissal of Andronicus. Another short interval, and Synesius was writing to the patriarch of Alexandria to implore his good offices for the fallen governor. "Justice has perished among men; formerly Andronicus acted unjustly, now he suffers unjustly. But it is the custom of the church to lift up the humble and to humble those who are lifted up. So Andronicus was hated by her for his evil deeds, but now is pitied for the calamities he suffers, beyond her curse, and in his behalf we have even offended those who are now in power. Alas that I shall never be on the side of those who rejoice, but shall always be mourning with those who weep! I have saved him from the hateful judgment-seat, and in other respects I have very much lessened his misfortunes. And if your holiness shall think him deserving of your care, I shall accept this as the clearest proof that he has not been altogether rejected by God." Freed for a time from these secular cares, Synesius was able to attend to his other episcopal duties. In a long letter addressed to Theophilus he has given a very interesting account of a visitation tour, undertaken at Theophilus's request in the course of the same year. This journey lay, through a part of the country which was still exposed to the incursions of the barbarians, to the villages of Palaebisca and Hydrax on the confines of the Libyan desert. His object was to induce the villagers to elect a bishop, but he was met at once by the objection that they had a bishop already, "the most religious Paulus of Erythron." The explanation which followed reveals a very curious page in ecclesiastical history. By ancient and apostolic custom, so the people said,[q] their villages had always formed part of the diocese of Erythron. In the reign of Valens the bishop of Erythron was an old man named Orion, whose only fault was his extreme gentleness. But what the rough inhabitants of these border villages wanted in a bishop was a man to rule them, a secular as well as a religious guide, a strong-minded and, if necessary, a strong-handed man, who should be judge in their disputes, a counsellor in their difficulties, a protector against their oppressors. As Orion was unequal to such a difficult post, the villages of Palaebisca and Hydrax revolted from the old man's rule and elected as their bishop Siderius, "a young active man who had just come home from the army to look after his estates, a man who could help his friends and injure his enemies." If his election was illegal his consecration was still more so. No permission was received from the patriarch of Alexandria, and only a single bishop could be found to officiate. But these were the times of the Arians, the majority of the people were heretics, and even the great Athanasius himself considered that in such perilous times the laws could not always be closely observed. Shortly afterwards, in hope of reviving the small spark of orthodoxy in Ptolemais, Athanasius promoted Siderius to that see, the metropolitan see of Pentapolis. In his old age Siderius retired to Palaebisca, and resumed the discharge of his episcopal duties there. At his death the people of Palaebisca and Hydrax returned to their ancient allegiance to the see of Erythron. When then

[q] By apostolic custom is doubtless meant the custom established by the apostolic see at Alexandria.

Synesius, at the request of Theophilus, who was probably not well informed of all the circumstances of the case, called on the people to elect a successor to "Siderius of happy memory," a striking scene occurred. With mingled cries of grief and expostulation they protested they would have no bishop but "the most religious Paulus of Erythron." In vain Synesius reproved and upbraided them for their impiety in resisting the commands of Theophilus, "whom to disobey or to honour is to disobey or to honour God." The people threw themselves upon the ground as suppliants, invoking the mercy of Theophilus, as if he were present and could hear their cries. All was confusion. No arguments could be listened to. Nothing was heard but the groaning of the men, the screams of the women, the weeping of the children. In vain Synesius had the most disorderly removed. The men were bad enough; but the women, "always most difficult to deal with," holding their infants in their outstretched arms, and closing their eyes that they might not see the bishop's seat unoccupied by their beloved ruler, continued weeping till Synesius himself was inclined to weep in sympathy with them. He dismissed the people and ordered them to reassemble on the fourth day. As the same scene was then repeated, he ultimately consented to send an account of all that had happened to Theophilus, leaving him to decide whether any further steps should be taken.

The next case which was brought before Synesius may perhaps explain what were the episcopal qualities which the people so much admired in "the most religious Paulus." Like "Siderius of happy memory" he was obviously an active man, one who could help his friends and injure his enemies. Near the village of Hydrax, on the summit of a precipitous hill, stood the ruins of an old castle. Part of its walls had been thrown down by an earthquake, but they could be so easily repaired, and the position was naturally so strong, that it was a place of great importance to the neighbouring villages in such troubled times. In those times of war and devastation it was a great advantage to the people to have a fortress close at hand to which they could retire with their cattle, and from which they could easily repel the attacks of the barbarians. Unfortunately for the people of Hydrax, the hill was the property of Dioscorus, bishop of the neighbouring town of Dardanus. Failing to obtain it by any other means, Paulus broke into the place by force, a table was brought and set up as an altar in a small out-building at the extremity of the hill, and then Paulus consecrated the building as a church. If this consecration held good, the building by law ceased to be private property, and as it was in the diocese of Erythron, it would remain in Paulus's hands, and as it could only be reached by a path which traversed the whole crest of the hill, the rest of the property would become almost valueless to any other owner. The question was referred to the bishop of the province, who strongly disapproved of what had been done, but hesitated to declare the act of consecration void. Synesius had no such scruples. He urged that the mere fact of celebrating the divine rites in a place could not make that place for ever sacred, otherwise all castles in time of war would become churches. "Besides," he said, "I distinguish between religion and superstition, a vice which wears the mask of virtue and is considered by philosophy the third form of atheism. I consider that nothing is holy or sacred which is not done in conformity with justice and piety. It is not the Christian belief that the divine presence must necessarily follow certain mystic rites and words, as if they had a magical power of attracting it, which might be the case with an earth-spirit.[r] The divine presence comes to those souls which are free from passion and devoted to God. Where wrath and anger and the spirit of contention rule, how can the Holy Spirit enter, for were He already dwelling there He would depart when these vices came." After this declaration of the metropolitan's views it was clear that judgment must be given in favour of Dioscorus. Then followed a scene very characteristic of the time and place. Overpowered probably by the general indignation, Paulus professed his penitence, and "when he owned his guilt and shewed the bitter grief he felt for the evil he had done, we were all conciliated, and began to sympathise with him." Dioscorus, who had refused every compromise before, now that his rights were established, shewed a most accommodating spirit. He was ready to sell the whole or part of the property to Paulus; he was willing to facilitate an arrangement by any means in his power. The affair terminated in Paulus becoming the purchaser of the hill and castle, and the people of Palaebisca and Hydrax doubtless congratulated themselves on the sagacity they had shewn in adhering to a bishop of such practical abilities.

Then the case of Lamponianus was brought forward, who pleaded guilty to the charge of having assaulted another presbyter, named John. Though the people interceded for him, and though he had acted under strong provocation, sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him, and it was expressly stipulated that he should only be absolved by the patriarch of Alexandria. If, however, he were dying, any presbyter might receive him to communion. "No one," said Synesius, "shall die excommunicated if I can help it."

The next subject which occupied Synesius's attention was connected with one of the worst evils which resulted from the misgovernment of the country. He found that even bishops were often accused by other bishops, not with any desire that justice should be done, but to give the commanders of the armies opportunities for extorting money. In such times of confusion it was doubtless easy to bring plausible charges against almost any one in high position. Synesius requested Theophilus to write to him on the subject, strongly condemning, but not by name, all who were guilty of doing so.

Then Synesius asked the patriarch's advice with regard to certain bishops, whom he calls Baskantibae, a Greek form of the Latin term Vacantivi. "They are men who do not choose to have a fixed diocese, for they have left their own without necessity, of their own accord. They enjoy the honours of their office, wandering to every place where they think they shall

[r] This is a curious allusion to his old belief in divination.

be best off. It seems to me, right reverend father, that these men who have rejected their own churches should be rejected by all churches, and until they return home should not be admitted to the altar, nor invited to occupy the places of dignity, but when they come to church should be left to take their seats among the common people. They will, perhaps, go home again, if they find they are losing the honours which they wish to enjoy anywhere rather than where they ought to be." . . . "Above all things pray for me. You will pray for one who is abandoned and utterly deserted, and who stands in need of such assistance, as I shrink from praying to God in my own behalf. For all things are against me, because of my reckless daring, because, though a sinful man, brought up an alien from the church, trained in another discipline, I have laid my hand upon the altar of God."

The morbid despondency shewn in these last lines was the result of many causes. He had hoped that in the episcopacy he should rise to a higher form of philosophy; he had found that he was not only overwhelmed with the secular cares he hated, but that even as a bishop his chief occupation seemed to be to settle the disgraceful quarrels of his suffragans. Like most highly sensitive men he needed personal sympathy as an assurance of divine favour, and he had no longer his happy home to fall back on as a refuge from his troubles. When the things went wrong, with his usual self-distrust he laid the blame upon himself. Above all, the conviction of personal sinfulness, which it seemed the special work of Christianity to produce in that day, was gradually being wrought into his conscience. Against his better judgment he had allowed himself to be ordained, trusting that fitness for the office would come with the discharge of its duties; and so he was continually making efforts to hold a position and to speak a language which were unnatural to him, and consequently when the reaction came he fell back into a state of exaggerated despondency.

The time during which he held his bishopric was so short, apparently only three years, and was marked by so many public and private calamities, that we possess but few letters which throw much light upon his life. In one we find him writing to his presbyters commending to their care the bearer of the paschal letter from Alexandria, who was travelling even through the parts of the country infested by the barbarians to announce to all the churches on what day Easter was be observed. In another he thanks Theophilus for the address he had sent by this messenger, praising it in the highest terms: "It conferred both a pleasure and a benefit on our cities, the latter by the grandeur of the ideas, the former by the grace of the language." In a third he urges his presbyters to vigorous, but peaceful, action against "the most impious sect of Eunomius, lest the newly-arrived apostles of the devil and Quintianus should secretly assail the flock." In a fourth he congratulates a friend on having embraced the monastic life, and "reached with a bound the goal, while I for a long time with labour and scanty success have been knocking at the outer door." In another he speaks of founding a monastery himself by the side of a running stream. His principal correspondent, however, at this period was Theophilus, whom he always addresses with a reverence and affection which may surprise those who have only known that prelate as the persecutor of Chrysostom, and which are the more important because Synesius, even in writing to Theophilus, professed his admiration for Chrysostom. Equally noticeable is the unqualified obedience which Synesius, though himself metropolitan of Pentapolis, cheerfully yielded to the "apostolic throne" of Alexandria. "It is at once my wish and my duty, to consider whatever decree comes from that throne binding upon me," he writes to Theophilus. The unquestionable superiority of Alexandria to all the cities of eastern Africa had given to the patriarch of Alexandria an authority over the bishop of those cities unsurpassed, even if it was rivalled, by the supremacy of Rome in that day over the bishoprics of Italy.

Of the bishop of Rome, and of the affairs of Rome, there is no mention in any of his letters—one of the many proofs which his works afford of the greatness of the separation, not only in government but in feeling, between the Eastern and Western empires. Though thoroughly well versed in all the branches of Greek literature, he never even alludes to any Latin author. After attentively reading his works, it is almost impossible to resist the belief that Synesius was ignorant even of the Latin language. If the interview, so pleasantly imagined by Mr. Kingsley, between Synesius and Augustine had ever really taken place, it is very unlikely that either would have understood what the other said. Still some notice of the crowning calamity, when the queen of the world yielded to Alaric without a struggle, could hardly have failed to appear in his writings, had not the misfortunes of Pentapolis been so great as to absorb all his thoughts. A vigorous general named Anysius, with only a troop of forty Unnigardae, had cut to pieces several detachments of Ausurians scattered in pursuit of plunder. A permanent force of only two hundred such soldiers under such a commander would have been amply sufficient, according to Synesius, for the protection of the country. The only result of these victories was that Anysius was speedily recalled to make way for an incompetent successor, and the Unnigardae, as no longer needed, were deprived of their horses and their higher pay as cavalry. When the means of resistance were thus destroyed, the Ausurians returned, only the more furious for the temporary check. The horrors of this last and worst invasion are graphically told by Synesius in a document apparently dictated to a secretary, and addressed to a friend at Constantinople who was to lay it before the emperor. The very abruptness of the style and the inconsistencies of the language shew, more strikingly than the most studied eloquence could have done, the troubled feelings of the speaker[a]. . . . "I have read of a country where only the women and children were left, the sign of its desolation. Things are still worse with us. There is no booty the Ausurians so much value as women and children, the women to bear fresh children to them, the children to swell their ranks. These children

[a] I have translated only a part of this Catastasis, as it is called.

will return one day to their native land, but they will return as enemies. The young man will devastate the fields which he cultivated as a boy by his father's side. Yet if we had had good generals it would have been easy enough to take vengeance on this sacrilegious and contemptuous enemy. What holy places have the barbarians spared? Have they not devastated the very tombs upon the plain of Barca? Have they not burnt and ruined my churches at Ampelis? Have they not defiled the holy tables, and used them for their feasts? Have not the sacred vessels of our public worship been carried off to be used in the worship of daemons? It is useless to speak of the forts they have demolished, the cattle they have seized in the caves of the mountains, the goods they have carried off. Pentapolis is ruined, is extinguished, has perished. I have no longer a country to fly from . . . Alas for Cyrene where the public records trace my descent from Hercules! Alas for the tombs where I shall not be laid, the tombs of the Dorians! Alas for Pentapolis, of which I am the last bishop! But the calamity is too near me—I can say no more—tears check my tongue. . . . I am overwhelmed at the thought of abandoning the house and services of God. I must sail away to some island, but when I am summoned to the ship I shall pray them to leave me a little longer here. First I shall go to God's temple; I shall embrace the altar, I shall wet with my tears the precious pavement, I will not leave till I have kissed the well-known door, the well-known seat. How often shall I call on God for help; how often shall I turn back, how often clasp the altar-screen . . . I would I could refresh my eyes with sleep, unbroken by the trumpet's sound. How long am I to be stationed on the battlements, how long am I to mount guard upon the wall? I am weary of setting the watches, guarding and being guarded in turn. I, who used to spend whole nights in observing the movements of the stars, am worn out by looking night after night for the movements of the enemy. Our time for sleep is measured by the water-clock, and often it is broken by the alarm bell. And if I do doze a little, what frightful dreams I have! In my dreams I fly, I am taken prisoner, I am wounded, I am fettered, I am sold as a slave. How often have I started from my sleep with joy because I escaped from my tyrant! How often have I awoke panting, bathed in perspiration, for the end of my sleep was the end of my flight from the soldier who pursued me . . . If the islands are free from such troubles as these, I will certainly set sail when the storm is abated. But I fear the calamity will overtake us before we can escape. The day for the assault draws near. When the peril of the city is extreme, then will be especially the time for the bishop to hasten to God's temple. I will stay in my country, in my church. I will place before me the sacred vessels of holy water. I will cling to the sacred pillars which raise the holy table from the ground. There will I remain while living, there will I lie when dead. I am God's minister, appointed to present the offerings to Him: it is perhaps His will that I should present to Him the offering of my life. Surely God will not look with indifference on His altar, stained for the first time with blood, the blood of His bishop."

But this was not to be. A new general, Marcellinus, arrived "like a God upon the scene." In a short time discipline was restored among the soldiers, and the Ausurians defeated in a decisive battle. Ptolemais was saved for a time, but the country was ruined. The enemy were gone, but desolation, poverty, and disease remained. In the winter Synesius lost "the last comfort of his life, his little son." The blow was too much for the father already crushed by the cares of his office, the labours of the siege, and the misery of his country. As death drew near his thoughts were curiously divided between the two objects to which in life he had given his faith. His last letter was addressed to Hypatia. His last poem was a prayer to Christ. The pagan philosopher retained to the end the reverence and affection of the Christian bishop. "You have been to me a mother, a sister, a teacher, and in all these relationships have done me good. Every title and sign of honour is your due. As for me, my bodily sickness comes from sickness of the mind. The recollection of the children who are gone is slowly killing me. Would to God I could either cease to live, or cease to think of my children's graves." In the hymn to Christ Synesius added an epilogue to the poems in which he had already recounted the drama of his soul. The actor who began so confident of success ended with a humble prayer for pardon. "O Christ, Son of God most high, have mercy on Thy servant, a miserable sinner, who wrote these hymns. Release me from the sins which have grown up in my heart, which are implanted in my polluted soul. O Saviour Jesus, grant that hereafter I may behold Thy divine glory." So in gloom and sadness, cheered by the Christian hope of the resurrection, closed the career of one, who in his time had indeed played many parts, who had been a soldier, a statesman, an orator, a poet, a sophist, a philosopher, a bishop, and in all these characters had acted as a man who deserved to be admired and still more to be loved. [T. R. H.]

NOTE.—This article was written by the Rev. T. R. Halcomb, Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, who died prematurely at Nice in the summer of 1880. Mr. Halcomb has also left behind him a considerable work on St. Gregory the Great, but it is unfortunately in too incomplete a condition to be published.

SYNUSIASTAE (Συνουσιασταί), a name given by Cyril to those who maintained that the divine and human natures were so united in one Christ that only one nature remained after the Union. (Cyrill. Alex. *Opp.* ed. Migne, *Patr. Graec.* lxxvi. 1427; Mai, *Bib. Nov. Patrum*, ii. 445.) [POLEMIUS (1).] [G. T. S.]

SYRIANUS, dux of Egypt, who in 356, instigated by the Arians, burst with his armed soldiery into the cathedral of Alexandria in the time of divine worship, when men were trampled down, women crushed to death and some of them stripped naked, while Athanasius himself barely escaped being torn in pieces (Athan. *Ap. ad Const.* §§ 22, 25, *Hist. Ar. ad Mon.* § 81; Tillem. viii. 151, 153–156). [C. H.]

SYRUS, the abbat of a monastery in Egypt, to whom is addressed one of the epistles of Pachomius with a mystic use of the Greek

letters. This use of the alphabet was believed to have been communicated to them by angels. Syrus is said by Jerome to have been living in the year 406 at the age of 110. (Jerome, vol. ii. p. 85–6, ed. Vall.; Gennadius, c. 7; Rufin. *Hist. Mon.* c. 10.) [W. H. F.]

T

TADIOCUS, said to have been the last bishop of York in the British line, and to have fled with Theonus, bishop of London, into Wales at the coming of the Saxons. There is no evidence for this save the chroniclers of the Arthurian school. [J. R.]

TALARICANUS (TARKIN), Pictish bishop, said in the *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. aest. f. cxxxiv.) to have been an Irishman raised to the episcopate by pope Gregory to convert the heathen nations, having his field of labour in the north of Scotland, where churches were dedicated to his memory. But the Scotch annalists make him bishop of Man late in the 9th century, while Skene (*Chron.* 168 and *Celt. Scot.* ii. 153) identifies him with Tolorggain, who died A.D. 616 (*Ann. Inisf.* A.D. 610 Cod. Bodl.), but both dates are doubtful. His feast is Oct. 30 in all the Scotch kalendars. Dempster places him at Lismore, Argyleshire (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 449 et al.). [J. G.]

TALASIUS, sixth bishop of Angers, was consecrated on the occasion of the synod of Angers, held in October 453, in which he took part (Mansi, vii. 899). He was not present at the first council of Tours in 461, but subscribed the *Acta* in his own diocese (*Ibid.* 947). There is extant a letter from Lupus of Troyes and Euphronius of Autun, in answer to questions he had put to them on some doubtful points of discipline and practice (*ibid.* 941; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 66; Ceillier, x. 357–8; *Gall. Christ.* xiv. 546–7). [S. A. B.]

TALITANUS, "publici patrimonii curator," is requested by Gregory the Great to prevent the officials of the state levying unjust exactions on the property of the church. (*Epp.* xi. 10.) [F. D.]

TAOR, a nun of a monastery near Antinople in Egypt, about A.D. 420. She was of singular beauty. While the other nuns went for communion to the church of the neighbouring city, she never left her cell for thirty years (Pallad. *Hist. Lausiac.* cap. cxxxviii.). [G. T. S.]

TAORGIUS, a bishop who ordained Ephesius as Luciferian bishop of Rome in opposition to Damasus, who persecuted him. (Marcell. et Faustin. *Libell. Precum*, cap. 23, 29, in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* t. xiii.) [G. T. S.]

TARACHUS, Oct. 11 (*Mart. Rom.*), Oct. 12. (Bas. *Men.*) He was also called Victor. He was an Isaurian from Claudiopolis, and a soldier, but left the army on the outbreak of the persecution. The acts of this martyr and his companions, Probus and Andronicus, are one of the most genuine pieces of Christian antiquity. They were first published by Baronius, in his Annals, at the year 290, but from an imperfect MS. Rosweyd and Bigot published subsequent editions, and finally Ruinart, at Baluze's suggestion, brought out the most complete edition in Greek and Latin from a comparison of several MSS. in the Colbertine Library. The martyrs were arrested A.D. 304 in Pompeiopolis, an episcopal city of Cilicia. They were publicly examined and tortured at three principal cities—Tarsus, Mopsuestia, and Anazarbus—where they were put to death. They were buried at Anazarbus, where their relics were carefully preserved. Towards the latter part of cent. iv. Auxentius, bishop of Mopsuestia, who, though a confessor in earlier life was then an Arian, built a church in their honour. He wished to obtain some of their relics for the use of this church. The martyrs, however, would have nothing to say to heretical honours. Their graves were opened, but such prodigies took place that no one dared to touch the sacred bodies. The martyrs were, however, more zealous for orthodoxy than the Roman martyrology, as Baronius has admitted this same heretical bishop as a confessor under date of Dec. 18, because he refused to place a bunch of grapes upon the pedestal of a statue of Bacchus, when ordered to do so by the emperor Licinius. The Acts of Tarachus are often quoted by Le Blant, in *Les Actes des Martyrs*, to illustrate his argument. Thus, p. 9, he notes the sale of copies of the Proconsular Acts by one of the officials for two hundred denarii. He also illustrates by them the judicial formularies, proconsular circuits, &c. Cf. pp. 27–29, 32, 63, 68, 72, 74, &c. They suffered under a president Numerianus Maximus. (Ruinart, *Acta Sinc.* 454–492.) [G. T. S.]

TARASIUS, ST., patriarch of Constantinople, was the son of the patrician Georgius, and himself became chief secretary to the emperor. Though a layman, he was designated by PAULUS IV. on his death-bed as his successor. The empress IRENE (10) desirous to find a fitting instrument to assist in restoring image-worship, procured his election, though the Iconoclastic clergy refused to assent. Tarasius was then ordered to come forward, and accepted the office on condition that a general council should be convened to heal the schism in the church. He was consecrated on Christmas Day, A.D. 784, and sent the usual synodic letters to Rome, and the three eastern patriarchates. The pope in his reply, in consideration of his zeal against the Iconoclasts, pardoned the irregularity that had been committed in appointing a layman *per saltum* to the patriarchate. For the history of the council which eventually met at Nicaea on Sept. 24, 787, see IRENE (10), Vol. III. p. 286.

When the emperor, in A.D. 795, repudiated his wife MARIA (7), Tarasius remonstrated with him, and threatened to exclude him from communion, nor when the emperor remained inflexible, would he consent to perform the ceremony of marriage between him and Theodote, but he did not carry out the threat of excommunication. He allowed the catechist of